

NORMATIVE CHRISTIANITY AND THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

NORMATIVE CHRISTIANITY
AND THE
GOSPEL OF JOHN

By

DAVID JOHN HAWKIN, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

May, 1974

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

AUTHOR: David John Hawkin, B.D. (London University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

NUMBER OF PAGES: xv, 222

SCOPE AND CONTENTS

The present study is an attempt to contribute to two areas of inquiry in New Testament studies. The first is the debate on orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity. The second is the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.

With reference to the orthodoxy/heresy theme, the effort of the dissertation is to propose and justify a question new to the contemporary debate; namely, whether, and in what terms, a Christian theologian of the New Testament era consciously intended to make his work cohere with Divine Revelation conceived as truth. In the present study the theologian in question is "the decisive redactor" of the Fourth Gospel. The dissertation argues that in elaborating themes such as those bearing on the "Spirit of truth" and "the disciple whom Jesus loved" the Evangelist has rooted a deep and pervasive concern for orthodoxy in the thematic core of Johannine theology: especially in the themes of "truth" and of Jesus as himself the truth (Jn. 14:6).

The main thrust of the study is exegetical. But, although limited to the understanding of one universe of discourse -- Johannine theology -- it has wider implications and belongs ultimately to a larger context: the understanding of early Christianity and its commitment to truth.

PREFACE

The exegesis of the Shepherd and the Vine (pp. 142-153) has been accepted for publication in the Evangelical Quarterly. Chapter Two is an expansion of a paper delivered at the Fifth International Biblical Congress in Oxford, 1973. The section on the Beloved Disciple (pp. 170-200) is to be read as a paper at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Biblical Studies in Toronto, 1974.

Where an English translation of a foreign work is available (and is indicated to be so in the footnote), I have used it for the purposes of quotation. Other quotations from works not available in English I have translated myself. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Meyer for his help in translating various works.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout the writing of this dissertation, I have received help from many quarters. I would like to thank in particular Professors C. K. Barrett, H. E. W. Turner, and R. Schnackenburg, not only for their assistance and advice in the hours they spent in conversation with me, but also for the gracious way in which I was received. I wish to thank also the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. E. P. Sanders and Dr. H. Jones, for their help and advice. Above all, however, I owe a special debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. B. F. Meyer, magister in sacra pagina, without whose inspirational guidance this dissertation would never have been written.

Lest it be thought that my expressions of gratitude are an attempt to implicate the above scholars in any errors in my work, I wish to add that they are, of course, absolved from responsibility for any of its inaccuracies or misjudgements.

I am indebted to Ms. Susan Phillips for typing the MS, and to Ms. Kassie Temple and Mr. Phil Shuler for their help in proofreading.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this work to my parents, who have been more than patient with a sometimes errant son.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE <u>THE ORTHODOXY/HERESY DEBATE.....</u>	1
1. <u>The Thesis of Walter Bauer.....</u>	1
2. <u>The Reply of H. E. W. Turner.....</u>	13
3. <u>The Orthodoxy/Heresy Debate Retrojected</u> <u>into the New Testament Era.....</u>	18
(a) The Debate on Paul.....	20
(b) The Debate on the Fourth Gospel.....	42
CHAPTER TWO <u>ORTHODOXY, HERESY AND DEVELOPMENT.....</u>	57
CHAPTER THREE <u>THE DECISIVE REDACTOR AND THE JOHANNINE REDACTION...89</u>	89
1. <u>The Decisive Redactor.....</u>	89
2. <u>The Johannine Redaction.....</u>	107
CHAPTER FOUR <u>NORMATIVE CHRISTIANITY AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.....</u>	127
1. <u>Truth in the Fourth Gospel.....</u>	128
2. (a) <u>The Shepherd.....</u>	142
(b) <u>The True Vine.....</u>	147
3. <u>The Paraclete.....</u>	154
4. <u>The Beloved Disciple in the Fourth Gospel.....</u>	170
<u>CONCLUSION.....</u>	202
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	204
I. <u>Texts and Tools.....</u>	204
II. <u>Books.....</u>	206
III. <u>Journal Articles and Essays in Collected</u> <u>Volumes.....</u>	214

ABBREVIATIONS

Barrett, John

Barrett, C. K. The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with commentary and notes on the Greek Text. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.

Bauer, Lexicon

Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature. Trans. and ed. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1957.

Blass-Debrunner, Grammar

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature. Trans. R. W. Funk. Chicago: University Press, 1961.

Brown, John

Brown, R. E. The Gospel according to John. Anchor Bible Vol. 29. i-xii: Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966; xiii-xxi: London: G. Chapman, 1971.

Bultmann, John

Bultmann, R. The Gospel of John: A Commentary. Trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Eusebius, EccHist

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine. Trans. H. L. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton. 2 vols. New York-Toronto: McMillan, 1927-28.

Kummel, Introduction

Kummel, W. G. Introduction to the New Testament. Trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. New York: Abingdon, 1966.

Schnackenburg, John

Schnackenburg, R. The Gospel according to St. John (i-iv). Trans. Kevin Smyth. New York: Herder and Herder; London: Burns and Oates, 1968.

PERIODICALS AND SERIES

BevTh	Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie
<u>Bib</u>	<u>Biblica</u>
<u>BJRL</u>	<u>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</u>
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie
<u>BZ</u>	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift</u>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
<u>ET</u>	<u>Expository Times</u>
ET:	English Translation
<u>EvTh</u>	<u>Evangelische Theologie</u>
<u>EvQ</u>	<u>Evangelical Quarterly</u>
FRLANT	Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<u>HarvThR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>JournRel</u>	<u>Journal of Religion</u>
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
<u>MunchTheolZeit</u>	<u>Munchener Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
n.f.	Neue Folge
n.s.	New Series

<u>NovT</u>	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
<u>RB</u>	<u>Révue Biblique</u>
<u>RGG</u> ³	<u>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</u>
<u>RivBib</u>	<u>Rivista Biblica</u>
<u>SBT</u>	<u>Studies in Biblical Theology</u>
<u>SJTh</u>	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>
<u>StudTheol</u>	<u>Studia Theologica</u>
<u>TDNT</u>	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament = TWNT</u>
<u>TheolLitZeit</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
<u>ThR</u>	<u>Theologische Rundschau</u>
<u>TS</u>	<u>Theological Studies</u>
<u>TWNT</u>	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament = TDNT</u>
<u>TZ</u>	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
<u>ZKT</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie</u>
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZTK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>

INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of the present study is to determine whether a concern for "orthodoxy" figures in the theology of the Fourth Gospel, and, if so, how. This principal objective is, however, related to a larger constellation of concerns, for a satisfactory resolution of this primary problem will contribute positively to the understanding of early Christian faith and theology. In other words, the delineation of the specific contours of the Johannine world of discourse contributes to the larger task of correlating the several universes of discourse which mark and partly constitute the history of early Christian faith. Our attempt to focus on one universe of discourse -- Johannine theology -- therefore represents a single effort belonging ultimately to a larger context: the history of the early Christian commitment to truth. In the present study we wish simply to illuminate an aspect of the intentions of the Johannine redaction relevant to this study.

To say that our object is "the concern for orthodoxy" in "the theology of the Fourth Gospel" requires a clarification both of "orthodoxy" and "the theology of the Fourth Gospel".

We take our definition of "orthodoxy" from the history of Christian thought. In this history "orthodoxy" is conceived of as right belief, belief which responds to and is grounded in Divine Revelation. It thus contrasts with "heresy", i.e., false or defective

belief. In this conception orthodoxy and heresy constitute a binomial; moreover, they are defined by reference to each other. Nevertheless, orthodoxy is logically prior to heresy, for one cannot have heretical belief without a norm against which it is judged defective or false. As such, orthodoxy usually reaches formal definition with the appearance of heresy.

This observation perhaps throws light on the suppositions of the so-called Eusebian view of history, which conceives of orthodoxy as historically prior to heresy. The Eusebian view of history was criticized by Walter Bauer in his book, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im "ältesten Christentum."¹ Bauer was specifically concerned with refuting the Eusebian view of early Christianity: he found no historical justification for the claim that orthodoxy was historically prior to heresy. In fact he concluded that what was labelled "heresy" in third and fourth century Christianity was in fact first in many areas.

The only detailed reply to Bauer has been given by H. E. W. Turner, The Pattern of Christian Truth.² Turner conceded that the Eusebian view of early Christian history would not stand. At some points he sought to correct Bauer's view on purely historical grounds;

¹"Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934. See below, pp. 1 ff.

²London: Mowbray, 1954. See below, pp. 13 ff.

but, more fundamentally, he insisted on the relatively undifferentiated character of the theologies of various groups in early Christianity. Thus, between orthodoxy and heresy Turner posited a "penumbra" rather than a sharply drawn distinction in earliest times. The divisions, he maintained, were not nearly as clear as either Bauer or Eusebius had averred.

Our own inquiry turns on whether there was a "concern for orthodoxy" in the theology of the Fourth Gospel, and, if so, what particular shape it took. The question focuses on an unknown which has not been thematically treated in the orthodoxy/heresy debate. Bauer's question was: Is Eusebius right in affirming that orthodoxy was present at the very beginning of early Christianity? By "orthodoxy" Bauer meant what "one usually and customarily"³ understands by the word and his model was the views reigning in ecclesiastical Christianity of the third and fourth centuries. Turner's work added a new dimension to the inquiry, for it contained the more fundamental insights that orthodoxy and heresy were relatively undifferentiated in early Christianity, and that the direction the Church took in defining orthodoxy was grounded in its commitment to the faith data which animated it and sustained its life. Turner's position is, in fact, a mediating position between Bauer's and our own.

The orthodoxy/heresy debate since Bauer and Turner has tended

³See below, pp. 57 ff.

to take its point of departure from Bauer's question. The unknown-to-be-known in the work of Schmithals, Koester and others is "the diversification" to be found in early Christianity.⁴ As such, their strategy of inquiry is different from ours. The strategy of the present inquiry is designed to offer a new orientation, or at least a new perspective, to the ongoing debate.

The Christians of antiquity conceived of orthodoxy as that which rightly responds to and is grounded in Divine Revelation. Revelation itself was the major presupposition of orthodoxy. The Fourth Gospel is clearly concerned with the theme of revelation. The question is whether the Gospel is also concerned with its preservation against error in the Christian community.

Much of the present study is thus exegetical in character, as is required if we are in fact to determine whether the concern for orthodoxy figures in the theology of the Fourth Evangelist. "Theology" we take to be a relatively systematic and distinctive conception of the faith heritage. By "Evangelist" we mean the "decisive redactor", i.e., that writer who more than any other has given the Gospel its peculiar thrust and present form.

Our study will proceed along the following lines. In Chapter One we shall describe briefly the work of some of the participants in orthodoxy/heresy debate. In Chapter Two we shall endeavour to ground

⁴See below, especially pp. 20 ff.

our suppositions and choice of unknowns by an emphasis on the notion of development. Finally, Chapters Three and Four will deal specifically with the Fourth Gospel. Chapter Three will be devoted mainly to Einleitung questions, while Chapter Four will deal with the contours the concern for orthodoxy takes on in the Fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ORTHODOXY/HERESY DEBATE

(1) The Thesis of Walter Bauer

In this opening chapter we shall examine briefly the contributions of some of the participants in the debate on orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity. Our purpose is to indicate the objects and strategies of inquiry employed in the debate so far, and so to say what contribution to our knowledge of the history of early Christianity such inquiries have made. This, we hope, will silhouette more clearly our own object and strategy of inquiry and the sort of contribution we would like to make to the discussion.

The initiators of the debate were Walter Bauer and H. E. W. Turner. We shall examine their work in some detail, for Bauer's book has given a particular direction to the discussion of orthodoxy and heresy in the New Testament era, while Turner's response to Bauer has influenced our own inquiry. Treatment of these two writers will be followed by a survey of recent attempts to carry on the orthodoxy/heresy debate in the framework of New Testament studies.

The classical view of the pattern of early Christian development runs unbelief, right belief, deviations into wrong belief. That is to say, unbelievers are first converted into orthodox Christian believers, and only later are there deviations from the norm with the rise of

heresies. The pure Christian doctrine was revealed by Christ to his Apostles, who were commissioned to take this unadulterated gospel¹ to the portions of the world allotted to them. It was only after the death of the Apostles that heresy crept into the Church.

This schematization of the development of early Christianity was criticized by Walter Bauer in his book Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im "ältesten Christentum".² Neglected for almost a quarter of a century, this book has now become the focal point of a growing and important debate.³ The discussion which has so belatedly ensued in the wake of Bauer's work focuses attention not only on the problem of orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity, but by implication in modern theology.

¹For example, the apostolic authorship of the Apostles' Creed is first found in a letter of the Synod of Milan (390 A.D.) and assumed by Tyrannius Rufinus in his commentary on the Creed (404 A.D.); see J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960²), p. 44.

²"Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934. A second edition, edited by Georg Strecker and with the addition of two appendices, was published in 1963. All references will be to the English translation, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), eds. R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel.

³See the second appendix, Orthodoxy and Heresy, pp. 286-316. Some of the key issues are indicated in H.-D. Betz, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Primitive Christianity: Some Critical Remarks on Georg Strecker's Republication of Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im "ältesten Christentum""; Interpretation 19 (1965), 299-311; C. Clarke Chapman, "Some Theological Reflections on Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im "ältesten Christentum": A Review Article", Journal of Ecumenical Studies 7 (1970), 564-574. In the present chapter we shall discuss most (though not all) of the literature.

Although J. M. Robinson describes Bauer's book itself as "in the older tradition of purely historical-critical scholarship",⁴ the polemic induced by the book has often been passionate and occasionally bitter.⁵

Bultmann himself endorsed Bauer's view⁶ and Bauer's thesis has been implicitly accepted by many Bultmannians. For example, Käsemann posed the question: "Does the New Testament canon establish the unity of the Church?" He answers that it rather establishes the "plurality of confessions".⁷ Koester, in acclaiming the work of Bauer, describes Christianity as "a religious movement which is syncretistic in appearance and conspicuously marked by diversification from the very beginning".⁸

⁴"Basic Shifts in German Theology", Interpretation 16 (1962), p. 77.

⁵Note the remark of Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1966), pp. 133 f.; ET: The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17 (London: S.C.M., 1968), p. 75, n. 1. See also the attack of J. Munck, "The New Testament and Gnosticism", StTh 15 (1961), p. 187, on Walter Schmithals. Moreover, one should remember that H. Schlier's eventual conversion to the Catholic Church was anticipated in his article "Über das Hauptanliegen des 1. Briefes an die Korinther: Eine Abschlussvorlesung", EvTh 9 (1949), 462-473, inasmuch as he associates Bultmann with Paul's adversaries.

⁶Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1954), pp. 489 f.; ET: Theology of the New Testament (New York: Scribner's, 1951-55), II, p. 137.

⁷"Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche?" Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960), 214-225; ET: "The Canon of the New Testament and the unity of the Church", in Essays on New Testament Themes, SBT 41 (London: S.C.M., 1965), pp. 95-107.

⁸"GNOMAI DIAPHORAI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in Early Christianity", HarvThR 58 (1965), 279-318, 281.

In an article in the Bultmann Festschrift he further argues in Bultmannian categories for a distinction between orthodoxy and heresy to be guided by the existential paradox of the cross.⁹

Bauer's pioneering study is important because of the crucial issues it raises. He has given renewed impetus to viewing Christian origins from the standpoint of diversity. Specifically, Bauer's work raises the following problems: Can the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" be applied correctly to earliest Christianity? Is "orthodoxy" to be seen as no more than that which gained acceptance by the Church at large? Does Bauer's work contradict the claim of the Church to be in direct historical continuity with the apostles? Again, Bauer used the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" without reference to the claims of the "orthodox" and "heretical" parties themselves; that is, he did not judge the claims or condemnations of either party. Eusebius used the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" with the claim that the assertions of the "orthodox" are true and those of the "heretics" false. Is there an alternative way of using these terms?

Such churchmen as Eusebius viewed history providentially. The view which won out is true because of the work of the Holy Spirit. Bauer insisted on a "scientific" approach to history. Are these two views mutually exclusive? Has the orthodoxy/heresy debate reached

⁹"Häretiker im Urchristentum als Theologisches Problem", in Zeit und Geschichte, Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag, im Auftrage der Alten Marburger und in Zusammenarbeit mit Hartwig Thyen, ed. E. Dinkler (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1964), pp. 61-76; ET: "The Theological Aspects of Primitive Christian Heresy", in The Future of our Religious Past, ed. J. M. Robinson (New York, Evanston, San Francisco and London: Harper & Row, 1971), pp. 65-83.

an impasse at this point?

These, then, are some of the questions raised by Bauer's work. Bearing them in mind, we will now examine in some detail Bauer's thesis.

In the introduction to the book Bauer gives a programmatic sketch of intention. He intends to use the scientific approach to history, in the spirit of the dictum audiatur et altera pars.¹⁰ Hence, in his discussion of orthodoxy and heresy he consciously avoids allowing his judgement to be swayed by one party:

that party which perhaps as much through favourable circumstances as by its own merit eventually was thrust into the foreground, and which possibly has at its disposal today the more powerful, and thus the more prevalent voice, only because the chorus of the others has been muted...¹¹

Orthodoxy and heresy are not to be discussed by the church,¹² but by history (xxiii).

The ecclesiastical position has four main suppositions. Firstly, that Jesus "revealed the pure doctrine to his apostles, partly before his death, and partly in the forty days before his ascension" (xxiii). Secondly, after Jesus' death the apostles took the unadulterated gospel to the portions of the world allotted to them. Thirdly, after the death of the apostles false doctrine crept in at the instigation of Satan. The

¹⁰"Let the other side also be heard".

¹¹Orthodoxy and Heresy, p. xxi.

¹²Throughout the discussion of Bauer's book we follow the convention of the English translation in not capitalizing this word.

pattern of development in earliest Christianity is thus envisaged as running unbelief, right belief, deviations into wrong belief. Bauer is disconcerted by the fact that there is scarcely "the faintest notion anywhere that unbelief might be changed directly into what the church calls false belief". Fourthly, there is the supposition that right belief is invincible.

It is these suppositions that Bauer intends to examine. As an historian he refuses to employ the correlatives "true" and "untrue", "good" and "bad". He is not easily convinced of the moral inferiority usually attributed to the heretics. Neither is it self-evident that heresies are a deviation from the genuine.

Having thus announced his intention, Bauer applies himself to his task. He begins with an examination of the region of Edessa in the post-apostolic age. Was there in the second century in Mesopotamia a large body of ecclesiastically organized Christians? After a lengthy and somewhat intricate discussion of the evidence, Bauer concludes that this is not the case. The orthodox¹³ arrive so late on the scene that they cannot even claim for themselves the title of Christians, for such a designation does not distinguish them from the Marcionites. Furthermore, Bauer finds evidence of subterfuge and deceit by the orthodox:

¹³Here we follow Bauer's convention in the use of this term. It is worth noting, however, that Bauer seems to equate "orthodoxy" with ecclesiastical Christianity. What exactly he meant by this term has caused considerable resultant confusion. Moffatt, Ehrhardt, Turner and Koester all redefine the term in a way which makes nonsense of Bauer's supposition that it can be used in its customary and usual way, see Orthodoxy and Heresy, p. 314, n. 30.

Kune stands accused of fabricating the Abgar legend which Eusebius reproduces in his Ecclesiastical History. In such a way Kune hoped to deal the death blow to the heretics by showing that the position he represented stood in direct continuity with the apostles. For Bauer there is no doubt: the foundation of Christianity in Edessa rests on an unmistakably heretical basis. Orthodoxy comes to prevail only "very gradually and with great difficulty" (43).

Next Bauer turns his attention to Egypt. He notes the almost total silence¹⁴ with regard to Christianity in Egypt and Alexandria in the first two centuries. This makes him very suspicious, for Christianity obviously came to Egypt very early. Why do we know so little of Christian origins in that country? Because the situation there was something of an embarrassment for later orthodoxy -- "even into the third century, no separation between orthodoxy and heresy was accomplished in Egypt and the two types of Christianity were not yet clearly differentiated from each other" (59).

As for Ignatius of Antioch, he is less concerned with depicting the actual situation than with portraying an ideal. Although it is true that the majority of Christians in the churches of Asia Minor at

¹⁴The extensive use of the argument from silence has been one of the most frequent criticisms of Bauer's work, ibid., pp. 290 f. It is surely a valid criticism. For example, he says "Were I not fearful of misusing the argument from silence, I would have to raise the question as to why we hear nothing at all about the community in neighbouring Thessalonica in this connection?" He then goes on to discuss that very question! Ibid., pp. 74 ff.

Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles and Philadelphia held to a form of Christianity which Ignatius could condone, we must beware of extending this judgement to cover the whole of Asia Minor, or merely only its Western part. For "the surviving clues concerning Antioch, Philippi, and Polycarp's Smyrna should at least urge us to be cautious, if not frighten us away from such a generalization" (77).

Ignatius knows of "difficulties" in Ephesus. Moreover, we can infer from I Timothy -- with its opposition to a Jewish type of gnosticism -- that there existed there

a gnostic Jewish Christianity large and powerful enough to evoke opposition, so that one could not simply classify the Jewish Christianity of this region as being on the side of ecclesiastical orthodoxy without further examination. Thus Jewish Christianity would be divided, just as gentile Christianity was divided, into orthodox and heretical types.¹⁵

For Bauer, that which triumphs as "orthodox" is the Christianity of Rome. Why did Roman Christianity come to dominate the whole of Christendom? Bauer finds a number of reasons, not the least of which is the affluence of the Roman church:

If we ask to what degree donations of money should be of importance in the warfare of the spirits, our imagination would have no difficulty in suggesting all kinds of ways....The encomium of Eusebius teaches us that Rome viewed it as an altogether legitimate practice in religious controversies to tip the scales with golden weights...¹⁶

Apart from material advantage, the Roman church was endowed

¹⁵Ibid., p. 85.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 122 f.

with "a shrewdness, energy and communal unity" (123) engendered by the experiences of persecution. The Roman church was essentially unanimous in the faith and in the standards of Christian living; after it had rid itself of the Marcionites it was never endangered by serious heresy. By the end of the second century, being meticulously organized and methodically governed by the monarchical bishop, the Roman church was ready to flex its muscles and extend its power.

Not unexpectedly, Bauer is somewhat cynical about the Roman church's claim to be in direct continuity with Peter. He finds specific ecclesiastical requirement more operative here than historical memory. Bauer notes that although Peter was linked originally with Paul at Rome, he is later singled out and elevated above the apostle to the gentiles because he alone provides the close tie to Jesus which guarantees the purity of church teaching (114).

In his treatment of the use of literature in the conflict Bauer focuses on the work of Eusebius. (After all, it is Eusebius who wished to show that the general rejection of false belief could be found in the very earliest Christian literature.¹⁷) Eusebius does not fare well under Bauer's scrutiny.¹⁸ He is simply inaccurate in depicting an

¹⁷"It is a matter of concern to him [Eusebius] to assert that there is in existence a body of ecclesiastical literature, as old as possible and as extensive as possible, but also treasured as much as possible in the present, and just as widely dispersed. He wants to show that the general rejection of false belief can also be found from earliest times in Christian literature". Ibid., p. 150.

¹⁸Bauer protests at one point that it was not his intention to be so critical of Eusebius, but the evidence drives him to the conclusion that Eusebius is "unreliable as an historian". Ibid., p. 165, n. 33.

abundance of orthodox literature extant in the first centuries.

Bauer adduces evidence of much chicanery in the use of literature. Opponents' views were distorted, their characters maligned, and their documents tampered with and falsified. Once the orthodox party gained the upper hand, they suppressed (where possible) all heretical literature. Hence we cannot hope to gain a true picture of the circumstances prevalent in the first few centuries by taking on face value the content of the literature.

Moreover, the canonical writings must be scrutinized, for they themselves are the end product of the struggle between orthodoxy and heresy. They are chosen by the orthodox. (The Old Testament is of no help either. It served a limited usefulness in opposing heretics, for it was subject to differing interpretations even within the ranks of the orthodox.) The Gospel of John began its course as a heretical Gospel. Paul also enjoyed the favour of the heretics.¹⁹ The pastoral epistles represent the attempt of the church to enlist Paul unambiguously as part of the fight against the heretics.²⁰ It was they who made Paul's letters ecclesiastically viable. I John, with its anti-heretical tone, performed a similar service for John.

¹⁹"Marcion simply represents a high point and is by no means a unique case". Ibid., p. 224.

²⁰Paul could hardly be excluded from the church's list of protagonists, as he had been appealed to too often. The tradition that he was a martyr and apostle of Rome was too strong.

Bauer sums up his position thus:

The form of Christian belief and life which was successful was that supported by the strongest organization -- that form which was the most uniform and best suited for mass consumption-- in spite of the fact that, in my judgement, for a long time after the close of the post-apostolic age the sum total of consciously orthodox and anti-heretical Christians was numerically inferior to that of the "heretics".²¹

Furthermore:

[I]t appears no less self-evident that the Roman government finally came to recognize that the Christianity ecclesiastically organized from Rome was flesh of its flesh, came to unite with it, and thereby actually enabled it to achieve ultimate victory over unbelievers and heretics.²²

With respect to the New Testament itself, the conclusions of Bauer are no less far-reaching. Paul himself scarcely knew a heretic,²³ and he had "calm confidence" that the Christian religion would eliminate from itself what was alien to it.²⁴ At this juncture, Bauer deftly

²¹Ibid., p. 231.

²²Ibid., p. 232.

²³"That is, 'heretic' in the sense concerning whom one is convinced that his divergent stance with regard to the faith bars him from the path of salvation". Ibid., pp. 234 f.

²⁴Bauer acknowledges that at least Galatians cannot be said to exude calm confidence: "On one occasion, to be sure, we see him flare up indignantly and hear him hurl his anathema against a divergent view -- this is in Galatians, where it is a matter of preventing a gentile Christian community from falling back into Judaism. But even here it is not the overt Jewish Christianity as advocated, for example, by the "pillar" James that is considered heresy and the object of Paul's wrath. Brethren are transformed into false brethren only at the moment in which, in defiance of the agreement reached in Jerusalem, an attempt is made to fasten the yoke of legalism on the necks of liberated gentile Christians". Ibid., p. 236.

inverts the argument and roundly declares that Paul is the only heresiarch known in apostolic times.²⁵ The Judaizers, who were the main critics of Paul, were to be judged more harshly by history:

The arrow quickly flew back at the archer. Because of their inability to relate to a development that took place on hellenized gentile soil, the Judaists soon became a heresy, rejected with conviction by the gentile Christians....Thus the Judaists became an instructive example of how even one who preserves the old position can become a "heretic" if the development moves sufficiently far beyond him.²⁶

Bauer concludes his book thus:

It is indeed a curious quirk of history that western Rome was destined to begin to exert the determined influence upon a religion which had its cradle in the Orient, so as to give it that form in which it was to achieve world-wide recognition. But as an other-worldly religion that despises and inflexibly orders life in accord with a superhuman standard that has descended from heaven, or as a complicated mystery cult for religious and intellectual connoisseurs, or as a tide of fanatical enthusiasm that swells today and ebbs tomorrow, Christianity never could have achieved such a recognition.²⁷

In a few words, Bauer's thesis has a three-pronged thrust. First, the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" are a retrojection of schematic categories inapplicable to a situation of considerable confusion and fluidity. Groups later labelled "heretical" were in fact the earliest representatives of Christianity in many areas. Finally, the victory of what is now labelled "orthodox" was due almost entirely to the Roman church.

²⁵Ibid., p. 236.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., p. 240.

(2) The Reply of H. E. W. Turner

The only other detailed work on the orthodoxy/heresy issue is that of H. E. W. Turner, The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church.²⁸ In a specific response to Bauer, Turner puts forward his own thesis.

He begins by describing the classical theory of orthodoxy and heresy. Heresy is not present before true doctrine. But the heretics themselves challenged such an orthodox caricature. Marcion himself claimed to be a conservative and certainly not an innovator. The Gnostics claimed to represent a secret tradition no less authentic than that of the Church.²⁹ And heretics no less than orthodox argued from scripture and laid claim to the title Christian (8).

Turner maintains that the classical view will not stand -- not least because it supposes a static conception of orthodoxy. Heresy is certainly not a deviation from a fixed and static norm. The Apostolic Fathers cannot be reduced to a single doctrinal common denominator, neither can the New Testament be embraced under a single theological rubric (10).

Turner briefly reviews three modern alternatives to the classical view of orthodoxy: A. Harnack, M. Werner, and R. Bultmann. Each of these expositors stresses the diversity and fluidity of early

²⁸ Bampton Lectures (London: Mowbray, 1954).

²⁹ Here we follow the convention of Turner in capitalizing the word "Church".

Christian thought, in opposition to the notion of a fixed and stable norm. Each seems to suggest that the "orthodoxy" which was eventually victorious was a severely malformed replica of the original Christian faith.

Turner finds himself out of sympathy with extreme views on the orthodoxy/heresy issue. The classical notion of a fixed and static doctrinal norm is too simple. On the other hand, the view that sees the resultant victorious faith as a travesty of its former self is too severe. These alternative modern views imply too high a degree of openness or flexibility. Accordingly, Turner sets himself the task of bridging the gap between the two views:

The development of Christian theology as a whole (and not merely in the Patristic period) may be perhaps better interpreted as the interaction of fixed and flexible elements, both of which are equally necessary for the determination of Christian truth in the setting of a particular age.³⁰

What are the "fixed elements" in the Christian tradition? First, says Turner, there are the "religious facts themselves, without which there would be no grounds for its existence" (26). Here we quote Turner at length, as this point seems to have been misunderstood by some later writers.³¹

Belief in God as a Sovereign Father of a creation which is his handiwork forms an essential part of the basic realities of the Christian Church. His

³⁰Pattern, p. 26.

³¹See, for example, Koester, "GNOMAI DIAPHORAI", p. 281.

being may at times be described in terms more appropriate to the static and transcendent Absolute of Greek metaphysics, His Fatherhood too closely approximated to mere causation, His Providence defined in terms drawn from the Hellenic concept of Pronoia. The religious fact still underlies the changing categories under which it is expressed. The fact of Christ as the Historical Redeemer serves to differentiate even the most metaphysical of Christian thinkers from the Greek 'flight from history'. The Christian estimate of history was already a stone of stumbling to Celsus, and here Origen, despite his fundamental sympathy with much of the Greek spirit and the priority which his theory of exegesis was to assign to the mystical over the historical, remains inflexible. If there was a tradition in Christology which saw the Divine Logos in the Incarnate Lord and scarcely had eyes for anything else, the Church as a whole never lost her grip upon the concept of the incarnation as an act of Divine Irruption into human history.³²

This is a fundamental point for Turner: "The Church's grasp on the religious facts was prior to any attempt to work them into a coherent whole" (27). Turner gives the name lex orandi to the notion of "the relatively full and fixed experimental grasp of what was involved in being a Christian" (28). Thus, for instance, Turner maintains that Christians lived trinitarily long before the evolution of Nicene orthodoxy.

Further elements of fixity lay in the Biblical Revelation, the Creed and the Rule of Faith. There is a direct sequence from the New Testament kerygma through the stylized summaries of credenda to the earliest credal forms themselves.³³ The creeds may well mark the

³²Op. cit., pp. 26 f.

³³Here Turner adduces evidence in support of his case. Op. cit., p. 30, n. 2.

beginning of a new stage. Yet this stage itself is a continuation "of a process which takes its origins from the formalized oral tradition of the Apostolic Church itself" (30).

Among the flexible elements within Christian thought, Turner finds one of the most important "differences in Christian idiom". Many see a radical difference between an eschatological and a metaphysical interpretation of Christianity. Turner, however, maintains that the "Christian deposit of faith is not wedded irrevocably to either idiom but is capable of expression both ontologically and eschatologically" (31).

The selection of a distinctive theological idiom, whether it be eschatology, ontology, or even in more recent times existentialism, illustrates one possible element of flexibility in Christian thinking.³⁴

Flexible elements also lie in the individual personalities of the theologians themselves.

Turner's main contention is that the situation described by Bauer is more adequately explained by the existence of a "penumbra" or fringe between orthodoxy and heresy; the line of division between the two was not nearly as sharp as Bauer avers. Bauer's treatment is vitiated by his failure to attain to an adequate view of orthodoxy: he does not allow for its richness and variety. In short, "orthodoxy resembles not so much a stream as a sea, not a single melodic theme but a rich and varied harmony, not a single closed system but a rich

³⁴Op. cit., p. 31.

manifold of thought and life" (80).

Turner's critique of Bauer is captured in the following excerpt:

His fatal weakness appears to be a persistent tendency to over-simplify problems, combined with the ruthless treatment of such evidence as fails to support his case. It is very doubtful whether all sources of trouble in the early Church can be reduced to a set of variations on a single theme. Nor is it likely that orthodoxy itself evolved in a uniform pattern, though at different speeds in the main centres of the universal Church. The formula 'splinter movement, external inspiration or assistance, domination of the whole Church by its orthodox elements, tributes of gratitude to those who assisted in its development' represents too neat a generalization to fit the facts. History seldom unfolds itself in so orderly a fashion.³⁵

In his theological analysis of heresy Turner tests the claim of various heresies to be Christian. If we put the question thus: How do the various heresies deviate from the norm? Turner answers that Gnosticism is a dilution of Christianity by alien elements (102-117); Marcionism is a truncation (117-124); Montanism is a distortion (124-132); Arianism is an evacuation (142-148). Those heresies which preserve the past without reference to the present Turner describes as "archaisms" (132-142).

Turner's effort is to show how heresy is not so much a questioning of the Tradition³⁶ as a whole, but rather the right relation of elements

³⁵Ibid., p. 79.

³⁶Turner is aware of the deeper problem: "The priority of Church to Bible is no doubt true in an instrumental sense. It was within the Christian Church and by her members that the New Testament was both written and received. Yet it is equally true and of even greater significance that the Scriptures, considered as the norm and groundwork of the Church's life, remain prior to the Church. They enshrine the realities upon which her life must be based and to which they must be continually referred. There is, therefore, no formal contradiction between these two complementary propositions, and those who maintain a priority of value of Scripture over tradition cannot on these grounds be accused of falling into an unobserved contradiction". Ibid., p. 487.

within the Tradition. There is an intuitive rejection of heresy through Christian common sense (498). The results of such development must be tested not only by the principle of coherence, "the logical articulation of the Christian faith into a systematic whole, but also by the further principle of correspondence with the Biblical facts themselves" (488).

Bauer and Turner are the two main contributors to the debate on orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity. The trend of the subsequent debate has been to retroject the orthodoxy/heresy question into the New Testament. The participants in this venture have tended to take their point of departure from Bauer rather than from Turner. In our next chapter we shall attempt to distinguish such inquiries from that of Turner, indicating the suppositions which ground the differently oriented inquiries. Before we do so, however, it will be useful to briefly indicate the method and results of the inquiry into orthodoxy/heresy in the New Testament.

(3) The Orthodoxy/Hersey Debate Retrojected into the New Testament

Bauer himself thought that the New Testament was "both too unproductive and too much disputed to serve as a point of departure"³⁷ in any discussion of orthodoxy/heresy. It was Bultmann who saw the full impact of Bauer's asseverations lying within the New Testament itself: "...the canon reflects a multiplicity of conceptions of Christian faith or its content. Hence, its inner unity becomes a question".³⁸ The origin of Christian theology itself is to be found

³⁷Orthodoxy and Heresy, p. xxv.

³⁸Theology, II, p. 141.

in the disputes and debates reflected in the New Testament documents. Hence a clarification of the issues at stake in such disputes is of concern for the understanding of both New Testament history and theology.

Bauer never considered whether the disputes in the New Testament were instances of his own thesis. Many subsequent scholars, however, have focused precisely on this topic. The problem of Jewish Christianity within the early Church has, of course, been recognized before. (F. C. Baur saw a radical break between the gospel preached by Paul and that by the Judaizers in Jerusalem.) In the appendix to the second edition of Bauer's book Strecker focuses upon this problem. He applies Bauer's thesis to one part of Jewish Christianity -- the nomistic Jewish Christianity at home in the Greek-speaking part of Syria. By evaluating in some detail the indirect evidence of the Didascalia apostolorum he concludes that the author there is a hard-pressed defender of "orthodoxy". Moreover, the author of the Kerygmata Petrou, which contains a theology of a Jewish-Christian character contemporary (or earlier) with the Didascalia, clearly does not have a sectarian self-understanding. Strecker therefore sees this particular contribution of his as a correction of Bauer, who was wrong in asserting that Jewish Christianity soon became a heresy rejected by Gentile Christians. Strecker believes that his argument shows that there was a Jewish Christianity predominant in Syria (independent of the catholic church) during the second and third centuries.

But the problem of Jewish Christianity is only one aspect of a very complex situation in early Christianity. It is evident from the Pauline letters that Paul was not in dispute solely with Jewish

Christians. Much of the debate on orthodoxy/heresy in the New Testament has been concerned with identifying precisely the beliefs of Paul's opponents. Accordingly, we shall now discuss the orthodoxy/heresy debate with specific reference to Paul.

(a) The Debate on Paul

A major question has been the identification of Paul's opponents in Corinth. Here there are at least three very detailed works and many articles. The first major work which was self-confessedly influenced by Bauer was that of Walter Schmithals.³⁹ His book has had a mixed reception.⁴⁰ There are those among the Bultmannians who have criticized Schmithals' "doctrinaire presupposition" of the Gnostic Redeemer Myth.⁴¹

³⁹Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen, FRLANT NF 48 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956, 1965), ET: Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the letters to the Corinthians (New York: Abingdon, 1971). The English edition is a translation of the second edition in which Schmithals takes note of the criticisms of Georgi and Colpe. All references are to the English edition.

⁴⁰See the criticisms of J. M. Robinson, "Basic Shifts", pp. 79-81; C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians", NTS 17 (1971), 233-254; Kummel, Introduction, p. 202, who is more favourable but has reservations as to whether it is possible to construct Gnostic Christology in the way Schmithals does. Undoubtedly the most caustic comments come from J. Munck, art. cit., p. 187: "The author of this book lacks historical training...Schmithals' book is striking proof of the decline of exegetical research since the thirties"; R. P. Casey, in his review of Schmithals' book in JTS 8 (1957), pp. 152 f.: "...as an example of the way in which historical sources should not be used and historical conclusions should not be drawn, this book is one of the most striking in recent literature".

⁴¹J. M. Robinson, art. cit., p. 80. In this regard, R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), p. 27, has put his finger on the weakness of Schmithals' position.

However, what we wish to draw attention to in our discussion of the work of Schmithals and others is the strategic character of the choice of question. The unknown-to-be-known in their inquiry is the nature and belief of Paul's opponents. That is, Schmithals and others are asking: What kinds of diversity are discernible in early Christianity? This is a different question to Turner's, which is: Given the diversity in early Christianity, what motivated the Church to take the direction it did? The different questions are grounded in different suppositions (see below, Chapter II). Our discussion of orthodoxy/heresy in early Christianity must be seen against this background, for it will illustrate our central point that the confusion arising out of the orthodoxy/heresy debate stems from the fact that the questions and suppositions in the debate have not been differentiated.

Schmithals' book is worthy of close scrutiny, for it is impressive for its lucidity. He devotes a large section of the book to Gnosticism, arguing that it is pre-Christian. In doing so, Schmithals is very careful in formulating his own thesis. It is Gnosticism as "an understanding of human existence" which "is older than the religio-historical phenomenon of 'Gnosticism'".⁴² The danger is, of course, that a gnostic motif may occur in Paul or elsewhere in the New Testament and yet "express an understanding of existence wholly different from the genuine Gnostic".⁴³ It is a danger Schmithals recognizes. Thus, to discover what Gnosticism is, "the phenomenological method of the historian and the religio-philosophical method of

⁴²Op. cit., p. 26.

⁴³Ibid., p. 29.

existential interpretation are to be used together".⁴⁴

Schmithals reconstructs a system of pre-Christian Gnosticism. It is a system older than the beginnings of Christian proclamation. (Note that Schmithals describes as "impossible" the attempt to derive Gnosticism from Judaism.⁴⁵) Schmithals proposes that the various Gnostic sects have a common origin in a comprehensive system of mythology, theology and cultus. They become differentiated in the course of dispersion.

Turning to the Corinthian correspondence itself, Schmithals argues for dealing with I and II Corinthians together. This procedure has met with much criticism, and is probably wrong.⁴⁶ After undertaking a careful literary-analytical study, Schmithals distinguishes no fewer than six letters in the Corinthian corpus.⁴⁷ He then reconstructs the course of events which gave rise to these letters. The

⁴⁴Ibid. Even so, Colpe still accuses Schmithals of falling into "historical pan-Gnosticism which no longer recognizes any distinctions", a criticism which very much offends Schmithals -- op. cit., p. 30, n. 11.

⁴⁵Op. cit., p. 77.

⁴⁶See Kummel, Introduction, pp. 208 f.; Barrett, art. cit.; D. Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), see below, pp. 22-28. Schmithals is not alone in maintaining that the heresy in I Cor. is the same as that in II Cor., so also Bultmann, Exegetische Probleme des Zweiten Korintherbriefs (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963).

⁴⁷They are:
 Epistle A: II, 6:14-7:1; I, 6:12-20; 9:24-10:22; 11:2-34; 15; 16:13-24.
 Epistle B: I, 1:1-6:11; 7:1-9:23; 10:23-11:1; 12:1-14:40; 16:1-12.
 Epistle C: II, 2:14-6:13; 7:2-4. Epistle D: II, 10:1-13:13.
 Epistle E: II, 9:1-15. Epistle F: II, 1:1-2:13; 7:5-8:24.
Op. cit., p. 100, n. 30.

first is sent by Paul through Stephanas, and shows Paul to be ill-informed as to the exact state of affairs at Corinth. "Chloe's people" write inquiring about certain doctrinal and disciplinary matters. This leads to Paul's second letter. Then Paul pays a short visit to Corinth, after which he sends another letter.⁴⁸ Apparently, however, the situation at Corinth deteriorates and Paul dispatches his "sorrowful" letter. This is followed by another letter carried by Titus. Finally, the situation improves so much that Paul can dispatch his "joyful" letter: he was plainly in error in "making his charge against the whole community of insubordination".⁴⁹

This painstaking reconstruction of events is but the preamble to Schmithals' controversial reconstruction of the heretical theology at Corinth. Paul's difficulties at Corinth are to be explained by the fact that he was confronted by Jewish-Christian Gnostics. In support of his case Schmithals deals extensively with the Corinthian Christology, the Corinthian Gnosis as gospel, the Corinthian anthropology, Gnostic freedom, the sacraments, eschatology and the functions of the community.

Schmithals' conclusions are far-reaching. He has no doubt that "all the individual questions handled in the epistles must be investigated with a view to whether they developed out of the problematic which certainly lies at the basis of a great number of themes".⁵⁰

⁴⁸"The fanciful assertion that Paul left Corinth abruptly in anger has no basis in the text". Ibid., p. 104.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 107.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 287.

He admits to one exception (I Cor. 6:1-11). There is only one battle-front in Corinth, and Paul takes his stand against one heresy.⁵¹

Schmithals sees great diversity in early Christianity. This is because Judaism -- from which, of course, Christianity is derived -- exhibited a great diversity of forms. Thus "the various expressions of Christianity cannot possibly have sprouted from a single root".⁵²

Throughout this and subsequent works, Schmithals' central thesis is that Christianity is characterized by diversification from the very beginning.⁵³ This suggests that the development of Christianity is arbitrary, entirely contingent upon historical factors. But the early Christians themselves did not share this view; hence Schmithals has overlooked in his discussion something which was very significant in the view of the participants in the dispute he describes. For the moment, however, we must be content with this brief observation, for we shall return to a detailed discussion of the issue in Chapter II(below).

Shortly after the publication of Schmithals' book there appeared another work by a Religionsgeschichtler, Ulrich Wilckens' Weisheit und Torheit.⁵⁴ Wilckens endeavours to show that the opponents of Paul at

⁵¹Ibid., p. 288.

⁵²Ibid., p. 297.

⁵³This is also the thesis of Koester, see above, n. 8.

⁵⁴Weisheit und Torheit. Eine Exegetische-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu I Kor 1-2 (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 26; Tübingen: Mohr, 1959). See also his article on οοφία in TWNT.

Corinth were advocates of a type of Gnostic teaching, somewhat akin to Valentinianism. It seems to Wilckens that the opponents of Paul were proclaiming a "wisdom" doctrine which saw the eschatological judgement as belonging to the past. Thus, they saw themselves in a position to "judge all things" (I Cor. 2:15), to be "full", "rich", and "to reign" (I Cor. 4:8).

Paul replies that apostles are sent by God and all parties belong to the Church. Thus the famous passage in I Cor. 1:12 f. -- "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas" -- includes "I am of Christ", for it was in the name of Christ that the Corinthians were baptized, and not in the name of their baptizers. Schisms are excluded on principle.

Much of Wilckens' argument hinges on the claim that "wisdom" for Paul was a Christological title. As initiates of Divine Wisdom they claimed fellowship with Christ; that is, the exalted Christ, for the crucifixion for them was "emptied" (I Cor. 1:17). Paul had a different notion of wisdom; it was not of this age and was the secret of eschatological salvation.

Wilckens finds an Erloergestalt in I Cor. 2:8-10 and gives a clear summary of the Gnostic Redeemer Myth which he thinks is pre-supposed in this passage (pp. 71-73). It is this aspect of his thesis which is perhaps the most controversial.⁵⁵

⁵⁵See the reviews of J. A. Fitzmyer, TheolStud 21 (1960), 468-470 and J. Michl, MunchTheolZeit 12 (1961), 229-231; and also the criticism of Wilson, Gnosis in the New Testament, p. 53. On the other hand, E. Lohse, TheolLitZeit 85 (1960), 357-359 is quite appreciative, and speaks of "discreet" conclusions.

The second and third sections of the book explicate the role of Wisdom in Valentinianism, The Acts of Thomas, Philo of Alexandria, and the Wisdom Literature of Judaism. Wilckens seeks to show that Paul's *λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ* specifically answers the *σοφία* Christology of the opponents in Corinth. Crucial to Gnostic thinking is that the Redeemer does not die; for Paul the cross is the climactic demonstration of the power of God. It is at this point that "strength is made perfect in weakness"; hence the Christian can only become "wise" by becoming "foolish".

A third major work to deal with the opponents of Paul at Corinth is that of D. Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief.⁵⁶ Georgi sees a different situation in I Cor. from that in II Cor.; although there are elements of continuity between the two, the centre of opposition shifts from the "spiritualists" to the "apologists". He confines his study to II Cor. 2:14-7:4 and 10-13. The book has two major divisions: the missionary function of the opponents and their religio-historical background, and the opponents' understanding of themselves.

The first part of the book deals with the following designations: *διάκονος, Χριστός, ἀπόστολος, ἐργάτης, Ἑβραῖος, Ἰσραηλῆτης σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*. Much of the force of Georgi's argument hinges upon his analysis of the last of these concepts, *σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*. He argues that the term refers to more than those of genuine Jewish origin. For Hellenistic Jewish apologists such as Philo, Abraham is not merely the father of the Jewish race; he is a man learned in astrology (the

⁵⁶ Op. cit. (above, n. 46).

zenith of wisdom) and the first to say that God is one. He is in fact the beginning of a new world. Moreover, Philo designates him as a pneumatic.⁵⁷

In dealing with the missionary methods of the Jews, pagans and early Christians, Georgi seeks to show how the notion of *θεῖος ἀνέμω* played an important part in the Jewish tradition. Indeed, Enoch, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Elijah, Elisha, David, and -- most important of all -- Abraham, Solomon and Moses were all regarded as *θεῖος ἀνέμω*.⁵⁸ Georgi then characterizes Paul's opponents in Corinth as claiming to be *θεῖος ἀνέμω*, who, true to their heritage, would go to extreme lengths to gain a proselyte (hence, "apologists").

The second major section of the work focuses more specifically on the exact identity of Paul's opponents as portrayed in II Cor. 2:14-7:4 and 10-13. For example, why is the transition from 2:16a to 2:16b -- *τὸς πάντα τὸν κόσμον* -- so abrupt? Because Paul's opponents claimed *ἰσχυρὸς ἐστίν*. In his refutation of this position Paul says this judgement belongs to God alone.⁵⁹

Georgi does not think that the adversaries in II Cor. are Judaizers in the same sense as those Paul contends with in Galatians or Colossians. Rather, they are emancipated allegorizers of the Old

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 79.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 148.

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 220-225.

Testament, who viewed Christ as the supreme example of a *Θεός ἀνθρώπου*. They did not see Christ as one crucified through weakness; rather, his death was understood as a radical break with the past. Hence they did not have any conception of the brokenness of human existence; for Paul, on the other hand, the death of Christ gave a new possibility for living.

The main issue in contention between Paul and his opponents is thus the eschatological character of Christian existence. Whereas the opponents of Paul emphasized "success", Paul emphasized his own sufferings as a sign of the presence (Vergegenwärtigung) of Christ. Their present is a self-determined existence; Paul's is that of the Lord.

All three of these works have had mixed receptions.⁶⁰ Much of the problem lies in the more general debate on Gnosticism in the New Testament. This is a very contentious issue which has led to much polemical misunderstanding. However, the issues have been clarified greatly by R. McL. Wilson's Gnosis and the New Testament.⁶¹ It will a useful procedure at this point in our inquiry if we reiterate some of Wilson's main points, in order that we may be able to focus more precisely on the complex of problems involved.

⁶⁰ Nevertheless, they have provided a valuable stimulus to New Testament research. Much may be learned from their method of Pauline exegesis -- see, e.g., E. Güttgemanns, Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr. Studien zur paulinischen Christologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

⁶¹ Op. cit. (above, n. 41).

It must be said that "we cannot yet trace the whole history of this movement [Gnosticism] in all its ramifications".⁶² The attempt to do so -- at least with some degree of probability -- has been stimulated by the recognition that Gnosticism may not simply be a perversion of Christianity into speculative theology. The problems of the inquiry are twofold. First, we must define Gnosticism in such a way that it does cover all which is essentially Gnostic, but does not incorporate those elements which are not necessarily to be designated as such. Secondly, we must determine as precisely as possible the origin and development of the movement and the influence operative in that process. In this respect it is important to bear in mind that separate elements are not Gnostic, but the total system.

This leads to the problem of definition, for Gnosticism in the Christian tradition refers specifically to the heresy of the second century. We can, however, speak of Gnosis in a broader sense. This term is to be employed when speaking of the ideas belonging to the Gnostic movement and related trends of thought.⁶³ But here we must resist the temptation of "converting parallels into influences and influences into sources".⁶⁴

The Messina Colloquium in 1966 endeavoured to distinguish Gnosticism and Gnosis. It defined Gnosis as "knowledge of the divine

⁶²Ibid., p. 1.

⁶³Ibid., p. 9.

⁶⁴E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), p. 82, quoted by Wilson, op. cit., p. 9.

mysteries reserved for the elect". Gnosticism (of the second century!) involves:

a coherent series of characteristics which can be summed up in the idea of the divine spark in man, derived from the divine realm, fallen into the world of fate, birth and death, and needing to be awakened by the divine counterpart of the self in order to be re-integrated.⁶⁵

Wilson puts the matter pointedly: in the New Testament we have to ask whether a term is being used descriptively or in the sense of derivation.⁶⁶ In the former sense we are admitting that the term is Gnostic in the second century, but may not be in the context of the New Testament. In the latter sense we are claiming that a certain motif or concept is taken over from pre-Christian Gnosis.

It seems valid to recognize that Gnosis is pre-Christian. It may therefore have been influential in the New Testament. But it is still vital that once a purported Gnostic motif is isolated it be explicitly identified as belonging to either Gnosis or Gnosticism. Here our conclusion must inevitably be that the existence of pre-Christian Gnosticism in the New Testament has not yet been convincingly demonstrated.⁶⁷

To return to our more immediate concern, there have been many more works which have attempted to identify Paul's opponents in Corinth.

⁶⁵Wilson, op. cit., p. 17.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁶⁷A. D. Nock, "Gnosticism", HarvThR 57 (1964), 255-279, argues that the Chenoboskian finds reaffirm the patristic picture of Gnosticism as a Christian heresy.

G. Friedrich,⁶⁸ who was acquainted with Georgi's work before it was published, criticizes his characterization of Paul's opponents at Corinth as *from Babylon*. As such they did not need commendatory letters. He derives the origin of the opponents at Corinth from Stephen and his circle. They were visionaries and ecstasies.⁶⁹ It does not seem too harsh a judgement to say that Friedrich's critique of Georgi's position is more convincing than his own positive thesis.⁷⁰

C. K. Barrett has contributed two articles to the discussion. In the first he argued that the "superlative" apostles were different from the "false" apostles.⁷¹ In his more recent article,⁷² he deals specifically with II Cor. He argues that Paul's adversaries -- "the intruders" -- were Judaizers from Jerusalem. The Corinthian church, in an effort to discriminate between the apostolate of Paul and his rivals, used Hellenistic criteria. It is this fact which makes the picture given in II Cor. so confusing:

⁶⁸"Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief", in Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel. Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag, eds. O. Betz, M. Hengel and P. Schmidt (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 181-215.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 200.

⁷⁰See Barrett, art. cit., above, n. 40.

⁷¹"Christianity at Corinth", BJRL 46 (1964), 269-297.

⁷²Art. cit.

In a sentence: the intruders were Jews, Jerusalem Jews, Judaizing Jews, and as such constituted a rival apostolate to Paul's, backed by all the prestige of the mother church; the Corinthians, confronted by these rival apostolates, proceeded to compare them and to judge between them on essentially hellenistic grounds. This explains the fact that the situation with which Paul had to deal, and consequently also his treatment of the situation, contained both Judaizing and hellenizing elements, which gave rise to mixed and contradictory data which in turn led to contradictory explanations.⁷³

Barrett conceives of at least two groups of adversaries. The kind of Christianity proposed is very much a derivative of the kind of Judaism the proponents had adhered to. There were three types of Judaism: liberal, conservative and revolutionary. The "conservatives" are represented by the "Pillars" in Jerusalem; Paul represents the "revolutionary" type; the "false" apostles (the "liberals") are thus to be identified with the envoys from Jerusalem who accepted a veneer of non-Jewish practice and misrepresented the views of those in Jerusalem.

Another contribution to this particular debate comes from G. Bornkamm.⁷⁴ He seeks to discern the essential differences between Paul and the Corinthians in the understanding of the Lord's Supper. He thinks that the "picture evoked by the thesis of the abandonment of the celebration of the sacrament in Corinth and the substitution of the

⁷³Ibid., p. 251.

⁷⁴"Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus", ZTK 53 (1956), 312-349; ET: "The Lord's Supper and the Church in Paul", in Early Christian Experience (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), pp. 123-160. All references are to the English edition.

congregation's unsacramental celebration of joy does not fit at all with the picture that I Cor 10 presents".⁷⁵ After a detailed exegesis and consideration of the evidence, he concludes that neither is the dispute over real "participation" in Christ's body and blood -- for here Paul can appeal to the language of tradition not first coined by him. Rather, one must take account of the eschatological motif of the celebration which had a strong impact on the early Christian congregation. In fact this aspect became over-emphasized. Thus the hellenistically influenced Corinthians tended to see the Eucharist as a sacramental celebration in which communicants received food and wine as medicine of immortality.

It is not difficult to imagine how for the Corinthians this understanding of the sacrament could have grown directly from their own pagan experience of the mystery religions in relation to their Gnostic experience of the spirit, and that now the Lord present in the sacrament was nothing more than a cultic god after the manner of other divinities.⁷⁶

It is against this background that we must reconsider the words "For as often as you eat this bread and drink of the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes". Here the boundaries of time are emphasized, thus precluding the transcending of such boundaries in spiritual eschatological enthusiasm. The Lord's Supper is a celebration between death and Parousia.

It is evident that there is little agreement concerning the

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 127.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 151.

exact nature of the opponents of Paul in Corinth. When we turn to identifying the opponents of Paul in the rest of the Pauline corpus, the disagreements are even more evidently basic. The most prolific contributor here is Schmithals. Building on the thesis articulated in his work on the Corinthian correspondence, he has argued in a number of articles -- eventually collected together in a book⁷⁷ -- for the unity of the battlefront against Paul throughout the Pauline corpus. In every case Paul's opponents are Jewish Christian Gnostics.⁷⁸

⁷⁷"Die Häretiker in Galatien", ZNW 47 (1956), 25-67; "Die Irrlehrer des Philipperbriefs", ZTK 54 (1957), 297-341; "Die Irrlehrer von Rom. 16:17-20", StudTheol 13 (1959), 51-69; "Zur Abfassung und Ältesten Sammlung der Paulinischen Hauptbriefe", ZNW 51 (1960), 225-245; all collected together and with "Die Historische Situation der Thessalonicherbriefe" published in a book, Paulus und die Gnostiker (Theologische Forschung 35; Hamburg: Herbert Reich Evangelischer Verlag, 1965); ET: Paul and the Gnostics (Nashville, New York: Abingdon, 1972). All references are to the English edition.

⁷⁸It may be useful to summarize Schmithals' argumentation here. In the first of his articles (ET: "The Heretics in Galatia", pp. 13-64) he begins by criticizing the claim that Paul's opponents in Galatia are Judaizers. Such an inference has a methodological weakness: it is the presupposition of the exegesis of Galatians and not its conclusion. Often the sponsors, either directly or indirectly, of the anti-Pauline missionaries in Galatia are said to be the "pillars" in Jerusalem. But for Schmithals it is inconceivable that there is in Galatia an anti-Pauline group which is more radical than the position of James. In his careful analysis of Galatians Schmithals seeks to uncover the exact nature of the controversy taking place between Paul and his adversaries. Paul is attacked because he has not received his apostolic powers directly from God but through men. This kind of charge is inexplicable if it is thought of as made by Judaizers in Jerusalem.

Paul replies that he too (i.e., he assents to what they assert of themselves) has received his gospel not from men but through revelation. This argument is genuinely Gnostic. Moreover, the dispute about circumcision is also Gnostic. By analogy with Col. 2:9 ff. Schmithals adduces that the cutting away of the foreskin symbolically represents the liberation of the pneuma-self from the prison of the body. This never required the Gnostic to keep the Law -- a fact which Paul points out (Gal. 5:3).

The implication of Schmithals' line of argument is seen in the

The misuse of freedom which Paul opposes in Galatians is best explained if we think of him as addressing pneumatikoi. Characteristic of such is not bodily discipline but bodily licentiousness. Paul's admonition in Gal. 6:3 is to be seen in the light of the Gnostic connection between pneuma and self-praise. The pneumatikoi are also eleutheroi -- they are liberated from sarx and all its attendant moral obligations.

In the next of the articles (ET: "The False Teachers of the Epistle to the Philippians", pp. 65-122) Schmithals pursues a similar line of inquiry. Paul is not arguing against a double front of pneumatics and Judaizers; there is only one front of opposition: Jewish Christian Gnostics.

Schmithals begins with a discussion of the literary problem. The integrity of the Philippian epistle has long been debated. Many have suggested "psychological" reasons for its apparent disunity: Paul was a sick, lonely man. Schmithals, however, argues that Philippians as we now have it is comprised of three letters: Epistle A, 4:10-23; Epistle B, 1:1-3:1; 4:4-7; Epistle C, 3:2-4:3, plus 4:8-9.

Schmithals then reconstructs the course of events giving rise to these letters: When in prison Paul receives a gift of money from the Philippians. His thanks is sent through Epaphras in letter A. After Epaphras has fallen ill, Paul hears of dissension and adversaries at work in Philippi. This provokes letter B. He also sends Epaphras back to Philippi. Later, Paul hears more precisely of the situation there, and thus sends letter C, which shows a better knowledge of the prevalent circumstances. The major source of Schmithals' investigation is letter C.

Schmithals proceeds with a detailed exegesis of text C. Paul's designation of his opponents as "dogs" (implying impurity or immorality) cannot refer to Judaists but rather refers to Gnostics. True, in Phil. 3:4-6 we find that Paul's opponents boasted of their Jewish origins. But Jewish Christian Gnostics, as well as Jews, gloried in their Judaism.

We find a similar argument in Philippians to that in Corinthians and Galatians -- the truth of the Pauline message is disputed by an attack on the messenger. This is a Gnostic argument. Likewise a denial of the resurrection is a foundational belief of the Gnostics. The denial of the resurrection is one of the central issues of contention in the Philippian epistle.

In Philippians 3:12-14 Paul is emphasizing that his status as a Christian is not "perfect"; he is pursuing the goal. But it is the Gnostics who have an exaggerated consciousness of perfection. They claimed to have attained everything.

For the Gnostics, libertinism was an expression of religiosity. There were two kinds of libertine practice which caused offence to Paul: sexual promiscuity and disregard for regulations concerning foods. It is these two offences which are dealt with in v. 9. Paul's opponents even boast of their immoral conduct; such can only be Gnostics.

conclusion to his first article:

Of course one may not even expect that the documents of a "pure" pre-Christian Gnosticism will ever come to light, thus that a "pure" Gnostic sect ever existed. Indeed, there was also never a "pure" Christianity, but only a Hellenistic Christianity, a Jewish Christianity, a gnosticizing Christianity, thus a Christianity which from time to time made use of the forms of existing manifestations of religion for the expression of its own religious understanding....Therefore Christian

Hence, for Schmithals, epistle C is wholly shaped by Paul's dispute with the Gnostics. (Epistle A does not supplement our knowledge of the Philippian situation; epistle B does, given what we know from C.) In order for Schmithals' thesis to be tenable, Ephesus has to be the place of writing; he thinks the evidence points to Ephesus in any case. In the only essay in the book not previously published (ET: "The Historical Situation of the Thessalonian Epistles", pp. 123-218) Schmithals begins by isolating two epistles in I Thess.: 1:1-2:12 plus 4:2-5:28 and 2:13-4:1. He then undertakes a detailed study of the text.

Again, he detects agitation by Gnostic missionaries of a Jewish-Christian or Jewish observance. For example, Paul is charged with being kenos, a charge only explicable if it is taken as meaning that Paul is no longer a pneumatic. Furthermore, the doubts of the Thessalonians about the resurrection as such (not a delay in the parousia) can only have been engendered by Gnostics.

Although the two epistles Schmithals has isolated in I Thess. are separated in point of time, they reflect the same discussion and belong to the same situation.

Turning to II Thess. (which he sees as genuinely Pauline) Schmithals again isolates two separate writings: 1:1-12 plus 3:6 ff. and 2:1-3:5 (= 2:13-14 + 2:1-12 + 2:15-3:1 ff.). Once more we find in, for example, II Thess. 2:2 Paul is refuting the genuinely Gnostic assertion that the Day of the Lord has already come.

In "The False Teachers of Romans 16:17-20" (pp. 219-238) Schmithals continues yet again the same argument. In Rom. 16:17-20 only an anti-gnostic battlefield comes into question. In the final essay (ET: "On the Composition and Earliest Collection of the Major Epistles of Paul", pp. 239-274) Schmithals draws the conclusion that in all the writings of the third missionary journey Paul is debating with Jewish Christian Gnostics. In this period of less than two years we can locate seven epistles: I and II Cor., Gal., Phil., I and II Thess. and Romans. The number seven may be significant in suggesting a universal audience. They were collected together as a weapon to use against the spreading heresy of Gnosticism.

Gnosticism is just as legitimate a form of this religious movement as, say, the Jewish Gnosticism of the pre-Christian era -- as indeed also a gnosticising Christianity no less than the Hellenistic one is a proper Christianity if it maintains the genuinely Christian understanding of existence.⁷⁹

It is here that Schmithals has highlighted the central issue, without, however, pursuing it in a methodical way. For the issue is precisely what the "genuinely Christian understanding of existence" is, and how adequately various categories of thought express it. Schmithals does not pursue this point because his strategy of inquiry seems to be grounded in the supposition that his work is to point to the nature of early Christian diversity. We must reserve a fuller discussion of this point until our next chapter.

The contribution of Schmithals is that he does stress in rather dramatic fashion the need to revise much of the traditional historical picture of early Christianity. Especially is there a need to reassess the relationship between Paul and James. In a subsequent book, Schmithals focuses upon exactly this problem.⁸⁰ It is an important book inasmuch as it proposes that the "Judaizing" question was never an issue between Paul and James.⁸¹ Hence Schmithals reverses Baur's

⁷⁹Op. cit., p. 63.

⁸⁰Paulus und Jacobus (Forschungen zur Religion und literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); ET: Paul and James (Studies in Biblical Theology 46, Naperville: Allenson, 1965).

⁸¹In the discussion Paul represents the Hellenistic churches and James the Jewish-Christian church in Jerusalem. Schmithals proposes that

thesis.⁸²

Koester, in his article "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment",⁸³ concerns himself with trying to identify the opponents of Paul in Philippians 3:2-4:1. He thinks that Beare's interpretation,⁸⁴ which conceives of several opponents, is wrong. However, he also questions Schmithals' conclusion that here we have to do solely with

there were in early Christianity two groups organized separately: those who observed the Law and those who were free from its control. Only those Jews who declared themselves free from the Law were persecuted -- "therefore, for the Jewish Christians in Palestine the question of their attitude to the Law was not only, perhaps even not principally, a theological problem, but a question of the possibility as a church in the Jewish land" (p. 37).

The Apostolic Council bears witness primarily to the desire of the early Christians to maintain unity. But for Jewish Christians to declare themselves free from the Law entailed persecution by the Jews. So the agreement in Jerusalem between Paul and James was a practical missionary one. Paul gave up the Law, the Jerusalem church abided by it (p. 46). However, Jewish Christians only clung to the Law for practical reasons. There was no question of thinking that observance of the Law was necessary for salvation; that is, "the different attitude of Paul and James to the Law cannot, at any rate primarily, have had theological reasons" (p. 47). The agreement in Jerusalem was in terms of missionary activity; Paul would go to the Gentiles and preach freedom from the Law, and James and Peter would go to the Jews and -- to avoid persecution -- remain under the Law. On the improbability of Schmithals' thesis see especially the reviews of U. Wilckens, TheolLit 90 (1965), 598-601; E. P. Blair, JournRel 46 (1966), 402-403.

⁸²For the significance which Schmithals attaches to his own work see the extended footnote, Paul and James, pp. 103 ff.

⁸³NTS 7 (1962-63), 317-332.

⁸⁴A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (London: A. & C. Black, 1959).

Gnostic libertines.

Koester thinks that Paul's opponents in Phil. 3:2-6 were

like those of II Cor,...Jewish Christian apostles who boasted of their spiritual qualities; however, in contrast to those of II Cor, their claim of the possession of the Spirit was especially demonstrated by their complete fulfilment of the Law, including circumcision as the unique sign of such fulfilment.⁸⁵

In Phil. 3:7-16 Paul is refuting the claim of his opponents to possess qualities of salvation in their entirety. They claim an eschatological rather than a moral or religious perfection. Thus Paul refutes them with an eschatological argument: Christian existence must share in the suffering and death of Christ and expect the resurrection in the future.

The "enemies of the cross of Christ" in 3:18 are those who do not take upon themselves the reality of the cross -- suffering and death -- and turn to boasting and self-glory.

This letter fragment is thus to be taken as a unity. Against whom is it directed?

According to our investigation they were Christian missionaries of Jewish origin and background, as most Christian missionaries of this time were (including Paul himself). In contradistinction to Paul they were preaching a doctrine of perfection based upon the Law and the continuation of Jewish practices that were viewed as special signs of belonging to the elected people of God (circumcision). This perfectionist doctrine of Law, however, was not simply moralistic, but constituted an integral part of an attitude that is best called 'radicalized spiritualistic eschatology'.

⁸⁵ Art. cit., pp. 321 f.

....This is what I would call typical of early Christian Gnosticism.⁸⁶

Koester, in collaboration with J. M. Robinson, has also produced a contribution to the more general discussion of orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity. In this book, Trajectories Through Early Christianity,⁸⁷ the influence of Bauer is explicitly acknowledged, and the authors go on to argue for a total reappraisal of New Testament studies. They maintain that the emphasis of New Testament inquiry should fall on the development of particular "trajectories", in an effort to find out how and why a particular movement grew and in which direction it went. This concept the authors feel to be useful because it reinforces the notion of the New Testament as a plurality of movements of thought. Koester says:

Christianity did not begin with a particular belief, dogma or creed; nor can one understand the heretical diversifications of early Christianity as aberrations from one original true and orthodox formulation of faith. Rather Christianity started with a particular historical person, his works and words, his life and death: Jesus of Nazareth. Creed and faith, symbol and dogmas are merely the expressions of response to this Jesus of history.⁸⁸

It is true that the concept of "trajectories" is useful inasmuch as it does focus attention on normative Christianity as a direction.⁸⁹ That is, Robinson and Koester are attempting to focus on the direction

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 331.

⁸⁷ Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

⁸⁸ Op. cit., p. 205.

⁸⁹ This point was also made in the paper presented by R. H. Fuller at the Fifth International Biblical Congress at Oxford, 1973: "New Testament Trajectories and Biblical Authority".

New Testament writers gave to Christianity in their correction of mistaken trends. However, the question must be pressed further and the question asked why the New Testament writers thought one direction preferable to another. The direction of a particular writer's thought leaves open the question of what the animating force was behind his choice.⁹⁰ We believe that Turner's notion of lex orandi is relevant in answering this question (Chapter II, below).

Our purpose in discussing the orthodoxy/heresy debate in the New Testament and specifically on Paul has been to show the character of the choice of question posed by the inquirers.⁹¹ In the works we have discussed the main concern is to specify the kinds of diversification in early Christianity. So the question becomes: Who were the "intruders" in Corinth? Were they Jerusalem Jews? Jewish Christian Gnostics? *Θεία ἄνδρες* ? Or are they to be identified with yet another group? The question by-passes recovery of the perspectives of historical figures engaged in controversy. Thus, it does not ask in what terms Paul himself was concerned with "orthodoxy" nor whether Paul and his adversaries conceived their struggle in like terms. But can early Christian disputes about orthodoxy take on historical intelligibility without resolving such issues?

⁹⁰ James Barr may have had a similar query in mind when at the Fifth International Biblical Congress (Oxford, 1973) he inquired whether "these missiles are being fired by God or by men".

⁹¹ We have not attempted to cover all the literature in the debate on orthodoxy and heresy in Paul. We have merely selected those authors who we think will indicate the trend the debate has been taking in recent years.

Our own question, in any case, is whether there is a concern for orthodoxy in the Fourth Gospel and, if so, how it finds concrete expression. As we turn to the orthodoxy/heresy debate on the Fourth Gospel, we again fix our attention on the concrete way in which the question about orthodoxy has been framed.

(b) The Debate on the Fourth Gospel

One can dispute Bauer's claim⁹² that the Fourth Gospel was originally an heretical Gospel. It is, however, indisputable that the Fourth Gospel was first used by the Gnostics and had difficulty gaining acceptance by the Church at large.⁹³ The best English study of the Fourth Gospel in the early Church is by J. N. Sanders, The Fourth Gospel in the early Church.⁹⁴ In this book Sanders considers whether the early Christian theologians considered it their bounden duty to transmit the faith without addition or diminution of content (granting that its form may change). He rejects both the schema which views the history of Christian doctrine as a degeneration and that which views it as an accumulation. He takes a third view which "allows both for the fact of revelation -- of a faith once delivered to the saints -- and the reality of development..."⁹⁵ This, in Sanders' opinion, is the view held by early orthodox Christian writers.

⁹²Orthodoxy and Heresy, p. 224.

⁹³See especially Walther von Loewenich, Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert (Beiheft 13 to ZNW; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1932).

⁹⁴Cambridge: C.U.P., 1943.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 2.

Sanders' inquiry endorses the view that the Fourth Gospel was first used by the Gnostics and is non-apostolic. It gained acceptance by the orthodox only with Irenaeus. Sanders thinks that the Fourth Gospel originated in Alexandria,⁹⁶ and agrees with Bauer that the early church there was not, by later standards, orthodox:

That a church should at least in an early period be what would later have to be regarded as 'heretical' is by no means a priori impossible....This is not to deny that there is such a thing as heresy, but only to suggest that the question whether a doctrine is heretical depends not merely on its wording (as for instance was assumed by those who condemned Origen), but also its relationship to other doctrines along with it and to the prevailing tendencies in which it was propounded....Even if it is granted that there did exist in the earliest period of the Church's history a single apostolic preaching, or kerygma, this would be in such general terms that diversities of interpretation could not be prevented from developing into distinctive types of kerygma, which could react on one another and be brought back into a systematic whole again only when theological thought became more systematic and explicit and contacts between the various churches were developed and strengthened.⁹⁷

With regard to the Fourth Gospel, Sanders is in no doubt that it cannot be regarded as "heretical", because it is true to the early Christian kerygma:

The Fourth Gospel itself presents the kerygma in the language of current religious speculation, and does it so well that, though it ultimately could be used to demolish Gnosticism because it itself was true

⁹⁶ However, Sanders modifies his position in a later work, Foundations of Christian Faith (London: A. & C. Black, 1951), p. 162, where he suggests Syria is more probable.

⁹⁷ Op. cit., pp. 41 f.

to the kerygma, yet it nevertheless attracted the Gnostics, who were anxious to appropriate its teaching, and who attempted to build up a religious philosophy (if their system can be so called) on the basis of an exegesis of the Prologue which adapted it to earlier dualistic and Docetic-Gnostic ideas.⁹⁸

Irenaeus is the interpreter of the Fourth Gospel par excellence, for it was he who put his finger on the reason why the heretics produced distorted interpretations: they sought to interpret Scripture by "means of a fundamentally alien theosophy, instead of doing it by means of the rule of truth, the Christian regula fidei which already, in the Apostolic kerygma, underlies and controls the very books of the New Testament themselves".⁹⁹

Of the exegetical works on the Fourth Gospel, Rudolf Bultmann's is perhaps the most significant. Paul and John form the core of Bultmann's theology. This is evident in his arrangement of his Theology of the New Testament.¹⁰⁰ It divides into four parts: (1) "Presuppositions and Motifs of New Testament Theology"; (2) "The Theology of Paul"; (3) "The Theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles"; (4) "The Development Toward the Ancient Church". A chiastic arrangement can be discerned: ABBA. A is primarily historical, while B is primarily theological and normative.¹⁰¹ A major difficulty arises with the

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 47.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 68.

¹⁰⁰See n. 6, above.

¹⁰¹Also noted in the review of vol. II by J. M. Robinson, Theology Today 13 (1956-57), p. 261.

unhistorical nature of the supposition, as J. M. Robinson observes:

It is...the historian who will be concerned by the way in which normative Christianity is not explained historically, but occurs as a creatio ex nihilo in Paul and then independently in John. Therefore he will not rest content until he has, on a more humble phenomenological level, supplemented the existential norm with a description of the historical unity or continuity with the early Church.¹⁰²

Bultmann conceives of the Fourth Gospel as having been written within the first century, in an environment heavily permeated by Oriental Christianity, by a person who was influenced by Gnosticizing Judaism. The Gospel used Gnostic thought-forms and concepts as a vehicle to express the true understanding of Christian existence; that is, there is an existential norm functioning in the Fourth Gospel. Bultmann therefore considers all references to the traditional doctrines of eschatology,¹⁰³ sacraments,¹⁰⁴ and the atonement¹⁰⁵ to have been added by an "ecclesiastical redactor". This redactor's concern was to bring the Fourth Gospel into line with the broad stream of Christian tradition. The implication is that the Fourth Evangelist had produced a work which was unacceptable to the Church at large.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ 5:27-29; 6:39, 40, 44, 41b-58; 12:48.

¹⁰⁴ 3:5; 6:51b-58; 19:34b.

¹⁰⁵ 6:53-56; 19:34b. The redactor also added the following: 4:1; 6:23; 11:2 (where the title 'Lord' occurs); 20:9; 21:24.

In this respect Kasemann is logically working out his teacher's thought when in "Ketzer und Zeuge"¹⁰⁶ he reverses Bauer's thesis that Diotrephes was the heretic in the Johannine letters. In this article Kasemann begins by acknowledging the influence of Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei on his own thinking.¹⁰⁷ He then criticizes Bultmann's thinking on the Johannine authorship problem:

It is no accident that the last great commentary on John, that of R. Bultmann, is highly sceptical of the view that the controversy over the authorship problem is of any value for its essential exegesis. Such an assertion seems to me to go too far. Every detail that allows us to grasp more exactly the historical placement of the work keeps us at the same time from losing ourselves in the realm of speculation. Moreover, scepticism would be justified only if all the available possibilities had been really exhausted. In my view that has not happened, for in the whole debate the third letter of John has been unduly left out of account.¹⁰⁸

Accordingly, Kasemann proceeds to argue that the author of III John (and the Gospel) was a presbyter, excommunicated by a representative of monarchical episcopacy, who had refused to accept the verdict of orthodoxy:

The essential point, if my argumentation proves right, lies in this: this presbyter is excommunicated and therefore forced to be a lone wolf. Despite the verdict of orthodoxy he has held fast to his title as well as his work and

¹⁰⁶"Ketzer und Zeuge. Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem", ZTK 48 (1951), 292-311.

¹⁰⁷Fittingly enough, this was Kasemann's Antrittsvorlesung on taking up Bauer's old chair at Göttingen.

¹⁰⁸Art. cit., pp. 293 ff.

organized his own Church association with its own Gentile mission alongside the orthodox community, without giving up the hope or the will to reach an agreement with the other side.¹⁰⁹

We are thus confronted with the question of whether he was a heretic or a witness,¹¹⁰ a question which has far-reaching implications. Although Käsemann's reconstruction of events is different from Bauer's, its dependence on Bauer's work is unmistakable.

Bornkamm gives a critique of Käsemann's position in the TWNT article on πρεσβυς.¹¹¹ He remarks rather dryly that "the only problem with this view is that it is in contradiction with what the letters have to say about the position and work of a presbyter".¹¹² Inter alia Bornkamm makes two points: the presbyter "lays claim to an authority which could hardly be in accord with the title of a local presbyter", and that there is no specific reference to doctrinal heresy.¹¹³

In a more recent work, The Testament of Jesus,¹¹⁴ Käsemann deals

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 301.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 311.

¹¹¹Op. cit., p. 671, n. 121.

¹¹²Ibid.

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1966); ET: The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17 (London: S.C.M., 1968). All references are to the English edition. Hereafter referred to as Testament.

specifically with the Fourth Gospel. He is concerned to find the historical situation in which the Gospel of John should be located (a procedure which for some is either invalid or misdirected).¹¹⁵

Nevertheless, for Kasemann, "A world without shadows and historical contours cannot be investigated. He [the historian] must be able to localize an historical object in order to recognize it".¹¹⁶

Kasemann chooses to focus his attention on chapter 17 because it is a summary of the last discourses and a counterpart of the prologue. In particular, Kasemann chooses for attention certain "key words" -- the glory of Christ, the community under the Word, and Christian unity.

The beginning of chapter 17 is dominated by the key word "glorification". The category of the Galilean teacher does not apply to the Johannine presentation.¹¹⁷ "The Word became flesh" is almost always made the centre and proper theme of the Gospel.¹¹⁸ But, asks Kasemann, in what sense is he flesh who walks on water and through

¹¹⁵ See the reply of Kasemann to Hoskyns, Testament, p. 13, n. 3.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 2.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹⁸ Although Kasemann himself does not mention it, there seems to be an overt reference to Bultmann here. Cf. Theology, II, p. 40: "The theme of the whole Gospel is the statement 'The Word became flesh'".

closed doors, cannot be captured by his enemies nor deceived by men, and permits Lazarus to remain in the grave four days so that the miracle of raising him might appear more impressive? Does the statement "The Word became flesh" mean any more than that he descended into the world of man "and there came into contact with earthly existence, so that an encounter with him might be possible?"¹¹⁹ Kasemann believes that 1:14a receives its meaning from "We beheld his glory".¹²⁰

"Kasemann finds in the Fourth Gospel evidence of traditions reflecting the "Corinthian enthusiasm" which Paul attacks in his correspondence with the Church at Corinth. For example, 5:24 indicates that "the believer has already passed from death to life" (cf. also 3:36; 6:47; 8:51; 11:25 f.). The Corinthian enthusiasts rejected not Christ's resurrection, but the believer's future resurrection; II Tim. 2:18 shows how this did become a major heresy in the Church.

It is quite disturbing that the Evangelist, at the very centre of his proclamation, is dominated by a heritage of enthusiasm against which Paul had struggled violently in his day and which in the post-apostolic age was branded as heretical.¹²¹

However, Kasemann does admit that the Evangelist modified this "heretical" heritage. He detached it from the understanding of baptism

¹¹⁹Testament, p. 9.

¹²⁰Ibid., pp. 9 f. See also his "Aufbau und Anliegen des johanneischen Prologs", in Libertas Christiana, Festschrift für F. Delekat (München: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1957); ET: "The Structure and purpose of the Prologue to John's Gospel", New Testament Questions of Today (London: S.C.M., 1969), pp. 138-167.

¹²¹Testament, p. 15.

as an initiation rite into mysteries and placed it "at the service of his Christology"; yet he still affirms what "the enthusiasts of Corinth and the heretics of II Tim 2:18 had proclaimed, namely that the reality of the general resurrection of the dead is already present now".¹²²

Moreover, neither the incarnation nor the passion have "those emphases which were taken from the ecclesiastical tradition".¹²³ The Johannine account sees a change in terms of "coming" and "going", "ascending" and "descending", and not a change in Christ according to his nature.

Contrary to most exegetes, Käsemann finds in the Fourth Gospel "a dogmatic controversy taking place", for only in Paul do we find the "same passionate discussion". So that for Käsemann the historical situation of the Fourth Evangelist is decisive in shaping its presentation. The Jews in the Gospel are representatives of the world "as it is comprised by its religious traditions". A struggle within the Church is "reflected and hidden in these debates with the Jews".¹²⁴ Thus the origin of the Gospel may well be in the circle of Hellenistic enthusiasm opposed by I Cor. 15 and II Tim. 2:18, and the controversy may well be over the slogan solus Christus. That the Fourth Gospel is anti-docetic is "completely unproven" and the danger of doceticism

¹²²Ibid.

¹²³Ibid., p. 20.

¹²⁴Ibid., p. 24.

in the Gospel's Christology of glory is very apparent.

In the chapter "The Community under the Word", Kasemann begins by making the observation that the Fourth Gospel seemingly does not unfold the kind of ecclesiology we might expect from a first-century representative of the Christian Church -- he has a very insignificant interest in sacraments, worship and ministry. However, the Gospel does presuppose an organized communal life.¹²⁵ Yet the whole presentation is different; the community is not troubled by questions of order, neither is it viewed from "the aspect of corporateness, but rather from the aspect of its individual members".¹²⁶ This is against the trend to incorporate the individual into the community by sacramental, cultic and organizational means.

Kasemann concludes that although the Gospel is connected with the main stream of Christianity, the historical context seems to be that of a side tributary; the Evangelist is on the periphery of the Church. Commentators perhaps attribute an "other-worldly" quality to the Fourth Gospel simply because it does not reflect the realm of the Church known to us through the rest of the New Testament.

In the chapter on "Christian Unity", Kasemann claims that unity in the Fourth Gospel is based not only on heavenly realities but is also deduced from the mutual relation of Father to Son and of

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 29.

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 31.

both to the disciples. Unity exists "only as a heavenly reality and therefore in antithesis to the earthly, which bears the marks of isolations, differences and antagonisms".¹²⁷ In speaking of the gathering "under the community of the Word what belongs to heaven" the Evangelist is showing that he is the representative of a community whose self-understanding is a gnosticizing one.

In conclusion, Kasemann proclaims that the inclusion of the Fourth Gospel in the canon is "not without irony".

If historically the Gospel reflects the development which led from the enthusiasts of Corinth and of II Tim 2:18 to Christian gnosticism, then its acceptance into the Church's canon took place through man's error and God's providence. Against all its own intentions, and misled by the picture of Jesus as God walking upon the face of the earth, the Church assigned to the apostles the voice of those whom it otherwise ignored and one generation later condemned as heretics.¹²⁸

From the historical point of view the Church was in error when it declared the Fourth Gospel as orthodox. But, Kasemann suggests, perhaps from a theological viewpoint it was fortunate.

"Ketzer und Zeuge" may be envisaged as a defence of Bultmann.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Ibid., p. 68.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 75.

¹²⁹ Cf. J. M. Robinson, "Basic Shifts", p. 77: "This was just the time when there was talk in some German church circles in Germany of a heresy trial for Bultmann, so that Kasemann was casting the evangelist in a role not too dissimilar from what Bultmann's might have become. After all, the Gospel of John is the norm of Bultmannian theology".

In The Testament of Jesus of Jesus, however, Kasemann seems to be deliberately correcting his teacher at certain points.¹³⁰ Perhaps this is why Bornkamm chose to reply to Kasemann at the 1967 meeting of the "old Marburgers".¹³¹

Bornkamm, not alone in his criticisms, had three main points to make. First, Kasemann fails to see that the farewell discourses centre on Jesus' death. The glory of Christ being lifted up upon the cross is presupposed by the Evangelist; it is this glory which is retrospectively visible in the flesh. Secondly, Kasemann's label of "naive docetism" may apply to the theology of the pre-Johannine tradition but not to the Evangelist himself. Thirdly, Kasemann has erred in applying later categories of discrimination to the New Testament.

Certainly Kasemann does neglect the emphasis of the Fourth Gospel on the death of Jesus. Furthermore, he avers that we must focus on the differences the Fourth Evangelist displays in contrast to the contemporary Christian tradition. But by the same token, one must focus on the differences between the Fourth Gospel and the

¹³⁰ See n. 118, above. Moreover, Bultmann's commentary on John shows that "at every crucial point the Gospel is in tension with the Gnostic point of view, indeed repudiates it" -- S. Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961 (London: O.U.P., 1964), p. 310.

¹³¹ "Zur Interpretation des Johannes-Evangeliums: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Kasemanns Schrift 'Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17'", EvTh 28 (1968), 8-25.

Gnostics.¹³² It also has to be noted that the epistles of John (which Kasemann believes were written by the same author) have an anti-docetic polemic. The judgement of Haenchen seems correct: "The Gospel of John is not a Gnostic Gospel, in spite of the many traits which sound Gnostic".¹³³

Besides writing a reply to Kasemann,¹³⁴ S. S. Smalley has made his own contribution to the purported heretical character of the Fourth Gospel.¹³⁵ By discussing Johannine dualism, Christology, eschatology, determinism and the Church in the Gospel, he seeks to bolster his thesis that in John we have "neither orthodoxy nor heresy, but diversity and development".¹³⁶ This is an interesting study, particularly in that Smalley concludes that examination of traditional material yields no conclusive results about development within the Gospel:

We have seen that the use of traditional sources by the final redactor (whoever he was) probably does not account fully for the diversity of John's doctrine, at least as far as his Christology is concerned. At the same time, the suggestion has been made (but not argued in detail) that these sources can include at any stage traditional material, with or without being edited. If the first of these conclusions is anything

¹³²See especially R. McL. Wilson, op. cit., pp. 46 ff.; R. E. Brown, "The Kerygma of the Gospel according to John", Interpretation 21 (1967), p. 396, n. 2.

¹³³"Neuere Literatur zu den Johannesbriefen", ThR 26 (1960), 281.

¹³⁴In Studia Evangelica VI (forthcoming).

¹³⁵"Diversity and Development in John", NTS 17 (1970-71), 276-292.

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 278.

like correct, then we must say that there is no apparent reason for John's diversity. And if the second conclusion is also correct, this means that the development of John's theology, which seems obvious in general terms, does not follow a one-to-one pattern as it grows....Diversity and development are both characteristic of St. John's Gospel, and they go hand in hand.¹³⁷

John is neither defending orthodoxy nor attacking heresy. He writes to evangelize and encourage, not to polemicize:

In the end, therefore, it looks as if the character of the Fourth Gospel which we have been analyzing comes nearer to an endorsement of H. E. W. Turner's view that a 'penumbra' between orthodoxy and heresy existed....During the first century, according to John's Gospel, the concern was with the formalities of neither orthodoxy nor heresy. Yet in spite of John's diversity, what was later defined as 'orthodoxy' (an unfixed lex orandi at the time) could when required be distinguished from what was later branded as heretical.¹³⁸

As in the orthodoxy/heresy debate on Paul, the discussion of John has not focused specifically on our question. Not only has the treatment of the question of orthodoxy/heresy been different from that which we intend, but also the suppositions grounding the inquiries we have spoken of are different. In particular, the debate has by-passed the theme "development". Had Kasemann, for example, clarified his notion of this concept, would it not have enhanced his work and precluded much of the confusion inherent in his thesis about the Fourth Gospel? Our next chapter will be an attempt to ground our own choice

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 289.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 292.

of the unknown-to-be-known by a special emphasis on the notion of development.

CHAPTER TWO

ORTHODOXY, HERESY AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the difficulties of dealing with Bauer's work is semantic. How should orthodoxy and heresy be defined? Bauer said that in using these terms he was referring to what one "customarily and usually understands them to mean".¹ Presumably he hoped thus to avoid confusion. In fact his lack of a precise definition has created confusion.² The author of the second appendix to his book, pointing to the varying definitions of orthodoxy given by Moffatt, Ehrhardt, Turner and Koester, plaintively asks: "Indeed, is there today any commonly accepted meaning of 'orthodoxy' such as Bauer wished to presuppose?"³

The problem of framing a definition adequate to present purposes should not be underestimated. This matter of definition has long been beset with confusion. Thus Georg Strecker argues against "dogmatically

¹Orthodoxy and Heresy, pp. xxii-xxiii.

²As evidenced by the misunderstanding of A. A. T. Ehrhardt, "Christianity before the Apostles' Creed", art. cit., who thinks that Bauer's work presupposes "that somewhere in Christianity a regula fidei was invented as a touchstone of orthodoxy, at the very outset of the history of the Church, an assumption which seems to leave out of consideration whether or not the problem of heresy was at all visualized in the early days of Christianity" (p. 93). This, of course, completely misconstrues Bauer's intention.

³Orthodoxy and Heresy, p. 314, n. 30.

conditioned" definitions of orthodoxy and heresy on two grounds. First, such definitions are aprioristic; they do not arise "phenomenologically on the basis of statements by New Testament writers".⁴ Secondly, such definitions are by nature incompatible with history, for they enshrine value-judgements and "value judgements", as Bauer himself had intimated, "are not the business of the historian".⁵ On the other hand, Strecker urges the necessity of entering into "the period and thought world" of the writers to be examined.⁶ Yet he overlooks the fact that it is the historian himself (and not his "sources") who poses the historical question. The historian may ask any question he wants. Moreover, Strecker seems to presuppose that the question to be examined in the present study (Is there a theological conception of orthodoxy already operative in a given New Testament writer?) has already been settled in the negative. At this point we would say that only detailed investigation will show whether or not Strecker's presupposition is grounded. We do indeed intend to follow his prescription by seeking to enter into the period and thought-world of the Fourth Evangelist. By doing so we hope to discover whether or not a theological conception of orthodoxy was operative there.

But besides being unpersuaded that the historical question about theological orthodoxy in the New Testament has already been

⁴Ibid., pp. 270 f., n. 84.

⁵Ibid., p. 313, n. 29.

⁶Ibid.

settled, we have a fundamental objection to Strecker's second view, that having to do with value judgements and value-free judgements. We understand history to aim at settling matters of fact. But this cannot possibly exclude value judgements from the matters of fact to be settled. History does not say who (if anyone) was orthodox, who (if anyone) was heretical. It does, however, have something to say about who claimed to be orthodox and who charged whom with heresy. Our question is whether the concern for theological orthodoxy figured in the intentions of the Fourth Evangelist. This is an historical question. It aims at settling a matter of fact. It does not say whether, if there was such a claim, it was verified or not. Again, it is a positivistic illusion to say that value judgements have no role in the work of the historian. They should not, indeed, serve as a substitute for evidence. They guide the choice of historical questions without presuming to answer them.⁷

In the light of these preliminary observations, we are in quest of a definition relevant to the thinking of the early Christians themselves, for the early Christians' world of meaning belongs indispensably to the data which the historian must take account of. Moreover, the definition ought, ideally, to be at once specific enough to

⁷Bernard J. F. Lonergan, Method in Theology (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), p. 232: "History is not value-free in the sense that the historian refrains from all value-judgements....The historian ascertains matters of fact, not by ignoring data, by failing to understand, by omitting judgements of value, but by doing all of these for the purpose of settling matters of fact".

meet real issues and flexible enough to apply to different times and places. It should serve us well in recovering horizons often less differentiated⁸ than our own.

The call for this kind of definition is as old as Socrates. When Socrates asked "What is justice?" he was looking not for a list of the acts of a just man but for a proposition hitting off the nature of justice, one applicable to every instance of justice and to nothing other than justice. Socrates was in quest of an insight not into the usages of words, but into the essences of things.

In the light of this reflection on definition, let us consider Bauer's critique. Bauer's starting point was the doctrinal commitments of the party that emerged dominant in Christianity by the end of the third century. The commitments were specific articles of faith. The claim was that these articles had defined Christian faith from the beginning. Taking "orthodoxy" to signify the commitments, Bauer set out to put the claim to the test of history -- and found it wanting.

Now this project, straightforward as it might appear, has two related drawbacks. First, it skipped too quickly over the thought of the participants in the ancient history of orthodoxy and heresy. Secondly, it did so because in his definition of orthodoxy Bauer took precisely the tack condemned by Socrates as inadequate. Like the

⁸For an explanation of this term see Method in Theology, esp. pp. 81-89. See also Bruno Snell, The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953). Snell's book describes how differentiations of consciousness took place in Greek thought.

Athenian who defined not the nature of justice but the acts of a just man, Bauer settled on the material components of orthodoxy in the third and fourth centuries. He saw that the claim that these material components of orthodoxy were present in first century Christianity was wrong. But what he himself failed to do was to settle on a heuristic⁹ definition of orthodoxy; that is, he did not offer a formal definition which, as an invariant structure, could take account of development. He therefore lacked the conceptual tools to deal with orthodoxy as a development incorporating the past, accommodating to the present and anticipating the future.¹⁰ Indeed, throughout the book we have the impression of entrenched rival factions waging war for souls from clearly defined positions. Hence, it is with some apparent surprise that Bauer notes:

The religious discussion which brought about the split in Rome between Marcion and orthodoxy was of a special sort. At least at the outset, it was not thought of as a struggle for the souls of Roman Christians fought from already established positions, but as an effort to ascertain what the true meaning and content of the Christian religion really is, and to that extent it was somewhat comparable to the apostolic council

⁹Lonergan, Method in Theology, p. 22: "Moreover, within method the use of heuristic devices is fundamental. They consist in designating and naming the intended unknown, in setting down at once all that can be affirmed about it, and in using this explicit knowledge as a guide, a criterion, and/or a premise in the effort to arrive at fuller knowledge".

¹⁰Perhaps this point is best illustrated by an analogy from music. If one is confronted with just one musical note, by itself it is not very meaningful. If, however, the same musical note appears in a series of notes of a melody, it takes on a whole new dimension, for we can then discern how it coheres with a choreographed sequence.

(Acts 15).¹¹

Our own definition of orthodoxy (that which coheres with the truth of Divine Revelation) is offered as a formal definition, the material components of which are provided by the relevant data of history. It is thus a definition which is not only taken from the history of early Christian thought, but one which also allows us to take account of development. It is heuristic in that it enables us to label the intended unknown and to set down all that can be said about it in the particular historical age under investigation.

Our own attempt at reconstructing the history of early Christian thought is closer to that of H. E. W. Turner than to that of Bauer. Bauer, because he conducted his inquiry without reference to any formal principle of orthodoxy, offered a view of early Christianity which retrojected a more differentiated mentality than we can reasonably suppose was there.

Like Bauer, H. E. W. Turner has concerned himself with the doctrinal content of orthodoxy and heresy. But he has done so in a somewhat different way. As we have seen, he argued that an examination of the self-understanding of post-apostolic Christianity revealed

¹¹Orthodoxy and Heresy, p. 132. However, Bauer does at several places indicate the undifferentiated and fluid character of early Christian thought. Note especially: "...The two types of Christianity were not at all clearly differentiated from each other..." (p. 59); "...Moreover, in this early period "orthodoxy" is just as much a sort of collective concept as is "heresy", and clothes itself in quite different forms according to the circumstances..." (p. 77); "....The confession of Jesus as Lord and heavenly redeemer is a common foundation for both tendencies, and for a long time sufficed to hold the differently oriented spirits together in one fellowship..." (p. 90).

a healthy interaction between fixed and flexible elements. Only by grasping this point would the unity and diversity of early Christianity become intelligible. Moreover, if we take account of the mentality of the earliest Church, we cannot but come upon the phenomenon Turner calls the lex orandi; that is, the consciousness of standing in a faith relationship, a response to Divine Revelation essentially consisting in thanksgiving for the boon of salvation. We infer from the performance (Vollzug) of Christian faith that it is at once an exigence for and a source of theology.

The more recent debate on orthodoxy and heresy reflects a marked lack of sympathy with Turner. Koester complains that Turner's notion of lex orandi is "theologically mute".¹² Ehrhardt thinks that Turner retreats into dogmatic categories and implies that he has missed the point.¹³ To facilitate further discussion of the whole problem of orthodoxy and heresy it is thus necessary at this point to endeavour to uncover some of the root suppositions which separate Turner from many of the other participants in the debate.

¹²

"GNOMAI DIAPHORAI", p. 281.

¹³

Art. cit. It is ironic that, as we have noted, Ehrhardt himself has missed the point.

There is an obvious difference between Turner and Koester over the concept of lex orandi. It is not entirely clear in what sense Koester thinks that Turner's lex orandi is "theologically mute".¹⁴ If he means that it is theologically unexplored or not fully formulated, then Turner would doubtless agree, for doctrinal explorations and formulations are the province of the lex credendi. To grasp this point one must remember that our horizons are genetically¹⁵ different from those undifferentiated horizons of early Christianity.

Let us pursue this tack a little further by examining early Christian thought in the light of the lex orandi. The formulation of doctrine was not the primary purpose of the early Church; rather, it saw itself as charged with the mandate of preaching the gospel and concomitant teaching of the Christian life. It was in the course of this mission that "intellectual scaffolding" was erected around the

14

It is perhaps instructive to quote the total context of Koester's remark: "On the other hand, the search for theological criteria cannot be avoided by means of a retreat into dogmatic or religious propositions. Such propositions often attempt to fill the gaps and bridge the inconsistencies in the history of orthodoxy by postulating a primitive orthodox Church which concealed its true beliefs in certain practices and institutions, and in the -- theologically mute -- 'lex orandi'" ("GNOMAI DIAPHORAI", p. 281).

15

Method in Theology, p. 236: "...horizons may differ genetically. They are related in successive stages in some process of development. Each later usage presupposes earlier stages, partly to include them and partly to transform them. Precisely because the stages are earlier and later, no two are simultaneous. They are parts, not of a single communal world, but of a single biography or of a single history".

living realities grounded in Christian experience mediated through the Church. The communication of these realities self-evidently implied conceptualization. But the need to present Christianity in an acceptable form -- implying, as it does, the use of a conceptual framework and linguistic idiom -- arose primarily in the contexts of propaganda and apologetics. The Church needed conceptual tools if it were to be missionary, and sheer survival dictated their use in the rebuttal of pagan criticism. The first attempts at the articulation of the Christian faith were not undertaken for their own sake; Origen's First Principles is the first treatise on theology conceived out of an exclusive passion for theologizing.

Thus the Biblical data are mediated through the medium of the lex orandi of the Church. All the major doctrines of orthodoxy were lived devotionally as part of the corporate experience of the Church before their theological developments became a matter of urgent necessity.¹⁶

The lex orandi preceded the lex credendi. Thus, as Turner and others have noted, trinitarian religion preceded and necessitated trinitarian theology. The triune baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 is universally cited in the practice of the early Church. Even the Arians accepted the text. The doctrine of the trinity was primarily an extension and exploration into the baptismal formula. It was this lex orandi basis which led the early Church to expand instinctively the Old Testament dictum "As the Lord liveth" into "As the Father Liveth, as the Son liveth, and as the Holy Spirit liveth". The attempt to

¹⁶Pattern, p. 474.

theologeîn Christon before a formulated Christology is also significant.¹⁷

Lex orandi then covers the instinctively taken up devotional and liturgical attitude of the early Church. It harmonizes with the close connection between spirituality and theology and throws light on otherwise seemingly intractable problems. In this sense it is akin to the Russian orthodox term sobornost -- "togetherness", the devotion of the faithful as a springboard and control of theological speculation.¹⁸

However, as we have said, missionary and apologetic motives dictated the articulation of the Christian faith. The degree and precision of such articulation was dictated by historical

¹⁷Cf. Pliny's letter to Trajan where he describes Christians as "carmina dicere Christo quasi deo". In the New Testament itself, see Lk. 24:52: καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης (NABWA *hifis rlfqny^{re}*; R^b); Phil. 2:10: ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων; Apoc. 5:8: καὶ ὅτε ἔλαβεν τὸ βιβλίον, τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα καὶ οἱ ἑῴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεσαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Ἀρνίου ἔχοντες ἑκάστος κιθάραν καὶ φιάλας χρυσᾶς γεμούσας θυμιαμάτων, αἱ εἰσὶν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων ; 5:14: καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ἔλεγον, Ἀμήν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεσαν καὶ προσεκύνησαν. Mt. 14:33: "οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες, Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς εἶ ; also Hebs. 1:3-6; Col. 1:15-20 and I Tim. 3:16. In John, perhaps two verses particularly worth noting are 9:38 and 20.28.

¹⁸This similarity was pointed out to me by Professor Turner in a private communication.

circumstance. The Church was not only subject to attack from without, but also to disruption by differences from within.¹⁹ Celsus treats Gnostics as Christians, and sixty years later we find Origen vigorously refuting that this is the case. Orthodoxy had evidently become much more selective in that sixty-year span. There is nothing odd about this; it indicates merely that certain tendencies in Christianity were seen as gradually leading to positions which were irreconcilable with the bases of the faith. Historically it is difficult to see how it could happen otherwise. It is wrong to think that the Church had a blueprint from the beginning which was the touchstone of correct Christian belief, for the early Christian consciousness was relatively undifferentiated. Heresy was not a known in the sense of the transgression of a fixed theological law.

In the beginning the Church was a collection of people who were bound together by the common belief that Jesus was the Christ, the bringer of salvation. The exact implications of such belief had to be worked out in the course of time as the need arose. The history of the early Church is thus a history of doctrinal explorations; it was not immediately obvious that certain avenues were culs-de-sac. Yet although the journey down a certain avenue may have begun, once the life and reflection of the Church had revealed that route to be a dead end, it was abandoned and others were

¹⁹ It is interesting to note that the differences were almost always over how the original deposit of faith could best be safeguarded, for both the heretics and the orthodox claimed to do this.

explored. Those who continued along that road eventually reached the point of no return and such the Church had to disown as it carried on its search for truth down other avenues.

The first major problem the Church faced in erecting its intellectual scaffolding around the faith was the reconciliation of its trinitarian theology (given in the lex orandi) with the monotheism of the faith from which it sprang. This occupied the mind of the Church until Nicea. The relation of the Father to the Son was the first item of reflection, as Christ was so central in preaching and teaching. Once this was settled, the precise nature and position of the Holy Spirit within the Godhead was formulated -- as is evidenced by the quite rapid development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the period from A.D. 327-381.

The formulation of Christian doctrine was the result of the interplay of various ways of thinking within the Church. The characteristics of the whole Church militated against extremism. Even the great individual traditions of the Church tended mutually to correct each other. The West -- with its love of the concrete and the balanced -- was a good foil for the East, with its love of the mystical and speculative.²⁰ It is quite valid to see the development of early Christian doctrine as an interaction between fixed and flexible elements. It is of course wrong to envisage this develop-

²⁰"Thus orthodoxy in its totality proved to be a far richer thing than any of its components...in each case it was the tradition defeated in the sphere of formulation which was ultimate in victory in the realm of interpretation". Pattern, p. 476.

ment²¹ as having fixed and narrow limits:

The customary limitations imposed by human sin, human error, and human blindness can be observed even here. Christian theology is not exempted from the law of oscillation which applies to all branches of human thought. Premature syntheses required subsequent modification and the dangers of distortion and accretion²² were not slow in making their presence felt.

Diverse usages reflect diverse realities. There really are evolutions and devolutions. Not every sequence is a development.

If the progression of orthodoxy did not proceed along the "straight and narrow" in quite the way envisaged by the classical approach, neither is it true to say that it often wandered off the road completely. To be sure, the development of early Christian doctrine is characterized by oscillations, but the quest for balance was always there, with the givenness of the New Testament data as the fulcrum.²³

²¹The word "development" may be used descriptively or normatively. That is, it may refer to merely de facto developments, or it may be reserved for authentic developments. Generally, we use it in the latter sense.

²²Pattern, p. 498.

²³The quest for balance is often lacking in contemporary debate, e.g., D. Welbourn, God-Dimensional Man (London: S.C.M., 1972) attempts to formulate a Christology based on Jesus solely as a human being. See in contrast G. V. Jones, Christology and Myth in the New Testament (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956), who stresses that Christology must balance the anagogic and catagogic aspects of Christ. See also the Christological debates in Christ, Faith and History, eds. S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1972). Here M. F. Wiles' essay, "Does Christology rest on a mistake?", pp. 3-12, reprinted from Religious Studies 7 (1970), 69-72, is particularly important. See also his "In Defence of Arius", JTS n. s. 13 (1962), 339-347.

The development of Christian thought begins with faith data; from this givenness certain inferences are drawn as historical circumstances dictate. These inferences at a later stage -- after they have become explored and tested -- become presuppositions. Thus, as Dodd points out,²⁴ the content of the kerygma entered the Rule of Faith²⁵ which second and third century Christian theologizing recognized as the presuppositions of faith. Out of the Rule of Faith the creeds eventually emerged.

Of course, one cannot sharply delineate these various stages. For example, the formulations of the Alexandrian school were characterized by a certain Gestalt to which the whole Church did not subscribe. In that sense they are not doctrinal formulations, but represent a stage at which the Alexandrian doctrinal tradition was crystallizing. Hence, doctrine develops from faith data, the data of the lex orandi. From such doctrinal explorations various doctrinal traditions crystallize, which are then synthesized into one formulation at the Great Councils.

This does not infer that agreement on doctrinal matters was reached solely on the basis of what the majority found acceptable. It was not a question of just taking a vote. Rather it was a question

24

The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936), pp. 73 f.

25

The constituents of the Rule of Faith were imprecise. They were variously seen as the Canon, the Creed or wider than the Creed.

of reaching agreement on a certain issue according to basic principles. Any doctrinal formulation must have coherence²⁶ and correspond to the early Christian faith data.

So far in this Chapter we have indicated that we think that the question of what orthodoxy means is vital to the whole discussion of orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity; it is not merely a semantic problem. We have further indicated that we think that the grasp of Turner's notion of the lex orandi is crucial to the understanding of early Christian thought, and have attempted to review briefly the history of early Christian history in the light of it. But the differences between Turner and other participants in the orthodoxy/heresy debate are not confined only to the lex orandi. A careful examination of the thought of Turner and others reveals another vital difference. While such as Koester stress the syncretistic nature of early Christianity,²⁷ Turner stresses the

²⁶Turner, Pattern, p. 488, defines coherence as a hypothesis which is "self-consistent and congruous with other related fields of knowledge and experience". Cf. J. H. Newman, Oxford University Sermons (London: Rivingtons, 1892), p. 337: "...it being a definition of heresy, that it fastens on some one statement as if the whole truth, to the denial of all others, and as the basis for a new faith".

²⁷It is salutary to recall here that it was Newman who pointed out that if there was a phenomenon named Christianity which the historian could investigate, Christianity was a fact. As such a fact, it "interfered with" such theories as that, for example, "historically it [Christianity] has no substance of its own but [has been] a mere assemblage of doctrines and practices derived from without" -- An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (18782).

identity of subject matter and congruity of content but sees a difference of style, idiom and historical context. That is, Turner argues for a dynamic²⁸ unity of Christian development.

Reprinted: London: Sheed and Ward, 1960), section 2 of the Introduction. Note also the following remark of Newman: "The phenomenon, admitted on all hands, is this: That great portion of what is generally received as Christian truth is, in its rudiments or in its separate parts, to be found in heathen philosophies and religions. For instance, the doctrine of a Trinity is to be found both in the East and in the West; so is the ceremony of washing; so is the rite of sacrifice. The doctrine of the Divine Word is Platonic; the doctrine of the Incarnation is Indian; of a divine kingdom is Judaic; of Angels and demons is Magian; the connection of sin with the body is Gnostic; celibacy is known to Bonze and Talapoin; a sacerdotal order is Egyptian; the idea of a new birth is Chinese and Eleusinian; belief in sacramental virtue is Pythagorean; and honours to the dead are a polytheism. Such is the general nature of the fact before us; Mr. Milman argues from it -- 'These things are in heathenism, therefore they are not Christian': we, on the contrary, prefer to say, 'these things are in Christianity, therefore they are not heathen'". *Ibid.*, VIII, 2 (12). This does indicate a fundamental difference in attitude which is to some extent still present in the contemporary debate.

28

Loneragan, *Method in Theology*, p. 138: "The unity of a subject in process of development is dynamic. For as long as further advance is possible, the perfection of complete immobility has not been attained, and, for that reason, there cannot yet be reached the logical ideal of fixed terms, accurately and immutably formulated axioms, and absolutely rigorous deduction of all possible conclusions. The absence, however, of static unity does not preclude the presence of dynamic unity..."

Note also G. Biemer, *Newman on Tradition* (London: Burns & Oates, 1967), p. 129: "The static and dynamic elements of revelation are, by their nature, and by reason of the medium of time, essential to the conservation and life of the deposit. To abandon either of them in favour of the other is to disregard history in one way or another. Either the origins are neglected, to make way for "enthusiasm" or the fanciful; or the continuity of history is not taken seriously, and an anachronistic "classicism" holds the field. Newman combined both elements in his theory of development". This seems very close to Turner's own attempt.

Turner believes that the Church's rejection of Gnosticism indicates that Christianity is not intrinsically a syncretism.²⁹ He admits that the Church used the best available categories, usually drawn from Greek philosophy, which were not designed with the Christian realities in view. But Turner considers the real question to have been whether these realities would be "evacuated", "diluted", or "truncated", or whether the thought-forms could be successfully adapted to their new purposes.

Yet although Turner sees the development of early Christian doctrine as an interaction between "fixed and flexible" elements, as we have seen he does stress that it is wrong to envisage this development as having fixed and narrow limits. In this connection, it must be acknowledged that development is mysterious:

29

In a private communication to me, Professor Turner pointed out that his view of the importance of the lex orandi is not only confirmed by the evidence which he adduces for basic and theologically unreflective statements both of the Divinity of Christ and the Trinity, but also from the Church's reaction to heresy. This is neither a position of complete closedness as the classicist theory presupposed nor a complete openness as Bauer and others implied. The reaction to Gnosticism is a case in point. We may grant that orthodoxy and heresy existed side by side in some areas and that there was a penumbra between them. However, there was sufficient communis sensus fidelium to suspect something amiss in Gnosticism and to put the Church on its guard and at "action stations" against the new movement. "Action stations" expressed themselves initially in the crystallization of existing or developing institutions such as episcopacy, the Canon of Scripture and the Creeds. Moreover, Irenaeus juxtaposed the Gnostic systems and the basic Christian credenda and allowed the former to fall by their own weight. Clement tries to show that the Christian is the true Gnostic. Origen offers a viable alternative based on the Rule of

Development, unlike organic growth, unlike logical deduction, takes place in the sphere of spirit, subjectivity, freedom, meaning and history. It is unpredictable. Its authenticity is not discerned equally by all, nor all at once. It is taken in piecemeal, by a learning process, and is satisfactorily grasped after the fact.³⁰

If we think of orthodoxy as a moving norm, then as normative, past orthodoxy is a discernible and powerful ocean current; as moving, present orthodoxy is mysterious and a challenge to discernment.

So then, Turner supposes that Christianity has a distinctive identity, that das Wesen des Christentums is a meaningful phrase, that there is such a thing as the "Christian deposit of faith". Koester and others seem to make no such supposition. On the contrary, they seem to suppose the opposite: that Christianity has no intrinsic substantial identity; that it is a syncretism or, more exactly, an on-going multiplicity of interpretations with family resemblances.³¹

Faith, but cuts the ground from under the feet of his opponents by offering a more intelligible and coherent alternative.

30

B. F. Meyer, The Church in Three Tenses (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1971), p. 71.

31

It must be said here that Christian self-understanding in every age, although always involved in development, always shared Turner's presupposition and never Koester's. This surely weakens the claim of Koester and others that they have caught hold of the earliest series of Christian mentalities. It may be, on the basis

Turner's starting point is the givenness of God.³² This is perhaps a point worth dwelling on. Christianity saw itself as being born not of its own act but of God's. Despite the diverse perspectives of New Testament writers, each has the conviction that the selfhood of Christianity was born "from above" and guided by God Himself.³³ Christians never thought of their existence as auto-justified, rather they held their existence in the consciousness of a Divine mandate.

Paul certainly conceived of the Gospel as having a distinct identity. Right belief was that which mediated salvation. But salvation is God's gift (I Thess. 2:13; Rom. 1:16); salvation is contingent upon the truly revealed. It is this lived consciousness of the interdependence of salvation and the truly revealed that is central to our discussion.

When Turner speaks of the lex orandi (which is to be conceived of as pre-theological³⁴) he is speaking of the heuristic effort to

of historical investigation alone, that we cannot show that Christianity has had a permanent identity maintained through extraordinary cultural mutations and maintained, in part, through intolerance for heresy; but we can say on the basis of historical investigation alone that this is the account that Christianity has always given of itself.

³²By this phrase Turner means both the reality of God and the gift God makes of Himself in His Son.

³³See B. F. Meyer, op. cit., p. 65.

³⁴And thus can hardly be "theologically mute"! On the contrary, it is that from which all authentic theological discourse flows.

grasp the givenness of God -- the "religious facts". There is the "that which" is experimentally grasped, the experimental grasp and the reflective thematization of the experimentally grasped. No concrete definition of what it is to be a Christian can be comprehensive. In this sense the "that which" is grasped is ineffable. Obviously there is a differentiation of consciousness between a Christian of the first century and one at Chalcedon. But these differentiations must be viewed in relation to what it is that is being expressed.³⁵

Turner's "religious facts" are irreducible to merely human conceptions and descriptions, and so may appear now in the mode of apocalyptic, now in the mode of metaphysics, now in the mode of existentialism, never fully grasped -- much less exhausted -- by any mode.³⁶ It seems that it is perhaps here that the widest gulf between

³⁵ It is a hermeneutical principle that there is a "circle of things and words" (Sache und Sprache). That is, I understand words by understanding the things they refer to; I understand things by understanding the words that refer to them. The first limb states the more fundamental insight -- it explains why a blind man will find a lecture on colour obscure.

³⁶ Cf. G. Biemer, op. cit., p. 122: "Having drawn the necessary consequences and formed the necessary definitions, reason arrives at a whole theological system. But its activity does not end there. The urge to know pushes it still further, and the growth of the spirit can never be checked. The end could only be brought about by the object, if all its aspects were grasped in their totality, and the idea then fully comprised and comprehended in an adequate act of knowledge. But such a perfection of knowledge cannot be attained even with regard to the objects and systems of our own world and its reality. Even here there are always new possibilities to explore, new aspects to throw light on, new means for approximating to the essence of the thing itself. Much less is it possible to have anything like complete comprehension of revelation, where human reason is confronted with the mysterious truths of the Infinite".

the universes of discourse of Turner and others is located.

From what we have said, it is clear that we conceive of orthodoxy and heresy not so much as disparate positions vying for souls, but rather as tensions within a developing tradition. Its character is only satisfactorily grasped after the fact and through the meaning it has for the disputants at the time; understanding orthodoxy is contingent upon understanding the self-understanding³⁷

³⁷ B. F. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-55: "Both 'self' and 'understanding' are...analogous terms for which the primary analogue is the human person as the subject of his own acts. 'Subject', however, says more than 'originating principle'. The plant is the principle of its own action; so is the animal....But 'subject' in the full sense is the self that is both revealed and in some sense constituted by the peculiar interiority of rational consciousness. The subject is the source of responsible action. What distinguishes him is a spontaneous awareness of himself as an originating, intending, self-orientating center. Inevitably, then, the subject finds himself invited by the sheer fact of spontaneous self-awareness to wonder about himself, to tend toward and away from himself, to direct, to congratulate, to suspect, and to despise himself; to observe and to learn himself; to problematize and theorize about himself; to know himself as alone, as encountering others, as identifying with them and recoiling from them, tempted to use them and summoned to join them....The sequence of spontaneous awareness and of wonder about the acting self culminates in the work of reflection whose fruit is a certain self-understanding....We...distinguish, first, between self-awareness and self-understanding as, respectively, the spontaneous phenomenon of consciousness and the acquired fruit of reflection; second, between the faith of the man of faith (or of the faith community) and the understanding generated by reflection on the self committed in faith. Faith, no doubt, already involves an inchoate self-understanding, but this takes on definite contour through the reflection that faith solicits, especially when it is under pressure".

Also: "There is a level of self-understanding, critical because operative in decision, which may never become reflexly conscious. Or one might happen on a perspective in which suddenly an underlying explanatory pattern emerges out of a maze of opaque choices long since made. Unarticulated facets of the self-understanding of the primitive Church are also discoverable 'after the fact', inferred from a certain style of thought and action". *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

of the groups.

Thus far we have indicated that our point of departure from many other inquiries into orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity lies precisely in the question of what orthodoxy means. We consider Turner's notion of lex orandi to be an essential cornerstone in any reconstruction of early Christian thought. We have also attempted to explicate what we consider a root supposition separating Turner from such as Koester: the former argues for an organic unity of early Christian development and the latter for an artificial unity. We shall now attempt to vindicate Turner's position on this latter point by reference to the New Testament itself.

In Paul's words, to be a Christian is to put on Christ (cf. I Cor. 3:10 f.). The experience of Christ is the guiding principle of the Christian's life.

There is a unity in all these early Christian books which is powerful enough to absorb and subdue their differences, and that unity is to be found in a common religious relation to Christ, a common debt to him, a common sense that everything in the relations of God and man must be and is determined by him.³⁸

This experience is largely inaccessible, except when it manifests itself in the life of the community. The cumulative self-understanding of the early Church community served as a regulative and stabilizing expression of this internalized "norm". As the Christian self-understanding was essentially ecclesial from the start, it was protected against arbitrary discontinuities and involved in the social process as a moving consensus. This notion of orthodoxy

³⁸J. Denney, Jesus and the Gospel. Christianity justified in the Mind of Christ (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919), p. 101.

as a moving, organic³⁹ consensus evolving from implicit beliefs grounded in the experience of Christ seems to be in essence the same as that of Turner.

This assertion that the Christian community, the Church, of the first century was subject to self-regulation and correction from within is subject to the following objection: Was there a Church self-understanding in the first century? Or were there just autonomous, spontaneously founded churches? The answer is that the individual Christian communities understood themselves as particular realizations of the Church as one transcendental reality.⁴⁰ A community of Churches was a first century fact, as the career of Paul illustrates.⁴¹

Moreover, this Church self-understanding was controlled by two factors: not only the experience of Christ, but also the scriptures.

³⁹The use of this metaphor argues for the identity of doctrine throughout the successive stages of Christianity. B. F. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 75 f., objects to the use of the analogy of organic growth because, he feels, it implies that the Church is predestined to "a fixed scheme of development through infancy, youth, and maturity to decline, senescence, and death". All analogies are defective at some point, and we would not like our use of "organic" to be taken as implying this. Our use of "organic" is meant rather to function in a negative way: by its use we hope to exclude from our definition any tinge of transformism.

⁴⁰The important works in this debate are: R. Sohm, Kirchenrecht, I (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblet, 1892); A. Harnack, Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs' Buchhandlung, 1910); O. Linton, Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung: eine kritische Darstellung (Uppsala: A'lmqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri.-a.-b., 1932). A brief summary of the issues appears in H. Conzelmann, Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Münich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1968²); ET: An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament (London: S.C.M., 1969), pp. 41 f. See also K.L. Schmidt's article on ἐκκλησία in TWNT; A.M. Hunter, The Unity of the New Testament (London: S.C.M., 1943), ch. 6.

⁴¹See L. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul (New York: Herder, 1963), pp. 248-261.

This latter point needs emphasis. The faith formulas of the early Church reflect a consciousness of continuity. The historic relationship with Israel was reflected in the covenant. The definitive character of the new covenant secured the present and the future; the past was secured by attestation of Jesus as fulfilment⁴² -- fulfilment of Law, promise, prophecy and type.⁴³ Paul, even if only in a limited sense, was conscious of this continuity. His experience did not lead him to repudiate his heritage, rather he saw it in an entirely new light.

We turn now to our fundamental and perhaps most contentious point that the Church did have an acute sense of the confessional principle.

Had the Christians of the apostolic age not conceived of themselves as possessing a body of distinctive, consciously held beliefs, they would scarcely have separated themselves from Judaism and undertaken an immense programme of missionary expansion....It was their faith in this gospel which called them into being, and which they felt obliged to communicate to newcomers. It would have been surprising if they had not given expression to it in their teaching as well as in their corporate life and organization. Like other

42

One must nuance this view when dealing with Paul on the Law. It is true that the Law is viewed negatively by Paul. But nevertheless, for Paul the gospel message is a positive fulfilment of the salvific hope to which the Law pointed, even if in a negative way.

43

In this connection see the interesting article by N. A. Dahl, "The Atonement -- An Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Ro 8:32)", in Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), pp. 15-29.

religious groups with a saving message, they must have been driven by an inward impulse to embody it in their liturgy, their institutions and their propaganda, and to seize every opportunity of harping on it.⁴⁴

It is by specifically focusing on the credal elements in the New Testament that we hope to support our case. It is true that the New Testament will not support evidence for sacrosanct and stereotyped creeds. But evidence can be adduced for early faith formulas.

The New Testament abounds with evidence of an emphasis on the transmission of authoritative doctrine, for example, Jude vss. 3, 20; II. Tim. 1:13; 4:3; Tit. 1:9; 1:13; I. Tim. 6:20; 1:19; 4:6; Hebs. 3:1; 4:14; 10:23; 6:2. Moreover, this is hardly a process confined to the end of the first century, for Paul witnesses to a much earlier stage in its evolution, for example, Rom. 6:17; 10:8 ff.; I Cor. 11:23-25; 12:3; 15:3-5.

The chief constituents in the preaching of this faith have been isolated in the classic study of C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.⁴⁵ However, this pioneering study does

⁴⁴ J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (London: Longmans, 1960), p. 8.

⁴⁵ Op. cit. (n. 25, above). However, it should be noted here that Dodd's thesis has been subjected both to attack and modification. The key question is: Are the kerygmatic speeches isolated by Dodd free compositions from the hand of Luke? Perhaps the most important article advocating the free composition theory is that of C. F. Evans, "The Kerygma", JTS n. s. 7 (1956), 25-41. His central argument is that there is no Sitz im Leben for the repetition and preservation of the speeches of the Apostles. That is, he sees no purpose corresponding to the interests of the primitive Church which would motivate the recording of the early kerygmatic discourses. See also the criticisms of Dodd's argument by H. J. Cadbury, "Acts and Eschatology",

not give us the full picture by any means. For the emphasis in preaching was necessarily Christological; we must be aware of the basic suppositions that Christianity took over from Judaism, for example, One God the Father, Maker of heaven and earth. We must also take into account the liturgical and catechetical life of the early Church. In baptism, for example, there seems to have been some sort of avowal of beliefs before the initiate entered fully into the Christian community. It is evident that such confessions would crystallize as a matter of course.

in The Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology. Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd, eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1956), pp. 300-321, esp. pp. 313 ff.

On the other hand, there are those who seek to isolate Aramaic substratum in the kerygmatic speeches of Acts, thus indicating a primitive source. Here there are various works, each of which formulates a slightly different hypothesis, e.g., C. C. Torrey, The Composition and Date of Acts (Cambridge, Mass.: H.U.P., 1916); J. de Zwaan, "The use of the Greek Language in Acts", in The Beginnings of Christianity II, 30-65; W. L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1948), pp. 18-21; M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953).

However, the argument that the kerygmatic speeches in Acts do reflect a primitive Palestinian kerygma does not stand or fall with Aramaic source theories. There is another -- theological -- criterion: theological archaisms. For example, in Acts the death and resurrection of Jesus are dissociated inasmuch as the death of Jesus is the work of evil men, while the resurrection is the supreme saving act of God. In the Synoptics, Paul and John, the death and resurrection are grasped as a unity as the saving event. See D. M. Stanley, "The Conception of Salvation in Primitive Christian Preaching", CBQ 18 (1956), 231-254. See also E. Schweizer, "Zu den Reden der Apostelgeschichten", TZ 13 (1957), 1-11, who seeks to demonstrate the use of ancient material in the specifically Christological parts of the speeches.

In conclusion, we should perhaps say that although the view that the speeches of Acts do reflect a primitive Palestinian kerygma has been the subject of attack by many scholars, the issue has certainly not been resolved. In any case, our view does not stand or fall with this question, for we place greater emphasis on the early faith formulas -- see below, pp. 83 ff.

J. N. D. Kelly has collected the most impressive list of one-clause Christologies, bipartite- and tripartite-structured confessions, and concludes that it is manifest that there is a common doctrine shared by the Church from the earliest times.⁴⁶ We will not repeat his argument here. Rather, we will focus attention on just one faith formula, I Cor. 15:3-5, to see if this sheds any light on our particular inquiry.

I Cor. 15:3-5 is a confessional formula which Paul declares he had received and which he had handed on to the Corinthians:⁴⁷

παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον
ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς
καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη
καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς
καὶ ὅτι ὡφθῇ κηρᾷ εἰτα τοῖς δώδεκα.

It is most probable that this kerygmatic formula was first composed in Aramaic.⁴⁸ As Paul says he "received" the formula, it

⁴⁶ Early Christian Creeds, p. 23.

⁴⁷ Παράλαμβάνειν and παραδίδοναι are fixed concepts of tradition. In all probability they correspond to ܕܢܪ ܕܡܫܝܚ (so O. Cullmann, The Early Church [London: S.C.M., 1956], p. 63 against E. Norden, Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede [Stuttgart: Teubner, 1913], p. 270). In present day vernacular 'tradition' denotes an unwritten body of doctrine handed down through the Church, but originally the word emphasized authoritative delivery. Hence in the early Church the word usually connotated that doctrine (written or unwritten) which Jesus or his Apostles committed to the Church -- see J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (London: A. & C. Black, 1960²), pp. 30 f.

⁴⁸ J. Jeremias, Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960³), pp. 95-97; ibid., "Artikkelloses Christos. Zur

must therefore date from at least the forties of the first century. Moreover, it doubtless served catechetical purposes (the lapidary form of the formula shows it to be an entity in itself and not merely a list of topics).

What is the centre of gravity of this formula? The central affirmation is made in lines one and three; line two functions as a warrant for line one and similarly line four for line three. That is, the formula affirms that Christ died for our sins and was raised again on the third day. The emphasis falls on the motif of expiatory death and the explanation of this is that it is "according to the scriptures". There was no need to emphasize that Jesus had died, but that he had died for our sins (not his own) and that this was according to God's plan (and not the decision of the political authorities). This motif is found in faith formulas elsewhere in Paul, for example, Rom. 4:25 and 8:34.

The last limb is important for it locates the testimony which specifies faith. This last limb is not a "proof". What it shows is that early Christianity was committed to the apostolic tradition as the basis and rule of faith.

That the early Church was in fact concerned with the transmission of faith data in pristine form has been shown recently in the

Ursprache von I Kor XV 3b-5", ZNW 57 (1966), 211-215; also B. Klappert, "Zur Frage des semitischen der griechischen Urtextes von I Kor XV 3-5", NTS 13 (1967), 168-173, against H. Conzelmann, "Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel 1 Kor. 15,3-5", EvTheol 25 (1965), 1-11.

incisive book of David L. Dungan, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul.⁴⁹ Dungan specifically focuses on the old controversy of the relation of Paul and the historical or earthly Jesus. He takes two texts -- I Cor. 9:4-18 and I Cor. 7:1-16 -- and discusses what the original saying of Jesus might have been (by comparison with the Synoptic material) and how Paul uses the saying. He concludes that Paul was very dependent on sayings of Jesus and that he takes great care not to stretch such tradition to suit his own needs. In short, there was a concern to preserve the tradition in its original form.

What we have endeavoured to show is that in the New Testament we find faith data (in the kerygma and in the faith formulas) which demand a faith response. Given a faith response, the faith data (Turner's religious facts) are then proclamations within faith. That is, they function only within a faith perspective; orthodoxy is an intelligible concept only within such a faith perspective. The ecclesial perspective thus enters constitutively into any debate on orthodoxy/heresy. For the primary question is: What was it that animated, sustained and nourished the early Church? From whence did it understand itself to derive its animating power? The answer to this question is surely the key to understanding the life and development of Christianity, and it is in addressing precisely this question that Turner formulated his notion of lex orandi. The faith response

⁴⁹The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).

is the response to the givenness of God. It is only within this context that one can begin to make sense of Christian development. The faith data are of course expressed in religious speech, and any use of language does involve the problem of the mediation of meaning. But religious speech is different from theological speech. It functions differently. Religious speech is the expression of worship; it is charged with thanks for the boon of salvation. Theology uses language to reflect, often on the religious life, but more often on the character of the God who is worshipped. Perhaps a concrete example will illustrate the point. The theologian may say: "The Catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance". The initial response of the religiously committed man is more likely to be in the form of an utterance such as: "O Love that wilt not let me go".

To repeat what we have said before: there is the "that which" is grasped, the grasp, and the reflective thematization of the "that which" is grasped. No concrete definition of what it is to be a Christian can be comprehensive; in this sense, the "that which" is grasped is ineffable. The differentiations of consciousness, the developments, of Christianity must be viewed in relation to what it is that is being expressed. It is here that the nub of the matter lies. For Turner's religious facts -- what we prefer to call faith data -- are irreducible to merely human conceptions and descriptions. They are never fully grasped by the various modes of apocalyptic, metaphysics, existentialism. It is this whole style of thought which

seems to be so foreign to many of the participants in the present debate on orthodoxy/heresy. Contrast this style of thought, for instance, with the notion that messiahship refers not to a role willed by God as a feature of his salvific plan, but merely to our idea of such a role. It is true that one cannot say that Jesus is messiah on historical grounds, whereas one can (perhaps) investigate Jesus' messianic consciousness. But this latter procedure leaves open the decisive question of the status in reality of "the thing" (die Sache) referred to. As messiahship may thus be reduced to a mere idea having no reality extra nos, so "orthodoxy" may be reduced to an essentially empty claim. In both instances the reduction may take place without being argued for, and so may function as an unexamined presupposition.

The Christian revelation was eschatological and definitive. Christians can never free themselves from this historical concrete revelation of God through Jesus Christ:

Revelation is not...a set of principles and development a set of inferences, nor is revelation a "seed" and development its organic growth. Revelation is not a Christology, it is Christ. Growth, as understood in Ephesians, is the deepening, not of the knowledge of theology, but of "the knowledge of the Son of God" (4:13); the "inexhaustible riches" (3:8) are not riches of doctrine, but riches of Christ. Likewise, "the divine mystery in which all treasures of wisdom and knowledge are to be found" (Col 2:3) is precisely Christ himself.⁵⁰

Thus the hermeneutical questions which are so central to the

⁵⁰ B. F. Meyer, op. cit., p. 140.

discussion of the orthodoxy/heresy debate might well begin with the question of Christology and of Christ. Is Christology the derivative of "Jesus-in-his-Christological-integrity?" Or is Christology rather an imposition on "Jesus-as-man-like-any-other?"

The first option affirms a Sache in which Christological Sprache is grounded: Jesus has the extra nos reality of "being the Christ". This is precisely the option supposed by early Christianity in accord with what Turner calls the lex orandi. Without it, the Christological struggles of the ancient Church from the Gnostic controversy to Nicea hardly make historical sense. Clarity on the question of orthodoxy and heresy -- a question which has thus far hinged on such buried issues -- would seem to require that this kind of option be explicitly recognized.

Our particular question, however, is a limited historical one. We are seeking to discover whether there is a concern for orthodoxy in the Fourth Gospel, and if so, how it expresses itself. We have endeavoured to show how the various approaches to the orthodoxy/heresy question are grounded in differing suppositions. We have also attempted to justify our own approach to the problem. We have defined orthodoxy as belief which responds to and is grounded in Divine Revelation. Moreover, we have sought to show that Divine Revelation is a presupposition of orthodoxy, and that this presupposition was part and parcel of the early Christian mentality. Our task now is to test this contention by a specific examination of the Gospel of John.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DECISIVE REDACTOR AND THE JOHANNINE REDACTION

(1) The Decisive Redactor

The main purpose of the present study is to find out whether the Fourth Gospel shows a concern for orthodoxy and, if so, to ascertain how it finds concrete expression. This purpose sets a project which, though finally oriented toward a history of the development of Christian faith, is immediately exegetical in character.

Now, every exegetical work proceeds on the basis of presuppositions. Among these presuppositions those bear most directly on the work of interpretation which belong to the special discipline called "Introduction" or Einleitung. In the present instance "Introduction" defines the "Johannine problem":¹ a network of questions concerning

¹ The best discussions of the Johannine Problem available in English are W. G. Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 139-174; Brown, John, pp. xxi-civ; R. Schnackenburg, John, pp. 11-92.

the Fourth Gospel's relation to the Synoptics,² its background,³ its

²The argument for the dependence of the Fourth Gospel on the Synoptics has rested on apparent literary links (see Barrett, John, pp. 34 f.; J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke [London: McMillan & Co., 1930], pp. 318-321) and the fact that John, like the Synoptics, is said to be a "gospel" (but see G. Richter's review of Schnackenburg's commentary on John in MunchTheolZeit 18 (1967), 247-250, where he claims that John is not a gospel but rather a Christological Lehrschrift). There is, however, strong support for the idea that the Fourth Gospel is completely independent of the Synoptics -- see P. Gardner-Smith, St. John and the Synoptics (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1938); B. Noack, Zur johanneischen Tradition. Beiträge zur literarkritische Exegese des vierten Evangeliums (København: Rosenkilde, 1954); C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition and the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1963); E. Haenchen, "Johanneische Problem", ZTK 56 (1959), 19-22, thinks that it is the redactor alone who is dependent upon the Synoptics. The whole problem of the relation of John to the Synoptics receives excellent treatment in J. Blinzler, Johannes und die Synoptiker (Stuttgart Bibelstudien 5; Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1965).

³The following attempt to understand the Fourth Gospel exclusively against the background of the Old Testament and Rabbinic Judaism: A. Schlatter, Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten (B.F.C.T., Jahrg. 6, Hfr. 4; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1902); F. Büchsel, Johannes und der hellenistische Syncretismus (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1928); A. Guiding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. A study of the relation of John's Gospel to the ancient Jewish lectionary system (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960). These attempts have been unsuccessful in showing that this is the exclusive background of the Fourth Gospel. Although it has to be conceded that the Fourth Evangelist does use the Old Testament -- see C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel", JTS 48 (1947), 155-169; J. J. Enz, "The Book of Exodus as a Literary type for the Gospel of John", JBL 76 (1957), 208-215; E. C. Hoskyns, "Genesis i-iii and St. John's Gospel", JTS 21 (1920), 210-218 -- it is only one woof woven into the whole fabric of the Gospel. C. H. Dodd's attempt (Interpretation, pp. 10-53) to show a relation between the Fourth Gospel and the Hermetic literature and Hellenistic Judaism of Philo remains problematic (Kümmel, Introduction, p. 155). Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums", ZNW 24 (1925), 100-146, attempted to place the Gospel against a background of Mandaean Gnosticism. W. Bauer also drew upon Mandaean texts in his commentary, Das Johannesevangelium (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933). The whole problem of Gnosticism in early Christianity is a contentious one (see above, Chapter I, pp. 28 f.). There have been attempts recently to link the Fourth Gospel with Qumran, e.g., J. A. T.

unity,⁴ its composition and its author. The burden of the present short

Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community", HarvThR 50 (1957), 175-191, reprinted in Twelve New Testament Studies (London: S.C.M., 1962), pp. 11-27; O. Betz, Der Paraklet. Fursprecher im haretischen Spatjudentum, im Johannesevangelium und in neugefundenen gnostischen Schriften (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spatjudentums und Urchristentums II: Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963). On Betz, see below, Chapter Four, pp. 156 ff.

⁴The problem of the unity of the Fourth Gospel arises from the fact that although we can detect the work of an undoubted genius in, for example, John 9, in other parts of the Gospel we find apparent breaks and inconsistencies, for example, 14:31, 20:30-31, 13:36 and 14:5, 5:1 and 6:1. (For examples of the author's skilfulness in writing see, for example, J. L. Martyn, History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel [New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1968]; R. Schnackenburg, John, pp. 114-115; Clayton R. Bowen, "The Fourth Gospel as Drama", JBL 49 [1930], 292-305; C. Milo Connick, "The Dramatic Character of the Fourth Gospel", ET 65 [1953-54], 173-176; Edith Lovejoy Pierce, "The Fourth Gospel as Drama", Religion in Life 29 [1960], 253-254.) Moreover, in some parts of the Gospel there seem to be unnecessary repetitions (but see T. F. Glasson, "Inaccurate Repetitions in the Fourth Gospel", ET 57 [1945-46], 111-112).

The proposed solutions to these difficulties have involved three hypotheses or combinations of them. They are: (1) The text of the Fourth Gospel has fallen into disorder through the displacement of pages; (2) The text is the result of the amalgamation of several sources; (3) The text has been expanded and revised by a redactor (or redactors), possibly to adapt it to the contemporary ecclesiastical situation. There have been many suggestions as to the original order of the Fourth Gospel. The suggestions that have found most favour are: (1) 3:22-30 should be placed between 2:12 and 2:13. This purportedly improves the itinerary in ch. 2 and restores the connection between 3:21 and 3:31. (2) Ch. 6 should stand between 4 and 5. Again it is claimed that this improves the itinerary. (3) 7:15-24 should stand after 5:47. Its placement at present seems to interrupt the sequence of thought, whereas it seems to continue the argument of ch. 5. (4) 10:19-29 should stand after 9:41 to restore the connexion between 10:18 and 10:30. 10:21 is said to be more closely related to the miracle of ch. 9. (5) It is thought that 14:31 concludes the Last Discourse. Therefore chs. 15 and 16 should stand before this verse, whilst the "farewell prayer" of ch. 17 should follow 13:31.

Although there has been support for such displacement theories, there has been a number of cogent objectors (Barrett, Dodd). It is palaeographically improbable (Kummel, Introduction, p. 146). Moreover, it is difficult to see how we can successfully restore the purported original order of the Fourth Gospel when the person responsible for the

chapter will be to indicate what presuppositions about the Johannine problem will guide our interpretive efforts and to offer at least a summary justification of the presuppositions adopted.

Our exegetical inquiry -- an inquiry into the Johannine concern for truth and particularly for orthodoxy -- obviously bears on Johannine theology. It therefore requires that we define Johannine theology as exactly as we can. The definition of its content ~~is~~ reserved mostly until the next chapter. But in terms of the Johannine problem we can locate our use of the term "Johannine theology" by describing it in terms of the "theology of the decisive redactor". The decisive redactor is that person who, more than any other, has given the Gospel its peculiar thrust and present form. This implies a particular position on how the Fourth Gospel was produced. Negatively, it says that the Gospel was not a free composition of a single writer at a single point in time. On the contrary, its composition had a history; and in this history there was one redactor decisively responsible for its present contour and content.

Our remarks on the Johannine problem, then, will turn mainly on the decisive redactor, distinguishing this stage in the history of the

original order could not, even though he had the original sheets which we do not have. (The reply that the editor or editors deliberately chose the present order or were working with fragmented material is no reply. In either case he [or they] sponsors an order which makes sense to him.) The danger of rearranging the text is obvious: often, either consciously or unconsciously, such attempts reflect the interest of the commentator rather than the Evangelist. Such rearrangements should only be undertaken if the present order does not make sense. It remains true that "no one has yet demonstrated convincingly that the gospel has been disarranged" (H. M. Teeple, "Methodology in source analysis of the Fourth Gospel", *JBL* 81 [1962], p. 281). Bultmann, who rearranges solitary verses, never even attempts to explain how such displacements could have taken place.

Gospel's composition from what preceded it and what followed it.

The question of what preceded the decisive redaction of the Fourth Gospel is currently dominated by a renewal of source-critical effort.

In his magnum opus on the Fourth Gospel Rudolf Bultmann⁵ posited three principal sources: the σημεία-Quelle or Signs-Source; the Offenbarungsreden or Revelatory Discourse Source; and a source underlying the Passion and Resurrection story.

The Signs-Source is a written document utilized by the Fourth Evangelist in the writing of chapters 1-12. Bultmann thinks that the existence of such a source is detected in the enumeration of the signs in 2:11 and 4:54, for the Evangelist himself attributes to Jesus a much larger number of signs (2:23; 4:45). Thus the enumeration of the signs belongs to the source. Moreover, 20:30 ("Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples"), although not a fitting ending to the whole of the Gospel, is an appropriate conclusion to the Signs-Source.⁶

The Offenbarungsreden are found throughout the Gospel, but their use is particularly apparent in the Prologue. The Offenbarungsreden form the basis of the discourses of Jesus in the Gospel. The source

⁵R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964); ET: The Gospel of John (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).

⁶This aspect of Bultmann's source hypothesis is dependent to great extent upon Alexander Faure, "Die alttestamentliche Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese", ZNW 21 (1922), 99-121.

is identified by its poetic structure and its Gnostic mythological motifs.

A third written source used by the Evangelist undergirds the Passion story (18:1-19:41). Elements of the Resurrection narrative (ch. 20) are also found in this source.

These three sources were woven together by the Fourth Evangelist who re-worked the sources to make them the vehicle for his own unique theological exposition. Unfortunately, the text produced by the Evangelist fell into disarray, and the order as we now have it was established by an "ecclesiastical redactor". This ecclesiastical redactor -- whose own concerns were primarily ecclesial -- added chapter 21 and interpolated into the text such passages as 5:27-29; 6:39, 40, 44, 51b-58; 12:48 (on eschatology); 3:5; 6:51b-58; 19:34b (on the sacraments); 6:53-56; 19:34b (on the atonement), and 4:1; 6:23; 11:2; 20:9.

Bultmann's work continues to stimulate further research along these lines⁷ and although it is true to say that his overall position

⁷Especially with regard to the "sign-source" -- see J. M. Robinson, Trajectories, pp. 253 ff. and n. 14 below. For surveys of source criticism in John see especially D. M. Smith, "The sources of the Gospel of John. An Assessment of the State of the Problem", NTS 10 (1963-64), 336-351; -----, The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965). R. Kysar, "The Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel: A Growing Consensus?" NovT 15 (1973), 134-152, would have us believe that there is a growing agreement on isolating the sources of John. J. Jeremias, "Johanneische Literarkritik", is still a valuable essay, although one should remember that Jeremias has changed his mind on 6:51c-58 which he had assigned to the redactor -- see "Joh 6:51c-58 redaktionell?", ZNW 44 (1952-53), 256-257.

has not received general support,⁸ some aspects of his work continue to command respect and attention.

There have been various painstaking studies which have attempted to disprove on linguistic grounds the hypothesis of sources in the Fourth Gospel. Of these studies, those of E. Schweizer⁹ and Ruckstuhl¹⁰ are perhaps the most important. Ruckstuhl sought, first of all, to determine the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of the Gospel, and second, to show that these peculiarities traverse the whole of the Gospel. Inasmuch as such stylistic peculiarities are found in all of the supposed sources, it cannot be shown that sources were drawn upon in the composition of the Fourth Gospel.

Schweizer was more cautious than Ruckstuhl. He sought to show that the unity of style in the Fourth Gospel is such that the distinguishing of sources on the basis of style is impossible. But Schweizer

⁸See especially E. Ruckstuhl, Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangelium, der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Erforschung (Studia Friburgensia, n.s. 3; Freiburg in der Schweiz: Ed. E. Paul, 1951); E. Schweizer, Ego Eimi. Die Religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneische Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939, 2nd ed. 1965). Bultmann demonstrated he was unmoved by his critics' reproaches when he edited the posthumous work of his student H. Becker, Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede (FRLANT 50; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

⁹
See above, n. 8.

¹⁰
See above, n. 8.

did not go so far as to say that sources were not utilized in the composition of the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, in the preface to the second edition of his book Schweizer grants that sources for the prologue and the miracle stories probably do exist.¹¹

Objections were raised to the work of Ruckstuhl by those who maintained that the linguistic characteristics which supposedly traverse the whole of the Gospel may have been inserted by the Evangelist into his sources. "Thus by means of these linguistic observations nothing decisive against this or that source hypothesis has been established".¹² But if we are to conclude that the linguistic peculiarities of the Evangelist are distributed over the whole of the Gospel then it follows that the "identification of connected sources on the basis of linguistic and stylistic arguments is hardly possible".¹³

Thus stylistic studies aimed at the refutation of the hypothesis of sources in the Fourth Gospel have not impeded the continuing quest for sources. The most recent trend is to focus particularly on the Signs-Source which the Fourth Evangelist purportedly used. The most noteworthy contribution here is that of R. T. Fortna.¹⁴ However, this effort, although highly ingenious, cannot be said to have been

¹¹Op. cit., p. vi.

¹²"Kummel, Introduction, p. 152.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴R. T. Fortna, The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1970).

successful.¹⁵

All the indications are that the Evangelist radically transformed his material, so that any source he might have used is now impossible to isolate.¹⁶ This is not to say that, for example, a Signs-Source did not exist. The question is whether the source can be isolated. We can only agree with James Robinson when he says that "the question of the difficulty of reconstructing a source is not identical with the question of whether the source existed".¹⁷ But unlike Robinson we believe that the difficulties in reconstructing any source in the Fourth Gospel are insuperable. At this point it is salutary to recall the comment of Streeter:

¹⁵Cf. the comment by C. K. Barrett in his review of Fortna's "Gospel of Signs", JTS 22 (1971), 573 f.: "That John used source material is almost certainly true; that here and there we can trace his editorial activity is probable; that we can write out one of his sources in extenso is not yet proved -- though if it could be proved at all it would have been proved by Dr. Fortna....If the case fails in the end to convince, the fault does not lie with the advocate". See also B. Lindars, Behind the Fourth Gospel (London: S.P.C.K., 1971), ch. 2.

¹⁶See, for example, the article by C. Goodwin, "How did John treat his sources?", JBL 73 (1954), 61-75, who argues that the one source we know John used -- the Old Testament -- is utilized freely and from memory; it follows that if John did the same with other sources he might have had, they are now irretrievable. F.-M. Braun, Jean le Theologien, II, pp. 20 f., has criticized Goodwin's argument by maintaining that John translated directly from the Hebrew and was not dependent upon the LXX. Fortna, op. cit., pp. 10-12, is totally unimpressed by Goodwin's argument.

¹⁷Trajectories, p. 242.

If the sources have undergone anything like the amount of amplification, excision, rearrangement and adaptation which the theory postulates, then the critic's pretence that he can unravel the process is grotesque. As well hope to start with a string of sausages and reconstruct the pig.¹⁸

But in any case, the question of sources has only a limited impact upon our inquiry. If it could be shown that the decisive redactor inherited the substance of his work, it would perhaps reduce our estimate of his genius. But it would not make the decisive redactor any less decisive precisely as redactor. It would mean only that when referring to "the theology of the Fourth Evangelist" (= decisive redactor) we mean "the theology sponsored by the Evangelist".

In accordance with the strategy outlined at the beginning of this chapter, we have thus far summarily indicated the efforts of source critics to determine the history of the Johannine redaction prior to the decisive redactor. But this aspect of Johannine research has yielded no clear consensus of opinion.

The extent of the editing, and the exact number of editors of the Fourth Gospel is controverted. It is, however, a problem with which we must now deal in order to defend our use of the term "decisive redactor". Our task is not, however, to deal with the whole range of the authorship question.¹⁹

Our attempt to indicate what we believe to have been the history of the composition of the Fourth Gospel will of necessity be conjectural.

¹⁸The Four Gospels (London: McMillan, 1930²), p. 377.

¹⁹We believe, however, that the author is not the Apostle John and that it is wrong to identify him with the Beloved Disciple -- see below, p. 179, n. 135.

The very nature of the problem means that we cannot offer a definitive "proof" of our conclusions. It is, rather, a modest attempt to put forward a working hypothesis for our study of the Gospel.

There are almost as many theories on the origin and composition of the Fourth Gospel as there are commentators on the Gospel. However, most agree that the Gospel was composed in stages.²⁰ R. E. Brown posits five stages.²¹ Stage 1 is the existence of "a body of traditional material pertaining to the works and words of Jesus".²² This material probably stems from John the Apostle.²³ "One principal disciple" is responsible for stages 2-4. Stage 2 is the "development of this material into Johannine patterns". Stage 3 is the first edition of the Gospel. Stage 4 is a revised edition by the same author. Stage 5 is the same edition revised and put out by the final redactor, a person other than the Evangelist.

²⁰W. Wilkens, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums (Zollikon-Zurich: Evang. Verlag, 1958); G. H. C. MacGregor and A. Q. Morton, The Structure of the Fourth Gospel (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1961); O. Merlier, Le Quatrième Évangile. La Question Johannique (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962); Brown and Schnackenburg (see below).

²¹John, pp. xxxiv-xxxix.

²²Ibid., p. xxxiv.

²³Ibid., p. c. Note that Fortna, op. cit., p. 6, n. 1, seems to be at cross purposes with Brown when he says that Brown distinguishes between the author and the writer, whereas he prefers "to use the terms interchangeably as equivalent to evangelist". Brown makes a distinction between the authority behind the tradition (stage 1) and the author who utilizes the material, stamping upon it his own theological outlook (stages 2-4). Thus he is hardly in disagreement with Fortna over who the author is "in the true sense".

It is noticeable here that for Brown the decisive redactor (stages 2-4) is not John the Apostle. Schnackenburg criticizes F.-M. Braun for wishing to limit the role of the actual writer of the Gospel. Braun also thinks that the Apostle is the authority behind the Gospel, but posits a "secretary" who is responsible for the actual writing of it. But as Schnackenburg says:

But since he makes much of the fact that he was a writer with roots in the Jewish diaspora, he is obviously inspired by the idea that the style and language have a character of their own which cannot be associated with the Apostle John. We must surely concede a far greater measure of independence to the Hellenistic disciple of the Apostle who committed the Gospel to writing, because form and content, language and thought, cannot be separated.....Thus the evangelist would have been both the spokesman who transmitted the tradition and the preaching of the Apostle John, and a theologian in his own right and a teacher of the readers whom he addressed.²⁴

Barrett puts forward a theory similar to Brown's. He suggests that the Apostle John migrated to Ephesus, where he attracted a group of disciples. Because of predictions such as Mark 9:1, as he became older it was thought he would survive until the Parousia. Accordingly, his eventual death engendered apocalyptic fervour. One of his disciples wrote the Apocalypse of the New Testament. Another wrote the epistles. And another -- "a bolder thinker, and one more widely read in Judaism and Hellenism, produced John 1-20".²⁵ The work was first used by the

²⁴ John, p. 101. We may note here that Schnackenburg himself has changed his stance from that he adopted in his commentary -- see below, Chapter IV, n. 135.

²⁵ Barrett, John, p. 113.

Gnostics. Only when the Church realized how usefully one might employ the Gospel against the Gnostics was it now edited together with chapter 21:

The evangelist, perhaps the greatest theologian in the history of the Church, was now forgotten. His name was unknown. But he had put in his Gospel references to the beloved disciple -- the highly honoured apostle who years before had died in Ephesus. These were now partly understood, and partly misunderstood. It was perceived that they belong to John the son of Zebedee, but wrongly thought that they meant that this apostle was the author of the gospel. 21.24 was now composed on the model of 19.35, and the book was sent out on its long career as the work of John, foe of heretics and beloved of his Lord.²⁶

This is an attractive theory, but it has certain weaknesses. There is no MSS evidence at all that the Gospel was ever circulated without chapter 21. If at first it remained unpublished, it is difficult to see how the Gnostics got hold of it. If it was first published without chapter 21, it seems strange that there is no evidence of this, especially as it would have had to have been in this form (at least in Barrett's theory) for some time to allow the references to the Beloved Disciple to be misunderstood. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether the Evangelist meant to refer to the Apostle when he spoke of the Beloved Disciple.²⁷

Chapter 21 is of vital significance in discussing the composition

²⁶ Ibid., p. 114.

²⁷ See below, Chapter IV, n. 135.

of the Fourth Gospel, for it is the key to any redaction theory.²⁸ It seems clear that it is an addition to the Gospel by another hand.²⁹

The principal reasons for this are:

- (1) The apparent conclusion of the Gospel at 20:30 f.
- (2) The sequence: It hardly seems likely that having been commissioned by the risen Christ in Jerusalem the disciples would return to Galilee and continue fishing.
- (3) The Greek style of chapter 21 leads one to believe that it is by another hand,³⁰ although the evidence here is ambiguous.³¹

Accordingly the question arises whether this redactor is at work elsewhere in the Gospel. Many scholars reply in the affirmative. But it is noticeable that each exegete has very different ideas on which verses are the work of the final redactor. As we have seen, Bultmann posits an "ecclesiastical redactor" who is responsible for 3:5; 4:1; 5:27-29; 6:23, 39, 40, 44, 51b-58; 11:2; 12:48; 20:9, and chapter 21. The subjectivity of such conclusions is rather disconcerting. We have

²⁸See D. M. Smith, op. cit., p. 234.

²⁹See Bultmann, John, pp. 700-706.

³⁰Ibid.; Barrett, John, pp. 479 f.

³¹M.-E. Boismard, "Le chapitre xxi de saint Jean: essai de critique littéraire", RB 54 (1947), 473-501. Whereas, for example, Barrett (above, n. 30) thinks such evidence suggests an addition by another hand; Wilkens, op. cit., pp. 158 f., thinks the evidence suggests the contrary.

already stated that isolation of additions by a redactor on the basis of style is highly problematic. Therefore content criteria have to be used. It is at this point that we see how the subjectivity of the exegete comes into play. For the conclusion seems inescapable that Bultmann begins with the supposition that the Gospel was unsacramental and then isolates all sacramental references and attributes them to an ecclesiastical redactor. Wilkens, on the other hand, locates sacramental allusions and futuristic eschatology in the first stages of the Gospel.³²

It is one thing to attribute chapter 21 to a final redactor; it is quite another to see him responsible for insertions into the Gospel. The arguments for attributing chapter 21 to a final redactor turn upon placement, content, purpose, and style; taken together they make a reasonable case. But the very way chapter 21 is added suggests, contrary to most exegetes' conclusions, that the redactor did not tamper with the rest of the Gospel.³³ If he had regarded his task as editing the Gospel in the fullest sense of the word he would presumably have removed 20:30 f. and the "aporias" noted by many scholars.³⁴ Moreover, the person who added chapter 21 is no mere inept collator of traditions;

³²Op. cit.

³³It is interesting to note here that Fortna's Gospel of Signs marks a shift from the view that a redactor so radically tampered with the Gospel that a corrupt work confronts us, pieces of which must be excised in order to recover the true Johannine Gospel. For Fortna considers that the aporias or inconsistencies are to be traced back to the decisive redactor. He even takes chapter 21 to belong to the Evangelist (op. cit., pp. 87 ff.).

³⁴The "aporias" have to be attributed to either the final

he is a skilful writer.³⁵ It is difficult to see how this same writer could have altered the main body of the text to create the "aporias". It seems more likely that the final redactor left the "aporias" in the text than that he was responsible for them.

Although the alleged "aporias" in the text may be over-emphasized, it cannot be denied that the Gospel does have rough edges, and we have insisted that these go back to the final redactor. What, then, is the explanation for this?

The problem of chapter 21 presents one of three alternatives:

- (1) Chapter 21 was always part of the Gospel and was written by the same person who wrote chapters 1-20.
- We have said that we regard this as unlikely.

redactor or the decisive redactor. If we maintain that the final redactor tampered with the Gospel we must ask why. Bultmann thinks it is because he wished to make the Gospel acceptable to the Church. But he fails to show consistently that the parts he wishes to delete as belonging to this "ecclesiastical redactor" are in fact at odds with the rest of the Gospel. For example, he detects the work of this redactor in 6:51b-58, because of the sacramental references, but overlooks the fact that there are sacramental undertones in 6:1-50 -- see R. E. Brown, "The Kerygma of the Gospel According to John", Interpretation 21 (1967), p. 394, n. 13.

³⁵ See, for example, Bishop Cassian, "John xxi", NTS 3 (1955-57), 132-136, who is so impressed by the fact that the chapter can only be understood in the context of the whole Gospel that he thinks it was written by the hand of the Evangelist and was always an integral part of the Gospel: "Certainly this connection of ch. xxi with the whole Gospel, especially with ch. xx, does not absolutely exclude the possibility of a careful adjustment of a later addition to the symbols and teaching of the Gospel. But this is highly improbable. It would reveal a master's hand of the spiritual and theological power of the evangelist himself..." (p. 136). While we think this conclusion goes too far, we do think that ch. 21 reveals a redactor of great perspicacity and aptitude.

(2) The Gospel was without chapter 21 for some time and then it was added before the Gospel was circulated.

Again, we have maintained that this is unlikely.

(3) Chapter 21 was added almost immediately to the Gospel by a different hand. This we regard as most probable.

The question then arises: Why, almost as soon as the Gospel was completed in rough draft form, was 21 added by a different hand? Why did the Evangelist (i.e., the decisive redactor) himself not add it if there was a need to?

There is one very simple answer. The Evangelist had died. Many critics agree with this, but seem to think that this implies that he left behind a very incomplete work which required much editing. We think not. There is nothing at all improbable about the suggestion that he had completed a draft of his work which required only "touching up" when he died.³⁶ A fellow disciple undertook the task of circulating the Gospel and, having read it, decided to add a postscript emphasizing 19:35 and commenting upon the position and fate of the Beloved Disciple;³⁷ but did not tamper with the rest of the text.

Thus, we envisage a situation in which the Beloved Disciple had gathered around him a number of disciples (in Chapter Four we shall give reasons for our belief that it is he who is behind the Johannine circle). Some of his disciples wrote. One wrote the

³⁶We are not, of course, excluding the possibility of previous rough drafts.

³⁷This is not to imply that this was the sole reason for writing the chapter -- the chapter displays evidence of other secondary considerations.

Apocalypse. One (or possibly two) wrote the Johannine epistles. Another wrote the Gospel. The latter, however, soon died after the completion of a draft of his work, and another of the group undertook the task of circulating it. It was this person who added chapter 21, possibly using Johannine material that he himself was familiar with. Thus, the Beloved Disciple is the authority behind the work, but one of his disciples is the decisive redactor responsible for chapters 1-20 and another of his disciples for 21. It was the former of these disciples -- whom we call "the Evangelist" -- who utilized and shaped the Johannine tradition, stamping upon the work his own unique theological perspicacity.

So far we have indicated that we believe that chapters 1-20 were written by a single hand, and another added chapter 21. We have called the former the decisive redactor, or the Evangelist, and the latter the final redactor.³⁸ We shall now seek to give a brief account of the redaction of the decisive redaction -- its thematic concerns, structure, and so forth -- after which we shall set forth as clearly as possible the method by which we intend to proceed in our inquiry into the Fourth Gospel. As we wish to conduct a redaction-critical inquiry, this will require that we give a brief exposition of what we consider the scope and limits of redaction-criticism to be.

³⁸ 5:3b-4 and 7:53-8:11 are not the work of the final redactor. They were added after the Gospel was published by a glossator.

(2) The Johannine Redaction

As a preliminary to our proposed sketch of the structure of the redaction of the Fourth Gospel, we shall deal briefly with Johannine themes. This attempt at a short explication of the Fourth Gospel's thematic concerns is a necessary preliminary inasmuch as it is helpful to have some notion of Johannine thematic complexes before we endeavour to discern how their organizational disposition gives us clearer insight into the author's exact intentions and meaning.

All the themes of the Gospel center on Jesus as the incarnate Word. He is God's only Son, the true life, the light that enlightens every man. His "signs" ("Christophanies") reveal him: in witnessing them, the disciples have seen his "glory" and testify to him. His mission is not condemnatory, but inasmuch as he is the light that shines in the darkness he shows up evil for what it is, and this is the judgement (cf., e.g., 3:19). As he is one with the Father and abides in him, so his disciples must be one and abide in him. They do this by love. Begotten of the Father from above (e.g., 8:23), he is the Way, Truth and Life; whatever is opposed to him is from below, especially darkness, lies, and death, the progeny of sin and the devil (cf. 8:44). He is sent into the world because the Father loves the world and wills its salvation (3:16 f.). The heart of his mission is his hour: the supreme moment of his glory and of the judgement of the world. He is the true shepherd, and his own recognize his voice; he is the true vine and his disciples abide in him like branches. He fulfills the types of Exodus (he is the light of the world and the true

bread from heaven) and this fulfilment is prolonged in the sacraments of the Church. He is the new Paschal lamb and the new Temple. He sends the Paraclete as a "guide into the whole range of truth". He empowers his own to forgive sins.

The transcendent nature of the Johannine Christ is asserted at the very beginning of the Gospel in the Prologue -- he is the pre-existent logos, the agent of creation. What is remarkable about the section following the Prologue (1:19-51) is the thematization of "testimony" and the number of appellations applied to Jesus. Testimony to Jesus is given by John the Baptist, Andrew, Philip and Nathanael. In the section Jesus is given the following titles: Lamb of God, Son of God, Rabbi, Messiah, King of Israel, Son of Man. It is perhaps worth noting that all these are Jewish titles. In other words, from the very beginning the Evangelist is asserting that Jesus is the fulfilment of Jewish religious hopes. He goes further in the incident of Jesus and the Jewish Samaritans (ch. 4) when he presents the Samaritans as confessing Jesus as "Saviour of the World". At the end of the Gospel Thomas confesses Jesus as his Lord and his God. But although the Johannine Christ is thus presented as transcending the boundaries of exclusively Jewish hopes, there can be no mistake that the Fourth Evangelist begins with the assertion that Jesus is the fulfilment of Jewish hopes.

That Jesus is the fulfilment of Jewish messianic hopes is also thematized throughout the Gospel by constant references to him as fulfilment of the scriptures. This is done both allusively and directly. There are many allusive references to the Old Testament in

the Fourth Gospel, for it is one woof woven into the fabric of the whole Gospel.³⁹ Besides 1:1-19 this is especially evident in 2:1-11 (Jesus as the agent of the new dispensation), ch. 6 (Jesus is the Bread of Life), 10:1-27 (Jesus the Good Shepherd), and 15:1-17 (Jesus the True Vine). The redactor specifically refers to the fulfilment of Scriptures in 12:37-41, 18:9, 18:32, 19:24, 19:28, and 19:36.

Thus by the use of testimonies to Jesus and by the use of Old Testament allusions and specific Scriptural citations, the Fourth Evangelist presents Jesus as the climactic revelation of God's plan. In this sense the Johannine Christ is at one with the Christ of the Synoptics. But the Fourth Evangelist's presentation of Christ goes further. Throughout the Fourth Gospel runs the recurrent theme of the Son's relationship to the Father. This relationship is explicated in such a way as to leave no doubt that it is this very relationship which is the reason for the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish authorities (cf. chapters 7 and 8). Jesus is presented unambiguously as the revealer of the Father (cf. 1:18; 6:37-40; 8:28 f.; 10:30; 14:9-11; 14:31; 15:15).⁴⁰ Bultmann finds the symbolic picture of Jesus as the man who has descended and ascended a puzzle in the Fourth Gospel, inasmuch as Jesus never reveals what he has "seen and heard", but only reveals that he is the revealer.⁴¹ But the Johannine Christ is the revelation of the Father (Jn. 14:9). Thus he is the way,

³⁹ See C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel", JTS 48 (1947), 155-169.

⁴⁰ See also E. M. Sidebottom, "The Ascent and Descent of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John", AngTheolR 2 (1957), 115-122.

⁴¹ R. Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums", ZNW 24 (1925), 102.

for he is truth and life (14:6). As he alone is "truth" (and, therefore, "life") he is the only way. This concern for truth (in which, as we shall see, the concern for orthodoxy is rooted) belongs to the substance of Johannine soteriology.

Now, our intent is to understand the redaction of the Fourth Gospel in its own terms. We are seeking to enter the Fourth Gospel's world of meaning. We have focused briefly on the Gospel's presentation of Jesus as unique revealer. However, discerning the organizational disposition of these thematic concerns in the redaction also gives us clearer insight into the author's exact intentions and meaning. For the organization of the whole further indicates the principle of intelligibility operative in the redactor's writing. This is why we now undertake a brief examination of the structure of the whole and seek to isolate those parts which constitute the whole. This strategy of inquiry is undertaken not only with a view to understanding the whole in terms of the parts and the parts in terms of the whole,⁴² but also in an attempt to grasp the peculiarity and particularity of the whole by discerning the function of the meaning of the parts. In other words, our effort is to enter the Johannine world of meaning by an examination of the Johannine constellation of themes, and to relate them to the thrust of the whole. Moreover, "the whole" in writing and music is sequential; it is not grasped all at once as in such art forms as sculpture and painting. It follows that the strategy of understanding

⁴²The so-called "hermeneutical circle" of interpretation.

the whole in terms of the parts and the parts in terms of the whole calls for the understanding of the author's strategy of sequence. Our effort, then, of drawing up a plan of the redaction will be followed by a few remarks on the strategy of sequence in the work.

Among those scholars who have not concerned themselves with displacement theories, most have tended to agree that the structure of the Fourth Gospel is "simple in outline, complicated in detail".⁴³ The main divisions are as follows:

Prologue	1:1-18
Narratives, Conversations and	
Discourses	1:19-12:50
The Discourse of Jesus to "his	
own"	13:1-17:26
The Passion and Resurrection	18:1-20:31
Postscript	21:1-25

Our question is: What is the function of the meaning of each part of the redaction? Accordingly, we will briefly examine the major parts as outlined above.

(a) Prologue (1:1-18)

Our specific questions are: What is the thrust of the Prologue and how does it relate to the rest of the Gospel? There can be no doubt that in its present form the Prologue is indissolubly linked to the rest of the Gospel. J. A. T. Robinson has maintained that the

⁴³Barrett, John, p. 11.

Prologue (minus vss. 6-8, which originally began the Gospel) has been tacked on to the completed Gospel.⁴⁴ His thesis falls on stylistic grounds.⁴⁵ Schnackenburg correctly maintains that "we are, therefore, dealing with a deliberate piece of redaction which, as is also suggested by the presence of criteria of Johannine style, can be attributed only to the Evangelist himself".⁴⁶

What, then, is the meaning of the Prologue in relation to the rest of the Gospel? It has been variously described as an overture,⁴⁷

⁴⁴J. A. T. Robinson, "The Relation of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John", NTS 9 (1962/63), 120-129.

⁴⁵Schnackenburg, John, p. 223: "These verses 6-8 cannot have been mechanically transplanted from, say, before 1:19 and put into the middle of the Prologue, since both the "giving testimony to the light" (v. 7b) and the second *ἵνα*-clause with the intransitive *πιστεύειν* (v. 7c) presuppose the preceding verses of the Prologue".

⁴⁶Ibid. Schnackenburg does, however, isolate what he considers to have been the "Logos-hymn" used by the Evangelist (see his "Logos-Hymnus und johanneischer Prolog", BZ [1957], 69-109). It consists of vss. 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 16. There have been many other reconstructions of this supposed "Logos-hymn". But Jack T. Sanders, whose own reconstruction of the hymn omits vss. 6-8 and goes through only to v. 11, admits that "It is not entirely clear that this passage should be referred to as a hymn. There are no particles in the passage, the article is generally present, and, with the exception of v. 3, there is no parallelismus membrorum..." (The New Testament Christological Hymns [Cambridge: C.U.P., 1971], p. 21). Barrett, John, p. 125 f., after dividing the Prologue into four parts, goes further: "It does not seem possible to split them up into poetic structure, either in Greek or in a conjectured original Aramaic". He maintains that the whole passage shows marked internal unity (see further his The Prologue of St. John's Gospel [London: University of London Athlone Press, 1971]).

⁴⁷Bultmann, John, p. 13.

a dramatic introduction,⁴⁸ and a summary.⁴⁹ How are we to see it?

There are four units within the Prologue: vss. 1-5, 6-8, 9-13, 14-18. The first describes the pre-existent status of the Logos; the second the testimony of John the Baptist; the third returns to the role of the Logos as creator and as existing in creation as the Light and Life of men -- he enters the world and is rejected; the fourth deals with the economy of salvation -- grace was manifested to those who believed.

It is evident that the Prologue is an announcement of theological themes. To this extent we agree with Bultmann when he says that the Prologue leads the reader "out of the commonplace into a new and strange world of sounds and figures, and singling out particular motifs from the action that is now to be unfolded".⁵⁰ The Prologue thus functions as a hermeneutical key to the sense of the narratives, conversations, and discourses to follow.

⁴⁸ Clayton R. Bowen, "The Fourth Gospel as Drama", JBL 49 (1930), 292-305. He conceives the Prologue to be "the overture to a drama". The whole Gospel is drama: "What we have is an imperfectly edited collection of material, only partially worked into the form it was meant to exhibit. What that form was meant to be is, I submit, obvious. It was to be a dramatic sequence, in many particulars not unlike what we today call a pageant" (p. 305).

⁴⁹ E. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. F. N. Davey (London: Faber & Faber, 1940), p. 137.

⁵⁰ Bultmann, John, p. 13.

(b) Narratives, Conversations, Discourses (1:19-12:50)

This section contains a great deal of apparently disparate material, but the function of the whole section is quite clear. As we have noted briefly, 1:19-50 is remarkable for the number of appellations applied to Jesus. It leaves the reader in no doubt that Jesus is the fulfilment of Jewish salvific hopes. 2:1-4:54 then elaborates on this theme. Jesus is not only the fulfilment of Jewish salvific hopes, his work has a universal significance (4:42). The meaning of the cleansing of the Temple (2:13-22) for the Evangelist is quite clear from the redactional comment in 2:21-22: the crucified and risen Christ would take the place of the Temple. This same theme had been anticipated in the incident at Cana (2:1-11). The dialogue with Nicodemus (3:1-15) stresses the point that only by rebirth can one enter eternal life and not by virtue of one's Jewish heritage. Chapter 4 then makes the universal significance of Jesus' work clear: he is "Saviour of the World" (4:42).

The healing story beginning chapter 5 provides the introduction for the important and recurrent explication of the relation of Jesus to the Father. As this healing takes place on the Sabbath (to the chagrin of Jewish authorities), the ensuing dispute provides the occasion for a discourse by Jesus explaining his unity with the Father. This is the real stumbling block to Jewish authorities, who fail to realize that their own religious heritage points to Jesus (5:45 f.).

Chapter 6 (an obvious midrash on the Exodus theme) then elaborates further the true nature of Jesus the Christ. He is the Bread of Life.

Chapters 7 and 8 -- masterfully exegeted by Dodd⁵¹ -- continue in a series of discourses the dispute of Jesus with the Jewish authorities. Throughout runs the continued explication of Jesus' relationship to the Father, and the opposition that these claims evoke from the Jewish authorities. Chapter 9 delineates the conflict by the use of dramatic irony: the Jews are blind to the Light within their midst.

In 10:1-18 (to be set against the background of Jewish salvific hopes) Jesus refers to himself as the Good Shepherd. A discourse follows, once again explicating the relationship of Jesus to the Father. 11:1-53 then climaxes the first half of the Gospel. Through the raising of Lazarus Jesus is quite clearly presented as the way to the victory of life over death.

Thus, although 1:19-12:50 does contain much apparent disparate material, it all coheres together in its function of explicating the true nature of the Johannine Christ. In particular, Jesus' relationship to the Father is treated over and over again in various ways.

It is evident that the Evangelist does not conceive of the Jewish scriptures as the norm against which Jesus must be measured; rather, the Evangelist presents the scriptures as being incomplete without the climactic revelation of Jesus the Christ. In other words, the thrust of the first part of the redaction is not to present Jesus as part of God's plan -- he is God's plan. Man's salvific hopes are consummated in him.

⁵¹The Fourth Gospel, pp. 345-354.

(c) The Discourse of Jesus to "his own" (13:1-17:26)

This section opens with the symbolic action of Jesus washing the disciples' feet, after which there follows an almost uninterrupted discourse given by Jesus to the disciples ("his own").

The subject-matter of the new section of the Gospel becomes clear from its opening scene: it deals with the relation of Jesus to his disciples, with his *ἀγάπη* to his *ἰδιοί*. His mission, seen as a whole, is itself the divine *ἀγάπη* (3:16) as it becomes operative in the world. The first part (chs. 3-12) has shown this *ἀγάπη* in its struggle to win over the world to itself; it had shown how *ἀγάπη* necessarily implies *ἐκτίσθαι* for the *κόσμος*, and how the latter allows the *ἐκτίσθαι* to become its own condemnation. The second part shows the *ἀγάπη* revealing itself to the community of "his own", firstly by direct means, in the farewell scenes of the night before the passion, and then indirectly in the passion itself, and in the Easter event.⁵²

Chapters 13-17 are a hermeneutical key to the following narratives of the suffering, death, and resurrection appearances. There is no particular focusing on "the Twelve", and the disciples present at the Last Supper represent the *idioi* generally. The whole of the Last Discourse embraces the life of the community and its relation to Jesus and the Paraclete. The guiding principle of the community is Jesus. The community is united to him by its knowledge and faith, and by its love. We shall return to a more detailed examination of this part of the Gospel in Chapter IV.

(d) The Passion and Resurrection (18:1-20:31)

The Passion in the Fourth Gospel is a narrative highly charged

⁵²Bultmann, *John*, p. 457.

with theological significance. Furthermore, the sparse comments of the redactor inescapably etch the meaning of Jesus' crucifixion: this is "the hour" of Jesus (13:1), the consummation of his salvific action, foretold by the scriptures (19:24; 19:28; 19:36-37).

The meaning of the resurrection appearances is specified in 19:17, where the Evangelist is making the theological assertion that "the elevation of Jesus which affected man's salvation involves the chain of crucifixion, resurrection and ascension".⁵³ Moreover, the meaning of Christ's first appearance to the disciples (20:19-23) is found in the crux of the episode in vss. 21-23, where they are divinely commissioned and receive the Holy Spirit to accomplish their mission. They are the chosen agents of the messianic economy of forgiveness.⁵⁴ The central intent of the second appearance in which Thomas is present is given in 19:27-29. The climactic response of Thomas, "My Lord and my God" is followed by a blessing of Jesus on those who believe and yet have not seen. 20:30 f. forms the conclusion to the Gospel.

From this brief analysis it is evident that there is indeed a strategy of sequence in the redaction of the Gospel. Moreover, the meaning of each part is grounded in the transcendent nature of the Johannine Christ. The unfolding of the meaning of the Gospel is governed

⁵³Brown, The Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1965), p. 95.

⁵⁴Barrett, John, pp. 474 f.

by the author's prime concern: to present Jesus as the revealer of the Father. In this respect, there are at least two "hermeneutical keys" which feature prominently in the sequential strategy of the writing: the Prologue and the Last Discourse. As we observed, the Prologue singles out the motifs of the Gospel. The second part of the Gospel features the revelation of Jesus to "his own". In the first part of the Gospel Jesus is presented as the revealer to the world. He is "Saviour of the world"; the judge of the world. In this sense, he is the norm of all religion. The second part of the Gospel embraces the life of the specifically Christian community and its relation to Jesus and the Paraclete. That is, here the concern is with the revelation of Jesus as the norm for Christians. We shall return to this observation in our next chapter.

Another point arises from our study of the Johannine redaction: the author's theology is expressed in a narrative of the past. This signifies a transposition with two facets: theology is transposed into story and present into past. Now it is true that this kind of transposition is also found in the Synoptics, for all Gospel narrative is confessional witness in narrative form, the narrative itself reflecting precisely in the narrative mode a to-be-communicated which transcends the historical. But in the Johannine redaction this transposition and retrojection is bolder, more central to the redactor's intention and more thoroughgoing than in the Synoptics. The distinctiveness of the Johannine transposition lies in the Evangelist's depiction of Jesus. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel is transposed from the realm of historicity (in the sense of "the literal actuality of the past" as

well as in the sense of "the reality of ordinary human existence") to metahistoricity. The Fourth Gospel is not concerned with history in the sense of the recovery of "past particulars", and in this sense it is the furthest removed of all the Gospels from the actualities of history. Yet the Evangelist's own Christian experience penetrates the records of the events that brought it into being, and reveals their deepest significance. In the performance of this transposition, the Fourth Evangelist reveals his deepest concern. He wishes to present Jesus as the way, for Jesus is truth and life. Jesus alone is truth (14:6). This concern is the key to the Johannine transposition, and in our next chapter we shall return to this theme.

We have one more task in this chapter. As we intend to do a redaction-critical study, we shall define as clearly as possible what redaction criticism is, its scope and its limits. We shall do this by first giving a brief description of the history of redaction criticism, and explicate from this history the two ways of conceiving the redaction-critical project. We shall then explain what our own approach is to be.

In 1935 R. H. Lightfoot wrote:

It seems as though the form of the earthly no less than the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. For all the inestimable value of the Gospels, they yield to us little more than a whisper of his voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of his ways.⁵⁵

These few lines provoked enormous controversy. Lightfoot himself reeled from the outcry to the extent that he in essence retracted

⁵⁵ R. H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation in the Gospels (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 225.

his statement.⁵⁶ But in fact our knowledge of the historical Jesus is very small. Lightfoot was prompted to make this comment because of his insight that the Gospels are theological documents. Much of the Gospel material must be ascribed to the theological motivation of the Evangelist.

As N. Perrin has pointed out, Lightfoot was a precursor of the redaction critic.⁵⁷ Redaction criticism is a recent development⁵⁸ in New Testament studies; it has steadily gained momentum since its inception in the mid-fifties. The English "redaction criticism" is a rendering of the German Redaktionsgeschichte. This phrase was coined by Willi Marxsen in his Der Evangelist Markus,⁵⁹ one of the pioneering works of redaction criticism.

⁵⁶The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), p. 101, where he says in a note that it had not been understood that the words echoed Job 26:24, the last words of which show "that the point of the passage lies in the contrast between the comparatively small knowledge which in Job's view is all that is available to man, and the boundless immensity which is quite beyond his grasp".

⁵⁷N. Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 21-24.

⁵⁸However, we should also note that the militant critic of Christianity, Bruno Bauer, averred over a hundred years ago that the evangelists were creators, authors in the fullest sense. He considered the real genius of early Christianity to be the author of Mark -- see D. McLellan, The Young Hegelians and Karl Marx (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 56.

⁵⁹"
Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.²

What then is redaction criticism? As it is a fairly recent discipline, conceptions of its scope and limitations vary. But the main task of the redaction critic is clear: By focusing upon the Gospel framework and its articulation of traditions it is hoped to uncover the theological position of the Evangelist. This approach differs somewhat from that of the form critics, who tended to look upon the Gospel writers as mere collectors (Sammler). Thus, for example, Dibelius maintained that "the composers are only to the smallest extent authors. They are principally collectors, vehicles of tradition, editors".⁶⁰ Bultmann seems to sponsor this view when he speaks of Mark not being "sufficiently master of his material to venture a systematic construction himself".⁶¹ However, it should not be thought that redaction criticism and form criticism are in opposition to each other, for the former builds on the insights of the latter.⁶²

The first voices to articulate protests against the notion of the Evangelists as mere "collectors" were Hans Conzelmann⁶³ and Willi Marxsen.⁶⁴ Bornkamm then added his weight to their position by doing

⁶⁰Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, 1913, 1933, ET: From Tradition to Gospel (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934), p. 3.

⁶¹Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 1931,² ET: The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), p. 338.

⁶²See R. H. Stein, "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?", JBL 88 (1969), 45-56; N. Perrin, op. cit., pp. 13-24.

⁶³Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (Tübingen: Mohr, 1962), ET: The Theology of St. Luke (New York: Harper & Row, 1960).

⁶⁴Op. cit.

what was essentially a redaction-critical study of Matthew.⁶⁵

As Marxsen was the first to coin the phrase Redaktionsgeschichte, discussions of its characteristics have tended to centre around his definition. Marxsen said that we should be prepared to consider three Sitze im Leben for the Synoptic tradition:

- (1) The Sitz im Leben of Jesus.
- (2) The Sitz im Leben of the early Church.
- (3) The Sitz im Leben of the Evangelist -- the ascertaining of his unique position.⁶⁶

In fact, what we have are two Sitze im Leben: the earthly Jesus and the early Church. "The second Sitz im Leben, however, is seen as two-fold. It consists of (1) the transmission of the oral tradition by the early Church and (2) the editorial redaction of the evangelist..."⁶⁷

It is important to note that there is some disagreement about the degree of continuity between form criticism and redaction criticism.

Stein comments:

The oral stage tended toward the breaking up and scattering of material, not towards its synthesisThe evangelists opposed this tendency toward scattering which existed in the oral period. There is not therefore a continuity of syntheticism

⁶⁵"Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium", in The Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology (Studies in honour of C. H. Dodd; Cambridge: C.U.P., 1956), eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, pp. 222-269; ET: "End-Expectation and the Church in Matthew", in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, ed. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held (London: S.C.M., 1963), pp. 15-51.

⁶⁶Marxsen, op. cit., pp. 12 f.

⁶⁷Stein, art. cit., p. 49.

but a decisive movement by the evangelists against this destructive dispersion of the oral period....The implications of what Marxsen is saying are of great consequence. He is in effect denying that the redaction of Mark by Luke and Matthew provides a pattern by which we can judge how the oral transmission of the gospel traditions were formed and shaped.⁶⁸

It is at the point where one isolates the Evangelist's redaction from the tradition that Marxsen saw the closest affiliation with form criticism.⁶⁹

The implications of redaction criticism are gauged very well by Perrin:

....We are moving beyond redaction criticism itself to a still newer stage, a stage where we work from a theological insight we have been able to determine to the historical situation in which the insight arose.....If redaction criticism helps us to determine more and more the theological developments within earliest Christianity, then it will be natural for us to go on and ask ourselves what historical circumstances lie behind these theological developments.⁷⁰

Now there are difficulties in doing a redaction-critical study of the Fourth Gospel, for it presents us with special problems in the effort of distinguishing the superimposed redaction from traditional elements;⁷¹ for we have been insistent that chapters 1-20 are a unity, written by an author who, if he did use sources, used them so freely

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 41.

⁶⁹"An diesem Punkt zeigt sich die grosse Nähe der Redaktionsgeschichte zur Formgeschichte", op. cit., p. 12; cited by Stein, art. cit., p. 52, n. 47.

⁷⁰Op. cit., p. 39.

⁷¹See Chapter IV, n. 67.

that they are impossible to isolate. However, this does not preclude redaction-critical inquiry into the Fourth Gospel. In the first place, we do not maintain that in places it is not possible to see certain verses as comments of the decisive redactor. Secondly, we must not forget that the author sponsors the whole of his work including the traditional elements he employs. Indeed, we see a danger of over-emphasizing the "überlieferungsgeschichtlich" approach. For example, James Robinson says:

New Testament theology cannot be carried on apart from a reconstruction of the history of the transmission of traditions, since apart from such a reconstruction the hermeneutical activity carried on within the Gospel itself cannot be identified. This in turn means that progress in understanding Johannine theology depends on progress in defining Johannine sources, such as the resolution of the problem of the miracle source...⁷²

The danger of such an over-statement is that the study of the Gospel sources -- and we doubt whether this can be successfully done in the Fourth Gospel in any case -- inevitably creates a tendency to make the distinctive central, irrespective of the status of the common material in the total design of what the writer finally produces.

In the final analysis we maintain that the study of the history of forms and tradition in the Fourth Gospel has yielded highly unsatisfactory and debatable results.⁷³ Literary criticism of the Fourth Gospel has shown, we believe, that one cannot isolate various independent

⁷²Trajectories, pp. 259 f.

⁷³Cf. the disparate results of the following: P. Parker, "Two Editions of John", JBL 75 (1956), 303-314; S. Temple, "A Key to the Composition of the Fourth Gospel", JBL 80 (1961), 220-232; W. Wilkens, op. cit.; O. Merlier, op. cit.

literary strata, and certainly cannot write out in extens o whatever written sources he might have used. Such conclusions are, however, very valuable "if they serve to underline the evangelist's predominant role in the making and shaping of the Fourth Gospel, and as the distinctive theologian who gave its doctrine its unified character".⁷⁴

Perhaps we can silhouette our own particular redaction-critical approach more sharply by noting two distinct tendencies within redaction criticism. One is to study the redaction primarily by reference to its sources. The other is to study the redaction primarily by reference to its total design. The differences of these approaches are motivated by different aims. The former tends to focus on the redactor's uniqueness vis-a-vis his predecessors, the latter tends to focus on the redactor's whole theology, underscoring not only what sets him apart from others but what unites him to them.⁷⁵ We are identifying more with the latter approach.

Thus, although major contemporary works on the Fourth Gospel have often undertaken the task of consistently distinguishing between materials inherited by the redactor and, on the other hand, the redactor's own additions, alterations and omissions, we are not so methodically ambitious. Our inquiry will be conducted within the

⁷⁴Schnackenburg, John, p. 73.

⁷⁵E. Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966), p. 24, has suggested the term "Composition Criticism" for this latter approach. J. D. Kingsbury uses a similar method in The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13. A Study in Redaction Criticism (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969).

limits of the redaction as such. This clearly limits the scope of our conclusions. For example, it does not allow us to estimate the originality of the decisive redactor of the Fourth Gospel vis-à-vis pre-Johannine tradition. But this cannot of itself invalidate the positive results of our inquiry. And, we believe, it does prevent us from entering into the entirely speculative realm of many Johannine studies.

CHAPTER FOUR

NORMATIVE CHRISTIANITY AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The present chapter, which represents the central statement of our study, might be seen as a single development in two phases: normative religion and normative Christianity. In the first phase (normative religion) we consider the Fourth Gospel as pervaded by the claim that Jesus is the one and only way to salvation. The Evangelist's presupposition is that salvation consists in communion with "the Father", that such communion is mediated by the gift of "eternal life", and that this gift is nothing other than "truth", (i.e., the revelation of the Father). The central affirmation is that Jesus -- to the complete exclusion of all others -- is the way to salvation. He alone has seen the father; so he alone can reveal him. It follows that he alone can give eternal life. It is clear that the Fourth Gospel prominently features themes of revelation and response, the unique saving revelation brought to the world by Jesus Christ and the call for unreserved adherence not simply to it but to him, for he is not simply the revealer but the revelation itself. Therefore normative religion can be nothing other than the response to Jesus. Indeed, he himself is the very norm of religion.

The second phase of this development is "normative Christianity". Here the Johannine concern is not thematic but performative. That is,

the decisive redactor has not presented "orthodoxy" as a theme; rather he has orchestrated themes such as "truth" and "witness" so as to secure orthodoxy as a fact. On examination it turns out that themes such as the sending of the Paraclete and the witness of the disciple whom Jesus loved have been pressed into the service of the concern for orthodoxy and that this is equally the key to what we have called "the Johannine transposition".

(1) Truth in the Fourth Gospel

It would not serve our purposes well to plunge immediately into the question of orthodoxy. First, orthodoxy supposes revelation as coherence with a norm supposes that norm. Secondly, in the development of "light", "truth", "life", and other themes, the redactor of the Fourth Gospel has laid elaborate foundations for complementary themes such as the trustworthiness of the Johannine tradition itself. Thirdly, primary themes such as Jesus' absolutely unique status as revealer are not only presuppositions but paradigms for the orthodoxy issue.

The theology of the Fourth Gospel is pre-eminently a theology of revelation. This note is struck in the Prologue and continues throughout the Gospel. The Word is the light that shines in the darkness. John the Baptist is "sent by God" but he is not the revealer. He is a witness to the revealer; his sole role is to testify to the light.

The dramatic element of the Fourth Gospel is epitomized in "divine initiative" versus "human response": The initiative of revelation (ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν... ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον) and the

response of unbelief (ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω ... οἱ ἴδοι αὐτοῦ οὐ παρέλαβον). Yet the divine initiative did win a positive response. There were those who welcomed the light, who not only "saw his glory" but who "knew" him, "accepted" him, "believed in his name" and thereby became "children of God". The Prologue concludes with a charged epitome of the Gospel's theology of revelation (1:14e-18). We will return to this passage of the Prologue, but only after endeavouring to determine as exactly as possible the sense of "truth" (ἀλήθεια) in the Johannine redaction.

The theme "truth" is so interwoven with the theme "word" (ὁ λόγος) in Jn. 8:31-55 that the two appear to be reciprocally defining. The relationship between them finds a first expression in vss. 31 f.:
 Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ , ... γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν .
 Those who seek to kill Jesus do so because ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν (v. 37). Or again, νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτείνειν, ἄνθρωπον ὅς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα (v. 40). The accusers of Jesus are not truly Abraham's descendants; if they were they would love Jesus. The Son claims no independent rights; he has been sent from God (v. 42). They do not understand Jesus' word because their father is the devil, and the devil is the father of lies: ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ ... ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ (v. 44). Therefore they cannot comprehend the truth: ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετε μοι (v. 45). They would believe Jesus if they were of God (v. 47). The word of Jesus, which is truth (v. 45), is also eternal life (v. 51). The texts of Jn. 8:31 ff., in which the theme

"truth" is interwoven with the theme "word", therefore supply a specific justification of the general agreement among scholars that the theology of the Fourth Gospel is a theology of revelation.

There is, however, some disagreement over the background against which *ἀλήθεια* is to be understood. Bultmann¹ and Dodd² argue that the Johannine usage of *ἀλήθεια* reflects a Hellenistic rather than a Hebraic background. This is disputed by I. de la Potterie³ who thinks that it reflects rather a late Biblical and post-Biblical background of sapiential and apocalyptic literature.

The resolution of the question whether the Johannine usage of *ἀλήθεια* reflects the Hebrew or Greek background will greatly facilitate our understanding of the intended sense of the word in Johannine redaction. We shall accordingly examine the question in some detail.

The etymology of the word *ἀλήθεια* suggests the root meaning of "non-concealment"; that is, "the full or real state of affairs".⁴

¹"Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium: *ἀλήθεια*", ZNW 27 (1928), 113-163; *ἀλήθεια* in TWNT; John, passim; Theology, II, pp. 18-21.

²The Johannine Epistles (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946), pp. 145 f.; Interpretation, pp. 170-178.

³"La verità in San Giovanni", RivBib 11 (1963), 3-24; "'Je suis la Voie, la Vérité et la Vie' (Jn 14, 6)", Nouvelle Revue Théologique 88 (1966), 907-942. See also, "ἀλήθεια et *qab-qab* les deux modes de la connaissance dans quatrième Evangile", Bib 40 (1959), 709-725; "L'arrière-fond du thème johannique de vérité", Studia Evangelica I (1959), 277-294.

⁴Bultmann, *ἀλήθεια*, p. 238.

Thus for historians *ἀλήθεια* would be real events as opposed to myths, while for philosophers it would indicate real being in the absolute sense.⁵

The two adjectives derived from *ἀλήθεια* are *ἀληθινός* and *ἀληθής*. *Ἀληθής* means "corresponding to facts", "true" or "veridical", i.e., a thing really is as seen or represented. *Ἀληθινός* applied to objects of experience means "real" as opposed to "pictured" objects (*τὰ ἀληθινά* as opposed to *τὰ γεγραμμένα*).

As the adjectives indicate, *ἀλήθεια* is susceptible to two nuanced interpretations. When the truth of a statement means "that which corresponds to the real facts", *ἀλήθεια* can refer to the abstract quality of truthfulness or the content of a statement. *Ἀλήθεια* can also mean "reality" as opposed to "appearance".

In Hellenism *ἀλήθεια* thus comes to refer to eternal or divine realities. "It still retains its sense of genuineness, since the divine being is that in which man comes to share in order to be saved (*→ σωτηρία*) and thus attain to his own genuine or proper being".⁶ But the presupposition that *ἀλήθεια* is accessible to thought has been abandoned; it is accessible only when human limitations are transcended (as in ecstasy or revelation). In this sense *ἀλήθεια* has become an eschatological concept.⁷

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 240.

⁷See J. Blank, "Der johanneische Wahrheits-Begriff", BZ 7 (1963), 164-173.

The LXX translates *אמת* as *ἀληθεια* primarily has the connotation of "trustworthiness" or "steadfastness" and is used as an attribute of God in this sense. The Hebrew concept of truth is different from that of the Greek; for the Hebrew truth is moral rather than intellectual.⁸

Bultmann gives a comprehensive account of the several different nuances *ἀληθεια* has in early Christian usage: that which has certainty and force; that upon which one can rely; the real state of affairs.⁹ We are, however, concerned specifically with the meaning of *ἀληθεια* in the Fourth Gospel. On this topic Bultmann says:

ἀληθεια and *ζωή* [in John] are understood as genuine possibilities of human existence.... Yet in revelation there is disclosed to man the true possibility of his own being when, in the face of the word of revelation which encounters him, he decided to surrender himself.... The antithesis of divine and anti-divine reality emerges at 8:44 in a formulation which derives from Gnostic mythology: *ὁ ἐχθρὸς ὁ ἀνθρώπου* (the devil) *τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἔσται, οὐδὲν ἀλήθειαν ἐν αὐτῷ.* But indirectly this asserts that the *ἀληθεια* gives life, and that what is not determined by it leads to death.¹⁰

⁸ J. Giblet, "Aspects of Truth in the New Testament", in Truth and Certainty, eds. E. Schillebeeckx and Bas van Iersel (New York: Herder & Herder, 1973), pp. 36 f.

⁹ *ἀληθεια*, pp. 241-245.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 245.

Dodd agrees with Bultmann that the background against which the Johannine concept of *ἀλήθεια* is to be understood is Greek rather than Hebraic. In his Johannine Epistles he defined *ἀλήθεια* as "the ultimate reality as revealed in Christ".¹¹ He has a more extensive discussion in his The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.¹² *ἀλήθεια* is "the eternal reality as revealed to men -- either the reality itself or the revelation of it".¹³ Dodd admits to only one passage in the Fourth Gospel where a reader would see *ἀλήθεια* used in a way strange to the natural idiom of the language: 3:21. He admits that in 16:13 the Hebrew expression may "find an echo" but argues that the context rules out the Hebrew connotation:

This is clearly not the sense of *ἀλήθεια* in John xvi. 13. The context speaks of things to be spoken, announced and heard. The Paraclete hears the word of Christ, receives them, and announces them to the disciples. The content of these words is precisely summed up in the word *ἀλήθεια*, which is therefore not *πίστις*, 'faithfulness', but 'truth'.¹⁴

In 1:14 the phrase *ἀληθὴς λόγος καὶ ἀληθεία* derives from a Hebrew source, but again, argues Dodd, "while the mould of the expression is determined by Hebrew usage, the actual sense of the words must be determined by Greek usage".¹⁵

¹¹Op. cit., p. 145.

¹²See n. 2, above.

¹³Op. cit., p. 177.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 174.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 176.

A mediating position on the Johannine background of ἀλήθεια is taken by Schlier¹⁶ and Büchsel,¹⁷ who affirm that the Johannine concept combines Biblical and Greek philosophical ideas. De la Potterie, however, has argued that the choice should not be restricted to Greek or Biblical background. Neither does he think that the background is Greek and Biblical. In the apocalyptic and sapiential literature of post-Biblical Judaism one finds a new usage and sense unrestricted by specifically Greek thought-forms.¹⁸

This new sense is moral, as in the Bible, but nuanced to include more than fidelity and, in fact, to signify "uprightness". Moreover, ἀλήθεια in these writings often intends revealed truth (as in the doctrine of Wisdom), and so is often synonymous with μυστήριον : the divine plan revealed to men. For example, in the ΠΑΧ 210 (Dan. 10:21) is written the plan of God for the time of salvation (cf. Wis. 3:9; IQH 7, 26 f.; IQH 6,6).

De la Potterie notes that the following expressions are missing

¹⁶"Meditationen über den johanneischen Begriff der Wahrheit", Festschrift für Martin Heidegger zum 70. Geburtstag (Pfullingen: Neske, 1955), pp. 195-203.

¹⁷Der Begriff der Wahrheit in dem Evangelium und in den Briefen des Johannes (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1911).

¹⁸"La verita in San Giovanni", pp. 5 f.

from Greek and Hellenistic literature, but are paralleled in the Bible, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the writings of Qumran, etc.:

ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (Jn. 3:21); ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (Jn. 4:23 f.); ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (Jn. 17:19). Still more probative of de la

Potterie's hypothesis on the background of ἀλήθεια is the close tie with word (see above, pp. 129 f.). In fact in Johannine usage

ἀλῶν signifies revelation (e.g., Jn. 17:17 ὁ λόγος ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἔστιν ; Jn 8:40: τὴν ἀλήθειαν λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ). In Hellenistic and Gnostic dualism, ἡ ἀλήθεια is not a

word which is heard, but the divine essence seen or contemplated on arrival at the spiritual goal (CH 8, 3). In apocalyptic literature, however, the explanation of enigmas is heard, and in Daniel this explanation is נִבְּח.¹⁹

The ultimate test of this hypothesis is, however, exegetical. We shall examine those texts concerning the "Spirit of Truth" later. At this point in our inquiry we intend to focus specifically on two texts: Jn. 1:17b-18 and 14:6. Our purpose in focusing on these texts is not only to test de la Potterie's hypothesis, but also to understand Johannine ἀλήθεια in the light of our particular inquiry into orthodoxy and heresy in the Fourth Gospel.

The text of Jn. 1:17b-18 reads:

ἡ Χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.
θεὸν οὐδεὶς ὥρακεν πώποτε.
μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς,
ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 8.

Our primary question is: What is the exact sense of ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια? Brown²⁰ thinks that χάρις and ἀλήθεια are linked together to reflect the Old Testament pairing of $\tau\omicron\pi$ and $\pi\delta\chi$. He translates the phrase as "enduring love". We, however, believe that the phrase implies more. If we take de la Potterie's argumentation concerning the background of ἀλήθεια as essentially correct, and understand the phrase ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια as a hendiadys, it might be rendered: "the gracious gift of revealed truth (came through Jesus Christ)".

Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν denies, as Bultmann observes, that God is directly accessible to men.²¹ It may also be a polemic against the desire to see the "glory of the Lord" (cf. Ex. 33:18) and mystical visions of the divine.²²

There are several variant readings for 1:18b;²³ μονογενῆς Θεὸς is the best attested reading, and to be preferred.²⁴ In the phrase εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, although in Koine Greek εἰς with the accusative is often simply the equivalent of ἐν with the

²⁰Brown, John, p. 16.

²¹Bultmann, John, p. 80

²²Schnackenburg, John, p. 278.

²³For the various readings see Schnackenburg, John, pp. 279 f.

²⁴So also Brown, John, p. 17.

dative,²⁵ it is possible that *ἐγὼ* is used deliberately here to indicate the dynamic force of the relation of the Son with the Father.²⁶

The whole phrase is a metaphoric expression which implies intimate communion (cf. Gen. 15:5; Deut. 13:7, I Kings 17:19).

ἐξηγεῖσθαι could mean "to lead",²⁷ but here probably means "to reveal (divine mysteries)". What, then, is revealed? It is the sonship of the Word, eternally turned toward the bosom of the Father by whom he is generated.

Now, our exegesis of 1:17c-18 suggests that the Fourth Gospel's theology of revelation is not concerned with the revelation of the divine nature; rather it is a theology of divine persons. We shall now seek to substantiate this further by an examination of Jn. 14:6.

The text of 14:6 reads:

ἄνθρωπος αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ. ὁὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ.

The real problem posed for exegetes is the exact relationship between the concepts of *ὁδὸς*, *ἀλήθεια* and *ζωή*. Bultmann finds here the dualist and gnostic theme of the ascent to light and truth:

²⁵Blass-Debrunner, Grammar, paras. 205 and 218.

²⁶"La Verita in San Giovanni", p. 10.

²⁷See the interesting argument of M.-E. Boismard, St. John's Prologue (Westminster: Newman, 1957); -----, "Dans le sein du Père", RB 59 (1952), 23-29. He thinks that the sense of the verse is that the Word (who came from the Father) leads men back (into the bosom of) the Father.

ἡ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ὁδός (Exc. Stob. II, B, 5). He interprets this verse as meaning that Jesus is simultaneously the way and the goal.²⁸ De la Potterie argues that this is mistaken, and points out that the view of ancient writers was that Jesus was the way to the goal.²⁹

De la Potterie substantiates his own interpretation of the verse ("C'est moi, le chemin") by a literary analysis and an examination of the milieu out of which 14:6 springs. In the first place, Jn. 13:33-14:6 is dominated by the theme of the departure of Jesus (a theme introduced by the departure of Judas in 13:30). The motifs of "going" and "following" are dominant.

In 14:1-4 Jesus seeks to console the disciples: all will be reunited in the Father's house, for he goes to prepare a place for them. 14:4 specifies the topic of the next few verses: οὐδὲν ; that is, the issue is "the way".

14:6 displays a chiastic structure:

6a ἐγὼ εἰμι ...
6b ... δι' ἐμοῦ.

Moreover, of the two questions of 14:5:

- (a) οὐκ οἶδμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις
(b) πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι;

14:6 emphasizes the answer to (b):

²⁸John, pp. 603-612.

²⁹"Je suis la Voie, la Verité et la Vie", pp. 908-910.

- (b) ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς
 (a) οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα
 (b) εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ

This significance of this literary analysis lies in the fact that in it ἀλήθεια and ζῶη play no significant role; they are no more than explanatory comments on ἡ ὁδὸς. The sense is this: Jesus is the way to the Father precisely inasmuch as he is truth and life: "I am the way (for I am) truth and (therefore) life".

This conclusion is quite in accord with what we have asserted about the background of the Johannine concept of truth. Certainly, its sense as defined above is neither Gnostic nor Greek. Neither in this text nor any other Johannine text can it be legitimately claimed that ἀλήθεια = God. As for the Biblical parallels to this verse, such texts as Ps. 86:11 (ὁδηγήσάν με, κύριε, τῇ ὁδῷ σου καὶ πορεύσασθαι ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου) are different from Jn. 14:6, for they intend ἀλήθεια as rectitude, a moral quality.³⁰

So then, ἡ ὁδὸς here is metaphorical, and does not suggest anything of the gnostic ascent to the realm of light and truth. Furthermore, truth is not "the reality of the divine", nor is it the goal. Its sense is perhaps best given by reference to the Acts of Thomas, where Christ is "the richness of truth", he who "mounts the way to truth", the "teacher of truth". This guides the exegesis of Jn. 14:6 -- Jesus is ἡ ἀλήθεια as "perfect revealer", as "plenitude"

³⁰Ibid., pp. 918 f.

of revealed truth.³¹

In the Fourth Gospel, then, ἀλήθεια is not "an object of intellectual research, but the essential principle of the moral life, of sanctity; for it is the thought of God on man, perceived and heard in faith".³² "To be of the truth" is to cultivate an interior disposition, bringing oneself into harmony with ἡ ἀλήθεια, remaining habitually under its action, acquiring a connaturality and affinity with the truth.

The truth "frees" the follower of Christ (Jn. 8:32). It is the word of Jesus which frees, and it frees from sin. ἡ ἀλήθεια is a divine, power-charged concept. Thus 17:17 (ἁγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) means, in effect: "Set them on a course of holiness by the [power of the] saving word of revelation". Expressions such as ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ now take on a rich, specifically Christian connotation. Even a seemingly colourless expression such as ἐν ἀληθείᾳ becomes "a magnificent compendium of [John's] whole moral teaching".³³ It is a pure semitism. To love one's brother "in truth" is not to love them "really" but to love them with the power of the ἀλήθεια which abides in us.

³¹Ibid., p. 925.

³²"La verita in San Giovanni", p. 20.

³³Ibid., p. 22.

In conclusion, the Johannine concept of truth is to be differentiated from the intellectualist concept of the Greeks and the cosmic dualism of theosophy. For the Fourth Evangelist *ἡ ἀλήθεια* is the word of the Father addressed to men, incarnated in Christ and illumined through the action of the Spirit.³⁴

The Fourth Gospel is, then, pervaded by the claim that Jesus is the one and only way to salvation, for this claim is the very core of the Johannine theology of revelation. This observation is further borne out by E. M. Sidebottom's study of the Johannine concept of the Son of Man.³⁵ The Son of Man has ascended and descended (3:13; cf. 6:62). He alone is of heavenly origin. No one has ascended and seen the Father, but the Son of Man alone, being in the bosom of the Father, has descended to reveal him. It is in love of the Son of Man and each other that men find God; "not the cross, nor the kerygma, nor any event, but the Lord himself is salvation".³⁶

What we have been endeavouring to show in our examination of the Johannine concept of truth is that salvation consists in communion with "the Father"; that such communion is communicated by the gift of "eternal life", and that this "gracious gift" is nothing other than "truth". As Jesus is not simply the revealer but the revelation

³⁴Ibid., p. 24.

³⁵The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First Century Thought (London: S.P.C.K., 1961).

³⁶Ibid., pp. 97 f.

itself, he alone is the way to salvation. This is what we mean when we say that Jesus is the norm of religion.

The second phase of the development of the Johannine commitment to truth we have labelled "normative Christianity". We now turn to an exegesis of the Johannine passages on Jesus as the Good Shepherd (Jn. 10:1-21) and Jesus as the True Vine (Jn. 15:1-17) in order to illustrate how the concern to present Jesus as the unique revealer is inextricably bound up with the concern for orthodoxy.

2. (a) The Shepherd (Jn. 10:1-21)

The transition from chapter 9 to chapter 10 of John's Gospel has disturbed some commentators, who attempt to improve the sequence by rearranging the text. Such rearrangements are unconvincing.³⁷ However, it is true that the thought in these verses "does not move along straight lines".³⁸

Vss. 1-6: It is certainly not impossible that ἀναβαίνων here has a double meaning;³⁹ it not only refers to the thief and bandit⁴⁰ gaining access to the sheep by surreptitious means, but also

³⁷So also Brown, John, pp. 388-390; Barrett, John, p. 305, says: "...the shepherd discourse follows naturally upon 9: 41 and is presupposed by 10:26-29".

³⁸Barrett, John, p. 305.

³⁹W. Bauer, Johannesevangelium, p. 49, lists many words in John which have a double meaning.

⁴⁰This is the best translation of ληστής ; see Brown, John, p. 385.

to those "who would ascend to heaven by some other means than the cross".⁴¹ But to whom is the primary reference? It is not to one particular figure but to "every corrupter of the faithful or of those who are called to the faith, to everyone who might be a temptation to them -- always, that is, in a particular concrete situation".⁴² Such pretenders will be unable to deceive Christ's elect sheep (v. 5; cf. I John 4:6). But since the shepherd calls his *ἱδίοι*, it follows that there are sheep in the fold who are not his and who do not respond to his voice. Who are the *ἱδίοι*? And with what group are the sum of the sheep in the fold to be identified? Barrett⁴³ sees the fold as that of Judaism and supports the argument by reference to v. 16 (*ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὔλης ταύτης*). Others have identified the flock with the Christian community, the Church, a position Bultmann strongly criticizes.⁴⁴

What is the Evangelist's intention? With which set of characters within the story-line are the readers to identify, if any? (It is useful to note here that false teachers and heresies were a problem in I John, for it illuminates the interpretation.)

The shepherd is to be identified with Jesus (v. 11), and,

⁴¹Barrett, John, p. 305.

⁴²Bultmann, John, n. 3, pp. 371 f.

⁴³Barrett, John, p. 306.

⁴⁴Bultmann, John, pp. 374 f.

following Bultmann, the bandits and robbers with false teachers. But, against Bultmann, we see the flock as the Christian community, the Church. But if this is the case, how are we to understand the sense of ²¹⁸οἱ ἄλλοι ? Who are the other sheep in the fold who do not recognize the shepherd's voice? Evidently they do not know the voice of the shepherd and are thus all the more susceptible to the bandit and thief. They are thus those in the community who are susceptible to false teachers. But what of v. 16? In v. 3 there is a distinction between sheep within the same fold; in v. 16 sheep of other folds are mentioned. If the fold of v. 3 is the Christian community, it follows that the other folds of v. 16 refer to other non-Christian communities.

Vss. 7-10: Many commentators have found considerable difficulty with πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λησταί. Does this verse refer to Old Testament prophets? Or the Pharisees and priests of Jesus' time? This seems most unlikely. On the basis of our interpretation above we conclude that it refers to all pretended revealers and saviours.⁴⁵ The verse is in fact a condemnation of the religions of the age, inasmuch as they appeal to supposed revealers of earlier ages.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ So also Bultmann, John, p. 376.

⁴⁶ Ibid. S. Schultz, Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960), pp. 90-131, thinks that the parables of the shepherd and the vine are unique in the Johannine discourses inasmuch as they alone are polemics against the redeemer-figures of Hellenistic Gnosis. (The other discourses in John seek to demonstrate that Jesus is the fulfilment of Old Testament and late Judaistic salvific hopes.)

There is a shift here from the shepherd of the previous pericope to the *θύρα*. There is also an ambiguity: v. 7 seems to mean "I am the door of the sheep", i.e., the shepherd approaches the sheep through Jesus. V. 9 seems to mean "I am the door through which the sheep enter the fold", i.e., Jesus is the door not for the shepherd but for the sheep.⁴⁷ But too much should not be made of this ambiguity. It seems unnecessary to think of composite sources underlying this section. "The only unity in the discourse is Christological, Jesus draws to himself every epithet which the picture of sheep and shepherd suggests".⁴⁸ This surely is precisely the point; the only protection the sheep have from pretenders breaking into the fold is to know the shepherd and his function. Jesus is the only means of entry into the salvific community (δι' ἐμοῦ ἔαν τις εἰσέλθῃ). All pretenders or unauthorized persons can only bring death (v. 10).

Vss. 11-16: Jesus is the good shepherd⁴⁹ and is willing even to die to protect his sheep (v. 11). It is quite common to see v. 12 as an attack upon the Pharisees; they are the *πρεσβυτεῖς* who betray the flock. But our interpretation sees the flock as the Church. Who then

⁴⁷In this connection see the interesting article of E. F. Bishop, "The Door of the sheep in John 10:7-9", *ET* 71 (1959-1960), 307-309.

⁴⁸Barrett, *John*, p. 308.

⁴⁹For the nuances of "good shepherd" see Barrett, *John*, pp. 310 f.; -----, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel", *JTS* 48 (1947), 163-164; cf. Bultmann, *John*, pp. 364-371.

are the *πρωτοὶ* ? They are those entrusted with the care of the flock who, when danger threatens, flee. They are those leaders of the Church who allow the sheep to be scattered. This kind of imagery of the flock being scattered is used elsewhere in the New Testament (cf. Acts 20:29-30⁵⁰); there is every reason to think that John was reflecting a situation familiar to him.

Jesus is the good shepherd because he knows his sheep (v. 14), a mutual knowledge analogous to that of the Father and the Son (v. 15).

On v. 16 see above. The unity of the flock is possible only through Jesus. There seems to be a telic force behind v. 17, i.e., "I lay down my life in order to take it up again", although it is just possible that it means "with a view to taking it up again". The former interpretation seems more Johannine, for in Johannine thought "the passion, death, resurrection and ascension constitute the one indissoluble salvific action of return to the Father".⁵¹

V. 18 refers to the divine command, a theme taken up frequently in the following chapters:

The characteristic ("new") commandment of Jesus is that his disciples should love one another (13.34; 15.12,17). If they keep his commandments, they abide in his love and show their love for him

50

Here Paul is recorded as speaking of the Ephesian church. If the Gospel of John were to originate from Ephesus, the parallel imagery would perhaps be more striking.

51

Brown, John, p. 399.

(14.15, 21; 15.10, 14). Similarly the love of the Father for the Son is bound up with the Son's voluntary acceptance of suffering in the work of salvation. The word *ἀγάπη* therefore sums up the Christian doctrine of salvation from its origin in the eternal love of God, manifested in Jesus, to the mutual love of Christians in the Church. Jesus himself found complete freedom of action in obedience (v. 18a); so will the disciples.⁵²

Vss. 19-21: Jesus' words produce a division among the Jews.⁵³

2. (b) The True Vine (John 15:1-17)

This section of the redaction divides into two parts.⁵⁴ Its background is controverted. Bultmann and Bauer see the predominant

⁵²Barrett, John, p. 313.

⁵³Before we conclude our exegesis of John 10:1-21, we ought to mention the ingenious hypothesis of A. Kragerud, Die Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium, pp. 74-81. He wishes to identify the Beloved Disciple as the "other disciple" of 18:15-16. He then draws parallels between 18:15-16 and the parable of the shepherd on the basis of vocabulary (he finds eight key words in common: *ἀγειν*, *ἀκολουθεῖν*, *ὀυλή*, *γινώσκειν*, *εἰσελθεῖν*, *ἐξελθεῖν*, *θύρα*, *θυρωρός*) and the traditional links which the Passion has with the shepherd motif (Mk. 1:18; 10:32, 52). He maintains that the shepherd in 10:11-18 and 26-30 is Jesus but in 1-5 and 7-10 the shepherd is the church leader. This parable of the shepherd illuminates the meaning of 18:15-16: for the Beloved Disciple "...als der rechte Hirte, geht durch die *ὀυλή* in die *ὀυλή* hinein, er ist dort ein Bekannter, und die *θυρωρός* öffnet ihm die Tür" (p. 78). The story is in fact a Parallelgestalt; there are two shepherds (Peter and the Beloved Disciple) but Peter is only a shepherd through the Beloved Disciple (pp. 79-80).

Although appealing, this hypothesis is unacceptable, for we see no convincing reason to identify the Beloved Disciple with the "other disciple" of 18:15-16.

⁵⁴

See the literary analysis of Brown, John, pp. 665-668.

influence here as Gnostic and Mandaean.⁵⁵ Others see it as Jewish.⁵⁶ If the background is Jewish and the Old Testament, John radically transforms the sense in that the vine no longer refers to Israel: it is a Christological definition applied to Jesus. Moreover, a comparison with similar sayings in the Synoptics (Mk. 12:1-9; Mt. 21:33-44, 20:1-16, 21:28-32; Lk. 20:9-16) reveals that in the Johannine redaction it no longer refers to the eschatological crisis of the ministry of Jesus but to the continuous life of the Church.⁵⁷

A point of discussion here is whether the vine has a (secondary) eucharistic significance. Bultmann totally rejects such a suggestion.⁵⁸ However, although the eucharistic institution is lacking in John, it was probably familiar to the readership, for it is part of an early faith formula (I Cor. 11:23-26). Moreover, the cup designated as "the fruit of the vine" was also probably familiar to them (Mk. 14:25;

⁵⁵It is interesting to note that in Ego Eimi E. Schweizer argued that the "I am" sayings were to be explained in terms of a Mandaean background. He has since partially abandoned this thesis (see Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament [Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1959], pp. 106 f., n. 446; ET: Church Order in the New Testament [SBT 32; Naperville: Allenson, 1961], p. 118, n. 446), precisely because of his reconsideration of the parables of the shepherd and the vine.

⁵⁶R. Borig, Der Wahre Weinstock (Munich: Kösel, 1967).

⁵⁷Barrett, John, p. 393.

⁵⁸Bultmann, John, p. 530.

Mt. 26:29; cf. also Didache 9:2). The theology of the eucharist in the early Church (I Cor. 10:16-17) and that of the vine in John both stress intimate union with Christ. It is therefore not unreasonable to think that this passage in John would evoke eucharistic thoughts from the readership.

This possibility is given more weight by the remarkable parallels of John 15:1-17 with the eucharistic section in John 6:51-58. (Cf. 15:15b with 6:56; 15:5c with 6:57; 15:13 with 6:51c; 15:1 with 6:51a.⁵⁹)

Perhaps, when it was brought into the context of the Last Supper, the mashal of the vine served in Johannine circles the paraenetic purpose of insisting that eucharistic union must last and bear fruit and must deepen the union between Jesus and his disciples already existing through love.⁶⁰

The emphasis in v. 1 falls on Jesus as the "true" (ἀληθινός) vine; only through him is life to be found. It has been suggested that here the author intends a polemic against Judaism, but this seems unlikely.

There is abundant evidence that John was well aware of the historical fact of the rejection of Jesus by Judaism (see especially 12: 36b-50). But this rejection he has already set forth, and here, as regularly in the last discourses, his major interest is in the life of the Church, in the question of who are and who are not disciples of Jesus.⁶¹

In v. 2 we are posed with the question: Who are the branches

⁵⁹See Brown, John, p. 673.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 674.

⁶¹Barrett, John, p. 393.

who do not bear fruit? Brown suggests that the author may have been thinking of the "anti-Christ's" of I John 2:18-19.⁶² Certainly Christian apostates are intended, as shown by ἐν ἐμοί .

The reference to the cleansing of the disciples in v. 3 recalls the footwashing scene. In the present context, however, it is Jesus' word which cleanses. Bultmann argues that in both cases the meaning is that the Christian is not cleansed by sacramental means or Church institutions but by the revealer's word alone. But there is no reason to think of one verse contradicting the other.⁶³

Vss. 4-5 accent the theme of the unity of Christ with the faithful. If they remain in him through faith he will remain in them through love and fruitfulness.

V. 6 begins εἰ μὴ τις μένη ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλημα καὶ ἐξηράνθη... The vital question is: What is the force of ἐβλήθη? Often it is taken as referring to eschatological punishment but this does not cohere well with Johannine thought. Ἐκβαλλω usually carries the connotation of "banishment from a family or society".⁶⁴ In John 9:34 f. it seems to have the double sense of "to expel from the synagogue and to expel from the audience room",⁶⁵ cf.

⁶²Brown, John, p. 676.

⁶³Ibid., p. 677.

⁶⁴Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London and New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914-1929).

⁶⁵Bauer, Lexicon.

also I John 2:19. Therefore it is very possible that here it refers to expulsion from the Christian community. The unfaithful or apostate Christian suffers the fate of the unfruitful branch in that he is cut off from that which gives him life (the Church).

Vss. 7-17: This sub-unit begins by stressing that indwelling involves harmony with Jesus' revelation and obedience to his commands (v. 7) which cohere with God's plan (v. 8). Vss. 7-10 reiterate the theme of indwelling, keeping the commandments and abiding in love. Jesus' commandment is to love one another (v. 12). Jesus' laying down of his life is not only an example of great love, it makes love peculiarly Christian (vss. 13-14).

V. 15 makes a distinction; the disciples are not slaves but friends:

According to him [the Evangelist], the difference between a *δοῦλος* and a *φίλος* lies not in doing or not doing the will of God, but in understanding or not understanding it. The disciples are *φίλοι* because Jesus has declared to them the whole counsel of God (cf. 16:12).⁶⁶

The disciples have been chosen to receive the revelation; in return they are to show love to one another (vss. 16-17).

In these two passages the theme of Jesus as the unique revealer is again predominant. There is only one shepherd (10:16) and

⁶⁶Barrett, John, p. 398. E. Gaugler, "Die Bedeutung der Kirche in den johanneischen Schriften", Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift 15 (1925), p. 29, argues that only in later mystical circles was the term "friends" used to denote a personal fellowship with Christ that determined one's action.

that is Jesus. Jesus is ὁ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή (15:1), and apart from him the Christian can do nothing (15:5). But in these passages it is also stressed that the response to the revelation of Jesus must be ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. There is a recognition that within the Christian community itself there are those who betray the flock (see above, p. 146). Moreover, if our exegesis of the passage on the vine is essentially correct, the Fourth Evangelist is stating that errant believers must be put out of the Christian community, a fate which, as the denial of eternal life, is death (15:6).

The Fourth Evangelist's concern, then, is not only to present Jesus as the unique revelation of the Father, but also to characterize the response that the revelation calls for. The very nature of the revelation of Jesus calls forth a response ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. This requires the cultivation of a certain inner disposition which has an affinity and connaturality with the revelation itself. As revelation is the presupposition of orthodoxy, so orthodoxy is the response called for by revelation.

Our exegesis of John 10:1-21 and 15:1-17 has further indicated that the Johannine Church conceived of orthodoxy in concrete terms, for heretics are to be expelled from the Church. Our task now is to secure this aspect of our thesis more firmly by an examination of the Johannine passages on the Paraclete. Not only are the Paraclete passages unique to John, but they also feature the Johannine theme of truth. Moreover, they do give us further insight into the contemporary

historical horizon of the Gospel.⁶⁷

⁶⁷The search for a discernible contemporary horizon within the redaction of John is of singular importance -- see R. Schnackenburg, "Zur Herkunft des Johannesevangeliums", BZ 14 (1970), 1-23; ET: "On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel", Perspective II (1970), 223-246, -----, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte", Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament: Vorarbeiten (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag; Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1970), Heft 2, ed. J. Gnllka, et al., 97-117.

Such a search for the contemporary historical horizon in the Fourth Gospel does touch directly upon the orthodoxy/heresy debate. For example, Barrett's discussion of the purpose of John is placed against the background of two problems: eschatology and gnosticism. However, he says, "...it may be doubted whether he was really interested in its publication. It is easy, when we read the gospel, to believe that John, though doubtless aware of the necessity of strengthening Christians and converting the heathen, wrote primarily to satisfy himself. His gospel must be written; it was no concern of his whether it was also read....It seems right to emphasize a certain detachment of the gospel from its immediate surroundings; no book was ever less of a party tract than John" (John, p. 115). This, of course, contrasts quite starkly with Käsemann's "Ketzer und Zeuge" and Testament of Jesus. We should perhaps note that, unlike Käsemann, Barrett does not think that the author of the Johannine Epistles is the same person who wrote the Gospel. (For Käsemann's reaction to Barrett's work see his Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970], II, 141-148.) What the contributors to the orthodoxy/heresy debate have done is to focus attention upon the possibility that the redactional story-line may be dictated by the historical circumstance of the author, so that opposition and dissent encountered by the author may well indicate how the work is to be understood and, indeed, why he wrote at all. We have already noted (Chapter One) that the orthodoxy/heresy debate on Paul focuses on trying to discover who his opponents were and the exact nature of the opposition, and how this trend has been shifted to the Johannine writings by the work of Kasemann. Unfortunately, to pursue this tack in John is very difficult. We have seen how the various studies on the opponents of Paul have produced very different results, and there are controls there which are lacking in the Johannine literature. If Fortna were right and the signs-source of John could be constructed as he would have us believe, this indeed would be a great breakthrough in the interpretation of John, for then we could compare the theology of this earlier source with that of the later redaction, noting where the redactor has made additions and alterations. The developments thus apparent would give us valuable insights into the situation giving rise to the total redaction (e.g., J. Becker, "Wunder und Christologie: Zum literarkritischen und christologischen Problem der Wunder im Johannesevangelium", NTS 16 [1970], 130-148). We, however, intend to pursue a more limited inquiry

(3) "The Paraclete"

Much has been written on the so-called "Paraclete" in John and it is not our intention to review the literature here or to offer

within what we consider more feasible horizons.

There have, of course, been many attempts to determine the concrete historical background of the Fourth Gospel; we do not mean to imply that such inquiry is only recent. (What is significant about Käsemann's work is that the position of the Fourth Evangelist himself is thrown into question; that is, the question is whether the Evangelist himself stands "on the periphery of the Church".) As early as 1898, W. Baldensperger, Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums: sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck (Freiburg i. Br.), saw the purpose of the Gospel as a polemic against the disciples of John the Baptist, and placed the Gospel against the background of a controversy with the Baptist's disciples. A polemic against John the Baptist veneration does seem to be discernible in the Fourth Gospel, especially in 1:19-51, and it would seem as though Baptist veneration posed a problem for the readership the Evangelist had in mind. (Clementine Recognitions, i, 54, 60, puts on the lips of Peter the claim that "some of the disciples of John...have separated themselves from the people and proclaim their own master as messiah".) However, the polemic is only slightly emphasized, and it cannot be correctly maintained that this is the primary purpose of the Gospel. (J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus", in Twelve New Testament Studies [London: S.C.M., 1962], p. 49, n. 49 doubts the existence of such a Baptist sect. See also J. H. Hughes, "The Disciples of John the Baptist", [unpublished M.A., Durham University, England, 1969]; -----, "John the Baptist: the Forerunner of God Himself", NovT 14 [1972], 191-218.)

It has also been noted that John displays evidence of a hardening battle against Judaism. Martyn's thesis (History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel) that the Fourth Gospel is intelligible against the background of the Church-Synagogue struggle is particularly interesting here. But again, it is doubtful whether this is the controlling factor in the composition of John (Kümmel, Introduction, p. 163).

The traditional view -- following Irenaeus -- that the Gospel displays a polemic against docetism has received support among scholars (see especially E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. F. N. Davey [London: Faber & Faber, 1947²], pp. 48-57); so too has Käsemann's position that John is to be located in a gnosticizing community -- see L. Schottroff, "Heil als Innerweltliche Entweltlichung", NovT 11 (1969), 294-317; -----, "Joh. iv 5-15 und die Konsequenz des johanneischen Dualismus", ZNW 60 (1969), 199-214; -----, Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt. Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium (Neukirchener-Vluyt: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970).

a critique of it. Rather, we will focus on two particular questions:

What is the function of the Paraclete in the Johannine redaction?

And what are we able to discern from a study of the Paraclete passages of the contemporary historical horizon of the Evangelist?

The word *παράκλητος* is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel and I John. It occurs four times in the Gospel (John 14:15-17; 14:26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11) and once in I John (2:1). Many scholars believe that the traditional Christian identification of the Paraclete with the Holy Spirit obscures the fact that originally the Paraclete was an independent salvific figure.⁶⁸ It is also maintained by some that the

68

See, for example, F. Spitta, Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), pp. 316 ff., 358, who believes that a redactor made the identification of the Paraclete with the Holy Spirit and that only the following verses are original: 16:7 f.; 16:12-14; 14:14; 16a-b. See also H. Delafosse, La quatrième Evangile. Traduction nouvelle avec introduction, notes et commentaire (Paris: Rieder, 1925), pp. 105 ff.; O. Betz, Der Paraklet Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, Johannes-Evangelium und im neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften (Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963). H. Sasse, "Der Paraklet im Johannes-Evangelium", ZNW 24 (1925), 260-277, says that in the Fourth Gospel there are two groups of statements about the Paraclete. One group (15:26-27 and 16:7-11) belongs to an earlier tradition -- here a human personality filled with the Spirit and a creator of tradition is meant. This personality Sasse identifies as the Evangelist himself (= the Beloved Disciple). (A. Kragerud, Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium, also makes this identification.) The later tradition (14:15-17, 26) identifies the Paraclete with the Holy Spirit.

Paraclete references are secondary.⁶⁹ Such views arise from the consideration of such fundamental questions as: Why is the title παράκλητος unique to the Johannine corpus? To what (or to whom) does the title refer: the third person of the Trinity? Some impersonal God-given force? Jesus' alter-ego?

Answers to these questions would be easier if the etymology of the word παράκλητος could be ascertained with some certainty. Unfortunately, it cannot.⁷⁰ O. Betz in a thorough (if at times rather confusing) study drew upon a whole series of words⁷¹ used at Qumran with a similar function to the Paraclete in John. He wished to posit a direct relationship of John to Qumran. This, however, is very doubtful.⁷² Indeed, the fact that ו'בקר (which appears in Jewish second century writings) is a transliteration

⁶⁹ See H. Delafosse, art. cit.; H. Spitta, op. cit.; H. Sasse, art. cit.; H. Windisch, "Die fünf Parakletsprüche", in Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag 26. Januar 1927 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Siebeck, 1927), pp. 110-137, who maintains that all the references to the Paraclete in John are secondary. This view has met with criticism even from Bultmann (John, p. 552, n. 1). G. Johnston, The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1970), esp. 61-79, thinks the Paraclete sayings are Johannine. See also R. E. Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel", NTS 13 (1967), 113-132; C. K. Barrett, John, pp. 75-76.

⁷⁰ See the rather inconclusive article of J. Behm on παράκλητος in TWNT, pp. 800-814.

⁷¹ Op. cit., pp. 137-147.

⁷² See especially the criticisms of R. E. Brown, art. cit., and R. Schnackenburg's review of Betz's book in BZ 9 (1965), 138-140.

from the Greek suggests that attempts to derive παράκλητος from a Hebrew or Aramaic title are rather futile. If attempts to derive παράκλητος from an Aramaic or Hebrew original have not been illuminating, what can be discerned from the cognates of the word? In an excellent article, R. E. Brown summarized the four possible alternatives.⁷³ First, παράκλητος is possibly a passive from παρακαλεῖν. Thus it would mean "one called alongside to help" (so frequently rendered "advocate"). Such an interpretation is supported by such texts as Mt. 10:20 and Acts 6:10.⁷⁴ Unfortunately, as Brown points out, this interpretation is not supported by the Johannine texts on the Paraclete,⁷⁵ and neither does it "do justice to his [the Paraclete's] role as teacher".⁷⁶

Secondly, παράκλητος could be taken in an active sense from παρακαλεῖν ("intercede", "appeal to") -- thus, "intercessor", "mediator". This interpretation is supported by I John 2:1, but not by the Gospel texts. The attempts of Bauer⁷⁷ and Bultmann⁷⁸ to

⁷³ Art. cit., 115-119.

⁷⁴ Where the Holy Spirit is said to defend disciples put on trial.

⁷⁵ Moreover, the Paraclete defends Jesus and not the disciples.

⁷⁶ Art. cit., p. 117.

⁷⁷ W. Bauer, Johannesevangelium, on 14:16.

⁷⁸ See especially John, pp. 566-572.

render παράκλητος as "helper" may also be deemed unsuccessful.⁷⁹

Thirdly, possibly the word παράκλητος reflects the meaning of "to comfort" -- thus, "comforter", "consoler".⁸⁰ Although the idea of consolation appears in the Last Discourse, it does not appear in the specific passages on the Paraclete.

Fourthly, perhaps the word relates to παράκλησις. C. K. Barrett has written an article defending this thesis. For Barrett, "the Paraclete is the Spirit of Christian paraclesis".⁸¹ There is much in this insight, but it seems rather over-emphasized and exclusive,⁸² for an examination of the texts (see below) suggests that the title is meant to evoke more from the reader.⁸³

⁷⁹ See W. Michaelis, "Zur Herkunft des johanneischen Paraklet-Titels", *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, xi (im honorem Antonii Fridrichsen sexagenarii edenda curavit Seminarium Neotestamentium Upsaliense; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1947), pp. 147-162.

⁸⁰ See J. G. Davies, "The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ", *JTS* n. s. 4 (1953), 35-38.

⁸¹ C. K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel", *JTS* n. s. 1 (1950), p. 14.

⁸² J. Behm, *TWNT*, p. 813, n. 99, thinks that the attempt of Barrett "to ignore derivation from the religious world around and to find the background of the Johannine use of παράκλητος simply in apostolic proclamation is not very convincing in view of the wealth of comparative material available".

⁸³ At this point perhaps we should mention that Norman Snaith's attempt ("The Meaning of the 'Paraclete'", *ET* 57 (1945), 47-50, to translate παράκλητος as "convincer" is itself most unconvincing.

If an examination of the word itself does not yield any really fruitful insights into the exact sense of the title *παράκλητος*, does an examination of the history of religious background? Bauer,⁸⁴ Bultmann,⁸⁵ and Windisch⁸⁶ attempted to demonstrate that the title derives from the Mandaean "Yawar" ("helper"). This hypothesis has received little support. Others such as Mowinckel⁸⁷ and Johansson⁸⁸ sought to find its origin in the Jewish background. Mowinckel maintained that the notion of "intercessors" (Fürsprecher) was common in Judaism, and to them are ascribed the same functions as to the Johannine Paraclete. The Fourth Evangelist was thus taking over (in a modified manner) a thought common in Judaism. O. Betz further sought to place the Johannine Paraclete strictly against the background of Qumran.⁸⁹ In a more recent monograph G. Johnston built upon Betz's insight while rejecting his conclusions.⁹⁰ Johnston accepts that the "Spirit of

⁸⁴See n. 77.

⁸⁵See n. 78.

⁸⁶See n. 69.

⁸⁷S. Mowinckel, "Die Vorstellung des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraclet", ZNW 32 (1933), 97-103.

⁸⁸N. Johansson, Parakletoi. Vorstellungen von Fürsprechen für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1940).

⁸⁹See n. 68 and n. 72.

⁹⁰Op. cit., (n. 69).

Truth" was identified with Michael at Qumran, but he rejects Betz's idea that John meant the same figure. Johnston's thesis is that John's opponents made this identification. Thus Johnston thinks that in the Paraclete theme we see a polemic against an incipient angel-cult related to Qumran. The Fourth Gospel stresses that Christians do not need angel defenders such as Michael, for truth can be found in the charismatic leaders of the Church.

R. E. Brown has built upon the researches of such scholars as Betz, Mowinckel and Johnsson in his article. He refers to the following points which may contribute to an understanding of the Paraclete. First, he speaks of the "tandem relationship", i.e., "a principal figures dies and leaves another to take his place, carry on his work and interpret his message".⁹¹ Secondly, there is "the concept of the Spirit of God coming upon the prophets that they might speak the words of God to men".⁹² Thirdly, a study of late Jewish angelology supplies parallels to the teaching function of the Paraclete.⁹³ A study of Jewish angelology is also instructive in revealing the forensic aspect of the Paraclete's work.

⁹¹Art. cit., p. 120.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Cf. John 16:13 where the Spirit of Truth is said to "ἀνακαλύψει" the things to come; this same verb ("to unveil") is used in apocalyptic literature where it often unveils the truth of a vision. See I. de la Potterie, "The Paraclete", in The Christian Lives by the Spirit, I. de la Potterie and S. Lyonnet (New York: Alba House, 1971), pp. 67 f. (This essay is wrongly attributed to Lyonnet in the book.)

Thus, an examination of the Jewish background is not uninstruc-
 tive inasmuch as there we do find the same basic elements as appear
 in the Johannine description of the Paraclete. However, no study has
 been successful in showing that the identification of the Paraclete
 and the Holy Spirit made by Christian tradition is invalid. If the
 Johannine conception of the Paraclete is influenced by the ideology
 of Qumran, it is a very indirect influence, for John quite obviously
 reshapes and adapts the concept to make it specifically Christian:

And indeed, in describing the Paraclete, John
 does not paint a picture without parallel in
 other New Testament descriptions of the Holy
 Spirit but only emphasizes certain aspects
 that were already present and gives them a
 new orientation and immediacy.⁹⁴

Ultimately, however, it is an examination of the texts them-
 selves which is most rewarding in revealing the function of the
 Paraclete in the Johannine redaction. Thus, we shall now turn our
 attention to an examination of these texts.

The first text in John which refers to the Paraclete is found
 in that section of the Gospel we have called "The Last Discourse".

The text reads:

Ἐὰν ἀγαπάτε με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε.
 καὶ γὰρ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον
 δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα ᾗ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ
 πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν,
 ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει· ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε
 αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῶν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.
 (John 14:15-17).

⁹⁴Brown, art cit., p. 124.

On the possibility that this saying is an interpolation, see n. 69. Ἐάν ἀγαπᾷτε με: This is a protasis which must be understood as governing the sense of the next six verses. The word ἀγαπᾷ appears at this point of the discourse and replaces the theme of ποτενεῖν. The intention of the protasis is given in vss. 15, 21 and 23 f. Thus the sense is not that when Jesus is present in the disciples, keeping his commandments will result;⁹⁵ rather the attempt is to define the nature of love.⁹⁶ The question to which this section addresses itself is to be understood in the context of the Last Discourse.⁹⁷ That is, the question is: Can the disciples continue to love Jesus, even after he is gone? The disciple who loves Jesus must continue to keep his commandments; he also receives a promise: he will receive the Paraclete.⁹⁸ Thus the disciples will not be without that which they had in Jesus.

⁹⁵As apparently Barrett, John, p. 385: "One consequence of the disciple's love for Christ will be their obedience to his commandments".

⁹⁶So correctly Bultmann, John, p. 612.

⁹⁷Ibid., pp. 612 f.

⁹⁸Here the Father gives the Paraclete at Jesus' request. Much has been made of the difference between this and 14:26 (where the Father sends him in Jesus' name); 15:26 (where Jesus sends him παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς and he ἐκπορεύεται [τὸν πατέρα]); 16:7 (where Jesus sends him). It is improbable that the Evangelist intends anything really significant to be implied by these different expressions (see Barrett, John, p. 385).

There are two possible translations of ἄλλον παρακλητόν: he will give (a) "another Paraclete" or (b) "another person to be a Paraclete" (i.e., "another, a Paraclete"). The suggestion of Spitta⁹⁹ that ἄλλον is an insertion is implausible. The context suggests strongly the continuity of the offices of Jesus and the Paraclete and there seems little justification for rejecting the sense of (a) (which is more in accord with Johannine style¹⁰⁰).

This Paraclete is τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. In the three usages of this title in John it defines Paraclete. Moreover:

τῆς ἀληθείας is not simply a defining genitive (equivalent, for example, to ἀληθινή at 15.1), nor is it simply a substitute for Jesus (the Spirit of Jesus, who is the truth). John means "the Spirit who communicates truth" -- a meaning closely parallel to that which has been ascribed above to παράκλητος, especially when it is borne in mind that in Jewish and early Christian literature ἀλήθεια often means the truth proclaimed by a missionary preacher and accepted by his converts (e.g., 2 Cor. 4.2).¹⁰¹

ὁ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν...: Windisch suggests that this statement is meant as an explanation of why the Paraclete gives his services to only a minority of mankind.¹⁰² But, as Bultmann observes:

⁹⁹Op. cit., p. 346.

¹⁰⁰Cf. John 10:16: καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω. It would certainly give a different bent to the interpretation of this passage if this were to be translated "And I have others, sheep..."

¹⁰¹Barrett, John, p. 386.

¹⁰²Art. cit., p. 115.

The statement that the world cannot "receive" this Spirit does not mean that the unbeliever cannot become a believer, but rather describes the essential contrast between the community and the world. The world qua world cannot receive the Spirit; to do so it would have to give up its essential nature, that which makes it the world. In the antithesis it is stated you "know" him -- not in the sense that a previous knowing is the presupposition for the receiving, but because "knowing" and "receiving" describe the same process. So too the clause ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ κτλ. does not give the reason why, but is really a description, just as the words ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε are substantiated on the other side by the clause τὰρ ὑμῶν μένει κτλ. ¹⁰³

The text of 14:26 reads:

ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάσκει πάντα
καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῶν ἐγώ.

The majority of MSS read τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . Some read τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (cf. 14:17; 15:26; 16:13). Barrett suggests that the shorter reading τὸ ἅγιον may be original. ¹⁰⁴ Although this is possible, the weight of evidence does not suggest that this is the case. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου: Brown suggests that this phrase suggests the unity of Jesus with the believer; ¹⁰⁵ it is probably to be paraphrased "to act in relation to me, in my place, with my authority". ¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³Bultmann, John, p. 616.

¹⁰⁴Barrett, John, p. 390.

¹⁰⁵Brown, John, pp. 635 f.

¹⁰⁶Barrett, John, p. 390.

ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα
καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα
ὃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγώ.

"Teaching" and "reminding" are not to be taken in different senses -- rather here we have synonymous parallelism.¹⁰⁷ Thus the meaning is clear: there is no independent revelation through the Paraclete.

(This is a very important implication in relation to our particular question of orthodoxy and heresy, for here the continuity of teaching is expressed.) The revelation does not die out with Jesus' departure.

πάντα is contrasted with ταῦτα of v. 25. This again does not imply that the Paraclete will teach the disciples more than Jesus, rather the Paraclete will enable the disciples to see the full implications of Jesus' words.¹⁰⁸

The text of 15:26-27 reads:

Ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ· καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσται.
ὁν, παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς -- see on 14:15-17. The fact that here we

¹⁰⁷ Bultmann, John, p. 626.

¹⁰⁸ Jn. 16:13 reads: Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούει, λαλήσει, καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
The expression εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν is clarified by two other expressions, which function as a commentary on it: ὅσα ἀκούει λαλήσει (the role of the Spirit is to lead the believer deeper into the self-same revelation as that mediated by Jesus) and ἀναγγελεῖ (the sense of which is not simply that the Spirit will "announce" τὰ ἐρχόμενα but rather that he will reveal them -- see de la Potterie, "La verita in San Giovanni", p. 18).

have a different agent sending the Paraclete is hardly theologically crucial. The "Spirit of Truth" "proceeds" (ἐκπορεύεται) from the Father; his mission is parallel to that of the Son (cf. 8:42; 13:3; 16:27; 17:8). καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε: the Spirit and the disciples together continue the work of Jesus.

This passage prepares very well for the next section (16:7-11) on the Paraclete, where we have a forensic description of his work. The gap is thus bridged between what has been said about the Paraclete and what will be said in the next reference to him. The Paraclete represents Jesus among the disciples, and this explains why the world will treat them in the same way it treated Jesus. The argument that these verses on the Paraclete are an insertion is certainly wrong.¹⁰⁹

16:7-11 reads:

ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν, συμφέρει ὑμῖν.
 ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. ἔάν γάρ μὴ, ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος
 οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. καὶ ἔλθὼν ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει
 τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης
 καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. περὶ ἁμαρτίας μὲν, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν
 εἰς ἐμέ· περὶ δικαιοσύνης δέ, ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω
 καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ σκεπτόμε με; περὶ δέ κρίσεως, ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων
 τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται.

ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν could mean simply "I am telling you the truth". But ἀλήθεια is almost certainly used here with its wider implications (see above, pp. 128 ff.). Vss. 8-11 present many

¹⁰⁹ See Barrett, John, p. 407; Brown, John, p. 699.

difficult exegetical problems. It is not clear in what sense *ἐλέγχεω* *παρὶ* is used. *ἐλέγχεω* has two meanings: "to expose" and "to convict". Barrett, in a lengthy discussion of v. 9, eventually settles for the paraphrase "He will convict the world of its sin, because that sin reached its complete demonstration in men's failure to believe in me".¹¹⁰ Brown, who translates *ἐλέγχεω* as "prove wrong", thinks that "convict of" is only appropriate to the first limb of the triadic statement.¹¹¹

There are further problems in the translation of *δικαιοσύνη*, a word which appears only here in John. The difficulty which the word presents in Pauline exegesis is well-known. Here possibly it is best taken as "justice". All three nouns *δικαιοσύνη*, *κρίσις* and *ἀμαρτία* are used without the article, which indicates that the sense is general and not particular.

The sense of the whole pericope is indeed difficult. It is possible that behind the imagery there is the notion of a trial of cosmic dimensions, in which the world is proved guilty before God. But, as Bultmann himself observes, even if that were originally the case, in the text before us the "mythical side of the picture has faded away".¹¹² Brown says:

Moreover, the trial is only indirectly a trial of the world. It is properly a rerun of the trial of Jesus in which the Paraclete makes the

¹¹⁰ John, p. 406.

¹¹¹ John, p. 705.

¹¹² John, p. 562.

truth emerge for the disciples to see. Its effect on the world stems from the fact that, having been assured by the Paraclete of the victory of Jesus in that trial, the disciples go forth to bear witness (xv 27) and thus challenge the world and its interpretation of the trial. In being the moving force behind this the Paraclete is simply continuing the work of Jesus, who himself bore evidence against the world that what it does is evil (vii 7).¹¹³

We may now draw the following conclusions about the sense of these verses. First, the world is guilty of sin by refusing to believe in Jesus. Secondly, the Paraclete shows the irony¹¹⁴ of the world's judging Jesus to be guilty, for in fact he was just and innocent. Jesus' death was really his glorification (cf. John 17:5; Rom. 3:21-31). Here we may ask in what sense is *ὅτι πρὸς τοὺς πονήσαντας ἵνα γινώσκω καὶ δοκῶσι θεωρεῖν* ^{ne} to be taken? It is addressed to the Johannine Church (see below, pp. 191 ff.) and therefore to be interpreted in terms of Christ's presence through the Paraclete, i.e., the Paraclete illuminates Christ's death. Thirdly, in condemning Jesus the world itself is judged. The paradox is that through the Paraclete Christ is still present after his death. Thus the world -- which thought that its crucifixion of Jesus was a victory -- is, in fact, defeated.

What, then, can we say about the function of the Paraclete in the Johannine redaction? Our study certainly indicates that he

¹¹³Brown, John, p. 712.

¹¹⁴Note *συνολογία* (cf. John 18:14).

functions as a guarantor of continuity between Jesus and the disciples; that is, he guarantees the continuity of the Christian tradition (cf. 14:16). We saw how 14:15-17 specifically focuses on the question of how the disciples can continue to love Jesus after he is gone. This is done through the Paraclete, who is the "Spirit of Truth", i.e., "the Spirit who communicates Truth". The Divine truth is that which works in revelation. The function of the "Spirit who communicates truth" is to continue the work of revelation in the community. Related to the Paraclete's revelatory activity is the forensic aspect of his work, for he glorifies Jesus by continuing the work of revelation (16:14) which continually calls for a response from the world (16:8-11).

It is clear that the theme of the Paraclete has indeed been pressed into the Evangelist's concern for orthodoxy. Those interpretations which focus solely on the charismatic function of the Paraclete are essentially defective, for the primary emphasis falls on the Paraclete's function as the communicator of truth; he is the nourisher and sustainer of that interior disposition which in faith grasps and responds to the revelation of the Father.

What, then, can we ascertain from these observations about the contemporary historical horizon of the Evangelist?

Brown is probably right in observing that the Evangelist had in mind the problem caused by "the death of apostolic eyewitnesses who were the living chain between the Church and Jesus of Nazareth".¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ Brown, art. cit., p. 128.

But can this observation be nuanced? Can we give a more concrete historical dimension to the concern of the Evangelist to show that his own community stands in direct continuity with Jesus of Nazareth? We believe that we can, and that a study of the figure of the disciple whom Jesus loved (the "Beloved Disciple") in the Johannine redaction gives us direct access to this concrete aspect of the Evangelist's concern for orthodoxy. Accordingly, we now turn to a study of those passages in the Fourth Gospel which feature the figure of the Beloved Disciple.

(4) The Beloved Disciple in the Fourth Gospel

Through our study of the Beloved Disciple we hope to determine the kinds of responses the Fourth Evangelist wished to inculcate in and elicit from his readership, and relate these aims to contemporary concerns. Although this aspect of our critical task must be distinguished from examining the relationships within the story-line, we should be aware that the two sets of relations are themselves related, for there is the question of how the author wishes the readers to identify with the groups and characters within the story-line. That is, the redactional story-line is functional to religious purposes.

Our strategy of inquiry will take account of "the hermeneutical circle", according to which the whole is intelligible in terms of the parts and the parts in terms of the whole. Although logically a circular method, this circle is broken open by acts of insight.

We have already indicated what we believe to be the organizational disposition of the redaction of the Fourth Gospel (above, Chapter

Three). Our specific question is whether the Fourth Evangelist shows a concern for orthodoxy. It seems evident that of the four major parts of the redaction which we delineated, that part we called "Jesus' discourse to 'his own'" (those with whom the Johannine Church would identify) is the most likely to shed light upon an inner Church conflict such as the orthodoxy/heresy issue.¹¹⁶ Moreover, we described chapters 13-17 as a "hermeneutical key" to the subsequent narratives of suffering, death and resurrection appearances.¹¹⁷ It behoves us therefore to undertake a more detailed analysis of the second half of the Gospel to see if it does, in fact, prove fruitful for our inquiry.

The composite nature of the Last Discourse has often been remarked upon. Brown makes the following observations which seem to militate against the unity of the section:

- (a) The words of 14:30-31 seem to mark the end of the Discourse.
- (b) There are duplications and repetitions, e.g., 13:31-14:31 and 16:4b-33.

¹¹⁶ See, for example, K. Grayston, "Jesus and the Church in St. John's Gospel", LondQuartHolR 36 (1967), 106-115, in which he emphasizes that chapters 13-17 are fixed on problems within the group, in contrast to the first half of the Gospel. H. Riesenfeld, "Zu den johanneischen hina-Sätzen", StudTheol 19 (1965), 213-220, seeks to show that John has its Sitz im Leben in the life of the community by an analysis of the hina sentences. The purpose of John is Christian instruction and clarification of the faith.

¹¹⁷ See above, pp. 118 ff.

- (c) Some material in the Last Discourse is placed in the public ministry in the Synoptics, suggesting that some of the Johannine material was not always associated with the Last Supper.
- (d) Some of the material, for example the allegory of the vine (15:1-6), does not seem to be connected with the characteristic theme of the Last Supper (Jesus' departure).
- (e) There seem to be differing theological outlooks present in the Last Discourse, which suggests to some scholars that not all the sayings were delivered at the same time.¹¹⁸

These considerations militating against the unity of the Last Discourse have been met in various ways. Bultmann¹¹⁹ rearranges the Last Discourse along the following lines: 13:1, 17, 13:31-35, 15, 16, 13:36-38, 14. Bernard,¹²⁰ has a different arrangement: 15, 16, 13:31-38, 14, 17. These two examples serve to illustrate the problem of rearrangement theories: often, either consciously or unconsciously, they reflect the interests and ingenuity of the commentator rather than strictly exegetical considerations. In accord with our avowed

¹¹⁸Brown, John, p. 582.

¹¹⁹Bultmann, John, pp. 457-637.

¹²⁰Bernard, John, pp. xxxiv-xxxvii.

intention we shall attempt no rearrangements of the text. Throughout our analysis of the Last Discourse, we rely heavily on Brown's fine analysis,¹²¹ although not agreeing with him in some details.

13:1-30 falls into two parts, each closely connected.¹²² The first part (13:1-20) has further subdivisions. 13:1 introduces the narrative. The footwashing scene (vss. 2-11) is followed by an interpretative discourse (vss. 12-20). The second part (13:21-30) concerns the prophecy of the betrayal.

What is the meaning of this complex of material in 13:1-30? The footwashing scene focuses on the self-abasement and humility of Jesus. There may also be a secondary sacramental motif.¹²³ As for the betrayal scene:

There can be no talk of the community, without reckoning with the possibility that one of its number is unworthy. But in the circle of those who have received Jesus' service, unworthiness is synonymous with betrayal. The consciousness of belonging to the body of disciples must not seduce any of them into the illusion of security. The Evangelist has emphasized this immediately after the emergence of the body of disciples as a limited circle (6. 66-71), and has twice drawn attention to the fact in the previous scene which dealt with the founding of the community (vv. 11, 18). He now uses a special scene, that of the prophecy of the betrayal (13. 21-30), in order

¹²¹ John, pp. 518-782.

¹²² Bultmann, John, p. 461.

¹²³ See the extended note of Bultmann, John, pp. 469 f., n. 2. One of the best arguments for a sacramental interpretation is that of M. E. Boismard, "Le lavement des pieds (Jn xiii 1-17)", RB 71 (1964), 5-24. A forceful argument against is presented by G. Richter, Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium: Geschichte ihrer Deutung (Regensburg: Pustet, 1967).

to express the idea in tangible form.¹²⁴

At the end of the section Judas leaves into the night. The Discourse proper now commences to the faithful.

13:31-38 is an introduction to the unit 13:31-14:31. It announces the theme of the unit -- Jesus' departure and new commandment. Chapter 14 subdivides into two parts: 14:1-4 focuses on the way to the Father for the community, and 14:15-31 on the promise of the Paraclete and his work.

The next unit is easily discernible. It begins at 15:1 and ends at 16:33. There are four sub-units: (a) 15:1-17 (b) 15:18-16:4a (c) 16:4b-15 (d) 16:15-33. The first three of these units have been cleverly woven together:

The theme of choosing the disciples in (a) overlaps into (b); cf. 15:16 and 19. The theme of love in (a) is matched by the theme of hatred in (b). The theme of the world's opposition in (b) prepares the way for the description of the Paraclete as the prosecutor of the world in (c).¹²⁵

The unit thematizes the community in the world. Undoubtedly there are parallels between 13:31-14:31 and 16:4b-33.¹²⁶ But these should not be overstressed. There is a progression in the two units we have isolated (13:31-14:31 and 15:1-16:33) from the departure of Jesus to the community he leaves behind (and the work of the Paraclete

¹²⁴Bultmann, John, p. 479.

¹²⁵Brown, John, p. 587.

¹²⁶Ibid., pp. 588-597.

within the community) to the community in the world. Moreover, these two units are preparatory to the final unit in the whole section, the prayer of Jesus for the community (17:1-26).

The point to notice at this juncture is how important the life of the community is for the Fourth Evangelist. The guiding principle of the community is Jesus. "And this community is united with him by both its knowledge and faith, and by love, and it is this that unites the members among themselves; but love is the content of the *καὶνὴ ἐντολὴ*, which corresponds to the *καὶνὴ διαθήκη* ".¹²⁷

The whole of the Last Discourse embraces the life of the community and its relation to Jesus and the Paraclete. This emphasis on the community life of the Christian, expressed so clearly in this part of the Gospel, may give us valuable insight into the meaning of the Gospel as a whole. To this we shall return later.

The Passion of Jesus (18:1-19:42) divides into the following sections:

Prologue	18:1-12
Act One	18:13-27
Act Two	18:28-19:16
Act Three	19:17-37
Epilogue	19:38-42

The "Prologue" (the capture of Jesus) and the "Epilogue" (the burial) are linked by being garden scenes. Act One is the interrogation

¹²⁷ Bultmann, John, p. 486.

of Jesus by Annas with all the historical problems that raises.¹²⁸

This anecdotal narrative is framed by the denials of Peter.

Act Two is set at Pilate's praetorium. There are seven scenes:¹²⁹

Scene 1	18:28-32	(outside the praetorium)
Scene 2	18:33-38a	(inside)
Scene 3	18:38b-40	(outside)
Scene 4	19:1-3	(inside)
Scene 5	19:4-8	(outside)
Scene 6	19:9-11	(inside)
Scene 7	19:12-16	(outside)

Why do the scenes alternate between outside and inside the praetorium? The answer is presented in an ironic way in scene 1: Jewish officialdom's fear of defilement. Act Two is, in fact, charged throughout with dramatic irony gravitating around the kingship of Jesus theme and his rejection by the Jews, as evidenced by the central scene 19:1-3.¹³⁰ Act Three similarly continues this theme.

In Act Three we are presented with five tableaux:

¹²⁸Bultmann, John, p. 643, n. 3.

¹²⁹Brown, John, pp. 858 f.

¹³⁰In connection with the irony of this central scene, it is interesting to note the observation of E. C. Colwell, John Defends the Gospel (Chicago and New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1936), p. 79: "When King Agrippa I visited Alexandria in 38 A.D., the anti-Semites made a public mockery of him. A naked fool was given a throne in the gymnasium, a diadem of paper, a doormat as a robe and a papyrus stalk as a sceptre. He was also given a bodyguard and hailed in mock reverence as king". The mimes -- the burlesque shows of the ancient world -- often ridiculed kings and deities.

Scene 1	19:17-22
Scene 2	19:23-24
Scene 3	19:25-27
Scene 4	19:28-30
Scene 5	19:31-37

The first scene has the ironic witness of the pagan to the kingship of Jesus. Jesus is "guilty" of being the messiah, King of Israel. Scene two demonstrates the fulfilment of the Book of Psalms. Furthermore, the reference to the seamless robe (exclusively Johannine) is probably intended to present Jesus as both King and Priest.¹³¹ Scene three -- the central one -- features the Beloved Disciple and we shall examine this in more detail later. In scene four the work of Jesus is depicted as now finished. He dies having fulfilled another scripture. Moreover, the mention of the hyssop branch recalls a detail of the Passover liturgy. The intention of scene five is quite clearly conveyed in the comment of the redactor in vss. 36-37.¹³²

¹³¹Brown, John, pp. 920 f.

¹³²R. E. Brown, The Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1965), pp. 91 f.: "In his life Jesus had spoken of the water of life that he would give; he had said of himself: 'From within him there shall flow rivers of living water' (Jn 7:38). Now that he is glorified, raised up on the cross, the water that flows from within him, permeated with the blood of his sacrifice, is truly the water of life bringing salvation to men.... Pressing on, John sees two Old Testament citations fulfilled in the piercing of Jesus. The text on not breaking a bone is again from the ritual of the paschal lamb.... The second citation, referring in the Old Testament to Israel's rejection of God, promises in its original context the pouring forth of God's spirit and the opening of a fountain of cleansing for Jerusalem". For a quite different interpretation, see G. Richter, "Blut und Wasser aus der durchbohrten Seit Jesu (Joh. 19, 34b)", MunchTheolZeit 21 (1970), 1-21.

The Fourth Evangelist's presentation of the Passion of Jesus gives us valuable insight into his intentions. In particular, we should note that scene four is the centrepiece of Act Two and scene three is the centrepiece of Act Three. Especially important for our inquiry is the fact that the latter scene features the appearance of the Beloved Disciple.

The Resurrection appearances in the Fourth Gospel divide clearly into two scenes, each comprising two episodes.¹³³ In each of the scenes the first episode is concerned with disciples and the second with specific individuals (Mary and Thomas respectively). In the latter case, however, the faith of the individual is related to a wider audience.

Even though our comments on the structure of the latter half of the Gospel have been brief,¹³⁴ one fact does emerge very clearly: The Evangelist has constructed his work carefully. Our task now is to discover the author's intentions in so constructing his work. In accordance with the strategy of inquiry specified at the beginning of this Chapter, we shall now focus our attention on those specific parts of the redaction which feature the Beloved Disciple. Our examination so far indicates that although he appears only three times (excluding the postscript) the placement of the incidents which feature him give him central significance. That is, he appears at the beginning of the

¹³³Brown, John, pp. 995 f.

¹³⁴Undoubtedly 20:30 f. originally formed the conclusion of the Gospel; ch. 21 is to be regarded as a postscript (see above, Chapter Three).

Discourse of Jesus to "his own" (13:23), in the Passion narrative (19:26 -- on the placement of this see above), and in the Resurrection narrative (20:2). He thus appears at crucial points in all three sections.

There have been various attempts to identify the Beloved Disciple with a particular historical figure.¹³⁵ These attempts cannot

¹³⁵The traditional view is that he was John the son of Zebedee. Irenaeus and Polycrates make this identification (Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., V, 8, 4; V, 24, 3). For further second century witnesses, see J. Colson, L'énigme du Disciple que Jesus aimait (Theologie Historique 10; Paris: Beauchesne, 1969), pp. 29-63. The most impressive argument for this identification is still in B. F. Wescott, The Gospel According to St. John (rev. ed., 1908), pp. xxi-xxv. Others who make this identification include: J. D. Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament (London: F. & C. Rivington, 1802), III, p. 318; W. Sanday, The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 252; F.-M. Braun, Jean le Theologien, pp. 396 f.; R. E. Brown, John, pp. xcvi ff.; D. Guthrie, New Testament Introduction: The Gospels and Acts (London: Tyndale, 1965), p. 224; H. Rigg, "Was Lazarus 'the Beloved Disciple'?", ET 33 (1921-1922), 232-234; D. G. Rogers, "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 214. R. Schnackenburg, John, pp. 97-104, cautiously identified the Beloved Disciple with John, but has subsequently changed his mind -- see "On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel" and "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte". The traditional evidence in favour of the identification is in fact very suspect (see Kummel, Introduction, pp. 165-174). Moreover, many arguments adduced in favour of the identification centre around a comparison with the Synoptics, which does raise certain difficult hermeneutical questions. That is, it seems incumbent upon any commentator who wishes to adduce parallels to first explain precisely how he sees the relationship between John and the Synoptics -- for if they both conceive of history in a different way, or have different historical concerns, comparisons can be (at the very least) misleading, and possibly even invalid. For example, R. E. Brown, John, pp. lxxxvii-cii, accepts that "John's historical tradition is somewhat of a challenge to the general tradition shared by the Synoptics", and wishes to further argue that the authority behind the Gospel (to be identified with the Beloved Disciple) is thus more likely to be a real authority in the Church -- "a man of status not unlike Peter's" -- i.e., John the son of Zebedee. However, he also relies heavily on arguments which can only be substantiated by a comparison with the Synoptics. He thinks that the Beloved Disciple must be identified with one of the Twelve (because of his presence at the Last Supper); that he is probably one of the "inner three" who in the Synoptics are closest to Jesus; moreover, in the

be regarded as having been successful.¹³⁶ The attempts to interpret

Synoptics John often appears with Peter and in Acts Peter and John are companions in Jerusalem (Acts 3-4) and on the mission to Samaria (8:14), a fact of significance when one notes a Samaritan mission in the Fourth Gospel. But in the Fourth Gospel itself there is no mention of an "inner three", and it is not stated that only the Twelve were at the Last Supper (see below, n. 140). Indeed, the evidence of the Gospel itself militates against the identification of John the son of Zebedee with the Beloved Disciple -- see P. Parker, "John the Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel", JBL 81 (1962), 33-43.

The Beloved Disciple has been identified with Lazarus by R. Eisler, The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel (London: Methuen, 1938); J. N. Sanders, "Those whom Jesus loved (John XI, 5)", NTS 1 (1954-1955), 29-41; -----, "Who was the Disciple whom Jesus loved?", in Studies in the Fourth Gospel, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1957), pp. 72-82; F. V. Filson, "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", JBL 68 (1949), 83-88; K. A. Eckhardt, Der Tod des Johannes als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der johanneischen Schriften (Studien zur Rechts- und Religionsgeschichte 3, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961). Eckhardt also wishes to identify Lazarus with John the son of Zebedee.

Others wish to identify the Beloved Disciple with John Mark: L. Johnson, "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 157-158; responded to by J. R. Porter, "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 213-214 and D. G. Rodgers, "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 214; Johnson replied in ET 77 (1966), 380.

There have been yet other suggestions. E. L. Titus, "The Identity of the Beloved Disciple", JBL 69 (1950), 323-328, argues for Matthias. B. W. Bacon, The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1910), pp. 301-331, thinks he is Paul. Lindars, John, p. 33, regards this particular suggestion as "grotesque", although Bultmann, John, p. 484, n. 5, who still regards the suggestion as "impossible" is more sympathetic: "...if one had to posit an actual historical figure who represented [this] free Christendom for the Evangelist, Bacon's view that Paul is intended is best as regards the subject matter".

¹³⁶ We have already pointed out the difficulties of identifying the Beloved Disciple with John the son of Zebedee (above, n. 135). The identification of the Beloved Disciple with Lazarus begins with the assumption that somewhere the Evangelist would indicate the identity of the Beloved Disciple. Given this premise, Lazarus becomes the most likely candidate in view of the fact that the Gospel does state that Jesus "loved" Lazarus (11:5). However, this argument still leaves the difficulty of why the Beloved Disciple is not named in chs. 13, 19 and 20. (The particular argument that 11:1-44 and 12:9-11 were added later to the work at a time when the Evangelist had decided to abandon the anonymity of the disciple is no answer, for it fails to take into account

the Beloved Disciple as a purely symbolic figure¹³⁷ are also open to

that his identity is still concealed in the postscript.) The proponents of this view have the merit of seeking a solution based in the text itself. However, what they seem unable to accept is the fact that the Evangelist simply does not tell us (for whatever reason) who the Beloved Disciple is. The argument that the Beloved Disciple is John Mark rests on very slender external evidence and unfortunately has no basis in the text. The idea that he is Titus or Paul need not even be considered.

¹³⁷Bultmann asserts that there is no accounting for the fact that the Beloved Disciple is never spoken of by name unless he is a symbolic figure. He thinks we must begin with John 19:26 f.: "If the scene has symbolic significance, which can scarcely be doubted, it can only be that the mother, professing loyalty to the crucified, and remaining at the cross to the end, stands for Jewish Christendom. And the Beloved Disciple therefore represents Gentile Christendom, -- not of course with regard to its ethnic character, but insofar as it is the authentic Christendom which has achieved its own true self-understanding. The self-awareness of this Christendom, emancipated from the ties of Judaism, shows itself in the two scenes 13.21-30 and 20.2-10, where the Beloved Disciple appears beside Peter, the representative of Jewish Christendom. It is he and not Peter who reclines in Jesus' bosom, and can mediate Jesus' thought. And the relation between Jewish and Gentile Christendom is portrayed in a characteristic fashion in 20.2-10, where each in his own way, by using the term in two senses, can claim to be "in front of" the other" (John, p. 484). Bultmann leaves out of account in such an interpretation 19:35 and chapter 21, because he regards the former as a redactional gloss and the latter as a redactional appendix. (He freely concedes the point that in chapter 21 "the term beloved disciple stands for a particular historical figure, clearly an authoritative one for the circle which edits the Gospel and one whose authority is placed side by side with that of Peter" -- *ibid.*, p. 483.)

Kasemann proffers the following opinion in "Ketzer und Zeuge", p. 180: "If, together with the whole of critical research [*sic!*], one rejects the historicity of this figure, seeing in him rather the embodiment of the ideal witness, one may even more precisely designate him as a projection of the author and his community into the Gospel history".

However, the most thorough-going and detailed argument for the interpretation of the Beloved Disciple as symbolic figure is offered by A. Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium* (Oslo: Osloer Universitäts Verlag; Hamburg: Grossohaus Wegner, 1959). In his work, Kragerud considers that besides the three places in the Fourth Gospel where the Beloved Disciple is explicitly mentioned (13:23, 19:26 and 20:2), two other passages refer to him: 18:18 f. and 1:35-40; (he also of course appears in 21:1-14, 15-23). Kragerud considers the material in these passages as freely invented and cannot be understood unless

serious objections.¹³⁸ We take the view that he is an historical figure

the Beloved Disciple is a symbolic figure. He considers it self-evident that the Beloved Disciple is of great significance in the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and finds the key to such interpretation in this disciple's relationship to Peter. Accordingly, he devotes much of his work to examining the meaning of the Beloved Disciple and Peter Gestalt. The Beloved Disciple represents a Christian "pneumatic" circle: "So ist L als der Representant eines kirchlichen Dienstes, und zwar eines 'pneumatischen' aufzufassen" (p. 82). Peter represents the ecclesiastical office, but the rivalry represented by Peter and the Beloved Disciple is not a matter of teaching but of practice. That is, the apostolic itinerant prophets represented by the Beloved Disciple considered themselves to be the "intellectual" leaders of the communities and conceded their authority to ecclesiastical office holders in "external matters".

This monograph does have the merit of seeking to locate the historical horizon of the Johannine community. (In particular, it is worth noting that he seeks to relate the Johannine community to the Johannine letters, and often concurs with Kasemann, e.g., "Dass Diotrophes kein anderer als eine Amtsperson in der Gemeinde sein kann, sollte eigentlich selbstverständlich sein", p. 107.) However, the monograph is open to rather serious difficulties. In particular, not only does he have difficulty with his exegesis of 1:35-42 (see A. Dauer, "Das Wort des Gekreuzigten an seine Mutter und 'der Junger, den er liebte'", BZ 12 (1968), p. 89), but his collective interpretation of 21:24 is untenable (see R. Schnackenburg's review of the book in BZ 4 (1960), 302-307, esp. 304 f.).

138

One difficulty with purely symbolic interpretations is that they fail to come to terms with the fact that the figures with whom the Beloved Disciple is associated -- Peter, Mary and Jesus himself -- are historical (even if a symbolic dimension be attributed to them). It seems to be somewhat incoherent to propose an interpretation in which a purely symbolic figure is juxtaposed with historical ones.

with paradigmatic significance.¹³⁹ But in any case, our avowed task is to focus specifically on the function of the Beloved Disciple in the redaction. Accordingly, we must now delimit and examine the texts which refer to him.

If, for the moment, we exclude the postscript, the Beloved Disciple is explicitly mentioned in three places: 13:23, 19:26 and 20:2. It seems no accident that he appears for the first time in 13:23-26. In our examination of the outline of the whole Gospel, we

¹³⁹This is also the position of the following scholars: T. Lorenzen, Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium (Stuttgarter Bibel Studien 55; Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1971), who says: "For it ought not to be maintained that the Beloved Disciple is no more than an historical figure [Gestalt]. Certainly he also has ideal and symbolic traits, but just these traits reflect his important position in the history of the Johannine community, his significant role for the typically Johannine theology, and also the theological situation of the community itself" (pp. 80 f. -- translation my own). R. Schnackenburg, "On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel", p. 234: "I would say, therefore, that we must settle the controversy in favour of a historical person, but without depriving him of paradigmatic significance". Brown, John, p. xcv: "That the BD has a figurative dimension is patent. In many ways he is the exemplary Christian, for in the NT 'beloved' is a form of address for fellow Christians. Yet this symbolic dimension does not mean that the BD is nothing but a symbol". W. Grundmann, Zeugnis und Gestalt des Johannesevangeliums. Eine Studie zur denkerischen und gestalterischen Leistung des vierten Evangelisten (Arbeiten zur Theologie 7; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1961), pp. 71 f.: "He is the bearer of revelation and as such a witness and characterization of the historicity of Jesus; he has his position in a charismatic group of the last phase of early Christianity. The Son is the revealer of the Father, the Beloved Disciple of the Son....The Beloved Disciple is both individual and type; he dies as individual, he lives on as type". M. Dibelius seems to equivocate: in "Joh 15, 13: Eine Studie zum Traditionsproblem des Johannesevangeliums", in Festgabe für Adolf Deismann zum 60. Geburtstag 7. November 1926 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), p. 180, he sees the Beloved Disciple as "the man of belief", the representative of "the disciple"; however, in Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, ET: From Tradition to Gospel (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson Ltd., 1934), p. 216, n. 2, he concedes that he is an historical figure who probably belongs to a priestly family in Jerusalem.

noted that chapters 13-17 are the Discourse of Jesus to "his own".

It is evident that the Christian readers of the Gospel are meant to identify with the group at the Last Supper¹⁴⁰ which is representative of the Church.¹⁴¹ The scene itself can hardly be maintained to be historical -- rather it is an "ideal" scene¹⁴² freely created by the Evangelist.¹⁴³

The text of 13:23 reads:

ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἰς ἓκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Now it is certainly no accident that the first reference to the Beloved Disciple refers to him as "lying close to the breast of Jesus". Many commentators have gone to great lengths to discover who was sitting where and how it was possible for the Beloved Disciple to

¹⁴⁰Note that the Twelve are not thematized here. It is therefore a mistake to see (as does, for example, Barrett) the Beloved Disciple as being one of the Twelve because he is recorded as being present at the Last Supper. The avoidance of the "Twelve" in the context of the Last Supper rather suggests that the Evangelist knew the Beloved Disciple not to be one of them.

¹⁴¹The Christian readers would obviously readily identify with a group labelled "his own".

¹⁴²So also Schnackenburg, "On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel", p. 235: "There is no possibility that this is an historical scene in the strict sense".

¹⁴³There is a growing trend to see the references to the Beloved Disciple as insertions of the redactor and not creations of the Evangelist. See H. Thyen, *Tradition und Glaube: Festschrift für K. G. Kuhn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), p. 343, n. 2, where he refers to H.-P. Otto's unpublished (as yet) dissertation *Funktion und Bedeutung des Lieblingsjünger im Johannes-Evangelium*. Otto thinks that all references to the Beloved Disciple are interpolations of the author of ch. 21, the redactor of the Fourth Gospel.

be "lying close to the breast of Jesus".¹⁴⁴ But the primary purpose of the phrase is surely to evoke a comparison with 1:18: *μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο*. That is, just as Jesus has a special relationship with the Father, so the Beloved Disciple has a special relationship with Jesus.¹⁴⁵

This special relationship is illustrated by means of the story of the betrayer. After Jesus says that one of his disciples will betray him, Simon Peter "beckons"¹⁴⁶ to the Beloved Disciple to ask Jesus who the betrayer is. The identity of the traitor is then revealed to the Beloved Disciple.

This incident has several strange features. Besides the difficulty of why Peter himself did not ask Jesus who the betrayer was, there is the problem that once the identity of the traitor is revealed to the Beloved Disciple it is not related to Peter. Indeed,

¹⁴⁴See Brown, John, p. 574.

¹⁴⁵Schnackenburg, "On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel", p. 235: the Beloved Disciple is thus presented to the readers "as the disciple closest to Jesus, as his confidant"; Barrett, John, p. 372: "...the specially favoured disciple is represented as standing in the same relationship to Christ as Christ to the Father"; (Lorenzen, Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium, pp. 83 f., takes exception to this formulation by Barrett -- only a similar relationship is meant, and one may not speak of it as the same).

¹⁴⁶It is possible that Peter could not speak out aloud because the meal was modelled on that of either the Essene or Qumran community. At such meals one could only speak in due order -- IQS 6:10. See especially K. G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the communal meal at Qumran", in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl (New York: Harper, 1969), p. 69.

v. 28 says that "no one" at the table knew why Jesus told Judas to do what he had to do immediately, when in v. 26 Jesus does reveal to the Beloved Disciple that Judas is the betrayer.¹⁴⁷

It can hardly be cogently maintained that the purpose of the pericope is to represent the Beloved Disciple as the "mediator" between Jesus and Peter and the disciples.¹⁴⁸ This is simply not true to the text. Nothing is mediated to Peter! Peter is mentioned only once in the pericope in v. 24. Certainly in this pericope nothing of significance is said about the relation of Peter to the Beloved Disciple.

What then is the point of the pericope? In Matthew, Jesus tells Judas himself that he is the betrayer; in the Fourth Gospel the secret is imparted to the Beloved Disciple. It is here that the point of the pericope is located. The whole scene specially introduces the "disciple whom Jesus loved", by which designation we are to understand him as having a special knowledge of, and relationship to, Jesus. This point is then illustrated in a simple story: the Beloved Disciple alone at the Last Supper knew of the identity of the betrayer. He was the special confidant of Jesus.

¹⁴⁷ It is true that Jesus does not specifically name Judas to the Beloved Disciple, but to assume that the Beloved Disciple did not understand the reply of Jesus (v. 26) is to assume that he was rather dim-witted, which hardly squares with the general picture we are given of him.

¹⁴⁸ As does Kragerud, op. cit., p. 22.

The next pericope in which the Beloved Disciple is explicitly mentioned is 19:25-27. The text of 19:26-27 reads:

Ἰησοῦς οὖν ἰδὼν τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα
 οὐκ ἠγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρί· γύναι, ἴδε ὁ υἱός σου.
 εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ· ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ σου. καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνης
 τῆς ὥρας ἔλαβεν ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτὴν εἰς τὰ ἴδια.

Two preliminary points are worth making. First, Peter does not figure in this incident but rather Mary, mother of Jesus. Secondly, the passage hardly squares with the Synoptic tradition that Jesus' disciples deserted him after his arrest, a tradition the Fourth Gospel does preserve: "The hour is coming, indeed it has come, when you will be scattered, every man to his home, and will leave me alone ..." (16:32). The Evangelist records the Beloved Disciple as being present at the Last Supper, and so this should apply to him as well. However, one has to be wary of concluding that this, too, is an "ideal scene", especially in view of 19:35 which can hardly refer to anyone but the Beloved Disciple under the cross, and the wording of which strongly suggests that he was there as an eyewitness.¹⁴⁹

The questions to be considered are: (1) How are we to understand the figures of Mary and the Beloved Disciple here? (2) What is the essential thrust of the whole pericope?

Bultmann¹⁵⁰ interprets Mary as symbolic of Jewish Christianity

¹⁴⁹ Schnackenburg, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte", p. 109.

¹⁵⁰ John, p. 673.

and the Beloved Disciple as representative of Gentile Christianity. E. Meyer¹⁵¹ sees the Beloved Disciple as replacing the unbelieving brothers of Jesus (7:3) and Jewish Christianity as being replaced by Gentile Christianity. But these suggestions are hardly true to the text. A. Dauer¹⁵² does not think that the emphasis in this pericope falls on Mary but on the Beloved Disciple. However, he does see the presence of the women as evoking one of the Evangelist's main themes -- the revealer is presented as the crisis of the world, calling forth unbelief and belief (represented by the soldiers -- vss. 23-24 -- and the women -- v. 25 -- respectively). This suggestion has been criticized by Brown.¹⁵³

We must look elsewhere for a plausible explanation of Mary's presence in the pericope. We begin with the text itself. In our examination of "the whole" we saw how scene four (19:1-3) was the centrepiece of Act Two (18:28-19:16). Similarly here, this scene is the centrepiece of Act Three (19:17-37). Its theological significance lies in its thematic conjunction with the Cana scene (2:1-11) through

151

"Sinn und Tendenz der Schlusszene am Kreuz im Johannes-evangelium (Joh 19, 25-27)", Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse (1924), 157-162.

152

"Das Wort des Gekreuzigten an seine Mutter und 'der Jünger, den er liebte'", BZ 11 (1967), 222-239 and 12 (1968), 80-93.

153

John, p. 904.

the term $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\eta$ derived from Genesis 3:15,¹⁵⁴ where Satan is crushed by the seed of the woman. Mary is representative of the woman, the woman who is mother of the faithful, for it is of the faithful that the Beloved Disciple is representative.

Dauer has pointed out the similarity of $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$, $\eta\delta\epsilon\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ $\eta\delta\epsilon\ \eta\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ to an adoption formula, and sees an emphasis on the disciple taking over the obligation of Mary as a grown-up son.¹⁵⁵

There is much in this insight. In the light of it, what can we say about the response the Evangelist wished to evoke from the readership in this pericope? The Evangelist is inviting his readership to identify with the Beloved Disciple, the disciple who was commissioned by the dying Jesus to be a witness and propagator of the new salvific dispensation, born under the shadow of the cross. The death of Jesus gives life to the Church.

The last pericope (apart from the postscript) in which the Beloved Disciple is explicitly named is 20:2-10. The scene presents some traditio-historical problems. Vss. 20:1-2 speak of Mary Magdalene coming to the tomb, finding the stone rolled away, and then rushing to Peter and the Beloved Disciple with the story. The two disciples then

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 925: "The episode at the foot of the cross has these details in common with the Cana scene: the two scenes are the only places in the Gospel that the mother of Jesus appears; in each she is addressed as "Woman"; at Cana her intervention is rejected on the grounds that Jesus' hour has not yet come, but here we are in the context of Jesus' hour....In becoming the mother of the Beloved Disciple (the Christian), Mary is symbolically evocative of Lady Zion who, after the birth pangs, brings forth a new people in joy (John xvi 21; Isa xlix 20-22, liv 1, lxvi 7-11)..."

¹⁵⁵Art. cit., p. 81.

run to the tomb. The Beloved Disciple arrives first, but does not enter. Peter arrives and enters. Then the Beloved Disciple enters, and he "saw and believed". V. 11 then takes up the second episode (see above) with Mary standing at the tomb. It seems at first glance as though the whole story of the two disciples is an interpolation.¹⁵⁶

However, the studies of Hartmann¹⁵⁷ and Benoit¹⁵⁸ suggest that this conclusion is too hasty, and that here we are not dealing with a story freely composed and inserted by the Evangelist. It seems as though Luke knew of a tradition of Peter visiting the grave, and that this tradition is linked with the tradition of the Fourth Gospel. What does seem probable is that the Evangelist inserted the Beloved Disciple into the story.¹⁵⁹

For the purposes of our inquiry we must pose two questions:

(1) In what sense did the Evangelist wish us to see the juxtaposition of Peter and the Beloved Disciple? (2) What is the significance of the whole pericope?

¹⁵⁶So, for example, J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Johannis (Berlin: Georg Rieme, 1908).

¹⁵⁷G. Hartmann, "Die Vorlage der Osterberichte in Joh 20", ZNW 55 (1964), 197-220.

¹⁵⁸P. Benoit, "Marie-Madeleine et les disciples au tombeau selon Joh. 20, 1-18", in Judentum, Urchristentum und Kirche: Festschrift für J. Jeremias (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 26; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960), pp. 141-152.

¹⁵⁹Schnackenburg, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte", 102 f.; Lorenzen, op. cit., pp. 24-37.

Here, as in 13:21-30, it must be noted that Peter and the Beloved Disciple are not placed in opposition. It is stated that the Beloved Disciple "saw and believed"; this is not stated explicitly of Peter. But:

Clearly, it is presupposed that Peter before him was likewise brought to faith through the sight of the empty grave; for if the writer had meant otherwise, and if the two disciples were set over against each other with respect to their πιστεύσαι, it would have had to be expressly stated that Peter did not believe.¹⁶⁰

Bultmann sees the relation of the two disciples as the key to the interpretation of the scene. The race to the grave illustrates how each achieves precedence over the other. Thus:

...the meaning manifestly then is this: the first community of believers arises out of Jewish Christianity, and the Gentile Christians attain to faith only after them. But this does not signify any precedence of the former over the latter....¹⁶¹

We agree that the relation of the Beloved Disciple to Peter is the key to interpretation here. Clearly, it is not one of rivalry; in this Bultmann is also correct. The narrative is constructed in such a way that each can claim precedence over the other. But we cannot go as far as Bultmann and identify the Beloved Disciple with Gentile Christianity and Peter with Jewish Christianity. It is evident that the Johannine community is meant to identify with the Beloved Disciple. The key to the problem of interpretation is to determine in what sense

¹⁶⁰Bultmann, John, p. 684.

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 685.

the Johannine readership would understand the representation of Peter.

There can be little doubt that Peter was a figure of great importance in early Christianity. There is a very strong tradition that he is a witness to the Resurrection (Lk. 24:34; I Cor. 15:5; cf. Mk. 16:7). He is known as an apostle (Mt. 10:12; Acts 1:13) and is recognized as the leader and spokesman of the disciples (Mt. 16:16-19; Mk. 8:27-29; cf.: Mk. 3:16, 9:2; Lk. 5:3-11, 22:31). The first chapters of Acts record him as being leader of the Jerusalem church in the early days,¹⁶² and he is an authority in Corinth (I Cor. 1:12, 22) and Galatia (where his apostleship seems to have been contrasted favourably with Paul's). Moreover, there is the strongest evidence that he was an important authority in Syria, Antioch and Rome. (The Apocryphal Gospel of Peter, the Kerygmata Petrou and the Gospel of Matthew probably originated in Syria¹⁶³ and there is a tradition that he was bishop of Antioch¹⁶⁴ and Rome.¹⁶⁵)

¹⁶²He initiates the electing of the successor of Judas (Acts 1:15-22); he speaks on the day of Pentecost (2:14-41); he is the first Apostle to perform a miracle in the name of Jesus (3:1-10); he is the spokesman before the Sanhedrin (4:1-21); he it is who pronounced judgement on Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11). However, it is true that James appears to take over Peter's position in Jerusalem at an early date -- quite possibly after Peter accepts the principle of a Gentile mission by admitting Cornelius to the Church (10:1-11, 18).

¹⁶³Peter is, of course, a key figure in Matthew -- G. Bornkamm, "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in Matthew's Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel", Perspective II (1970), 48: "...the congregation which acts in Matthew 18:15-18 knows itself as founded on the teaching of Jesus as guaranteed through Peter".

¹⁶⁴Cf. Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., III, p. 36.

¹⁶⁵This is, of course, a controverted issue. Ignatius (Rom. 4:2) seems to suggest that Peter and Paul were persons of special authority in

The Fourth Gospel itself retains the tradition of the prominence of Peter in early Christianity (cf. 1:42; 6:68, and, of course, he is the first witness to the Resurrection -- 20:6-7). In the light of these observations, how is the figure of Peter to be understood in the Fourth Gospel? It seems justified to see him not as a representative of Jewish Christianity, but in a wider context: he is representative of the Gesamtkirche.¹⁶⁶ That is, Peter represents the whole Church, while the Beloved Disciple is representative of the local Johannine Einzelkirche.¹⁶⁷

What, then, of significance is being said in this pericope? Simply this: The Johannine Einzelkirche (the Beloved Disciple) has an equal claim to that of the Gesamtkirche (Peter). Its faith and belief are just as authentic, indeed go hand in hand with that of the Gesamtkirche. The two disciples run to the grave together; one reaches the tomb first, but the other enters first. There is no attempt to denigrate Peter; rather the emphasis falls on the fact that the Beloved Disciple believed. It is not so much that the importance of Peter is played down;¹⁶⁸ rather the attempt is to elevate the

Rome, and Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., III, i, 2; III, iii, 1) explicitly says that they founded the Church in Rome. Eusebius (Ecc1. Hist., II, xxv, 5-8) cites both Gaius of Rome and Dionysius of Corinth as substantiating this tradition.

¹⁶⁶We are using this term to denote the Christian communion of communities.

¹⁶⁷We are using this term to denote a particular local Christian community.

¹⁶⁸So Lorenzen, op. cit., pp. 93 ff.

importance of the Beloved Disciple. The whole thrust of the pericope seems to be to show that just as Peter and the Beloved Disciple share the same faith experience, so the faith of the Johannine Einzelkirche can be correlated with that of the Gesamtkirche.

The Beloved Disciple is also explicitly mentioned in the postscript (21:7 and 21:20). Although added by an editor, the references are instructive in confirming our conclusions. It seems unlikely that this editor misunderstood or intentionally falsified the Evangelist's picture of the Beloved Disciple.¹⁶⁹

This observation is borne out by the text. 21:7 f. shows the same bias as 20:2-10. The Beloved Disciple recognizes Jesus first, but Peter reacts quickly and jumps into the sea in his desire to reach Jesus. Moreover, and this is of vital significance, 21:15-17 confers upon Peter a great honour. In response to Jesus' question "Do you love me more than these?"¹⁷⁰ (i.e., the disciples, including the Beloved Disciple, who are present), Peter does not reply specifically to the question. He only asserts that he loves Jesus. This is important. The Johannine church, identifying with the Beloved Disciple, would probably see this in a positive manner. The sense is

¹⁶⁹ The point is a controverted one. There are many who maintain that ch. 21 is not a postscript (see Bultmann, John, pp. 700-706 for a discussion of the problem). We, however, not only think that it is, but that it was probably added by someone who was familiar with the author's work and intentions and perhaps an acquaintance (see above, Chapter Three).

¹⁷⁰ It is unlikely that πλέον τούτων is a gloss -- see Bultmann, John, p. 711, n. 4. The possibility that Jesus is referring to the fishing tackle and not the other disciples is most improbable -- see Barrett, John, p. 486.

this: the authenticity of the faith of the Johannine community is acknowledged, inasmuch as Peter does not claim to love Jesus more; moreover, in the Fourth Gospel the theme of love is closely bound up with the concept of unity. Christians are one in love. There then follows the commission by Jesus to Peter as leader of the community.¹⁷¹

In v. 20 the Beloved Disciple is represented as doing what Peter has already been bidden to do: to follow Jesus. Again, it is difficult to see how this verse implies the Beloved Disciple's superiority to Peter; rather he is pictured as following Jesus as Peter is already doing. That is, he shares the same faith.

V. 21 contains a question about the Beloved Disciple by Peter: "Lord, what about this man?" To which Jesus replies, "If it is my will that he remains until I come, what is that to you? Follow me!" "What is that to you?" can hardly be construed as a denigration of Peter, who after all had died a martyr's death (vss. 18-19). V. 23 then corrects an apparent misunderstanding: Jesus did not predict that the Beloved Disciple would live until the Parousia.¹⁷² Presumably this was now a problem because he had died. One cannot use this verse as evidence that he is thus John the son of Zebedee, around whom legends had grown to this effect because of his immense age, for the earliest Christian belief was that the Parousia would take place before the first

¹⁷¹Bultmann, John, p. 713.

¹⁷²B. Lindars, The Gospel of John (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1972), p. 32, thinks that the point of the verse was to "stop speculation about the Beloved Disciple, which had arisen from the Gospel already completed".

generation of Christians disappeared (I Thess. 4:15 and I Cor. 15:51).

In other words, it was a general belief not attached to specific persons. Thus the Beloved Disciple could be anyone of the first generation of Christians.

V. 24 then appears specifically to identify the Beloved Disciple with the author of the Gospel. If we accept the general verdict of scholarship that this is not the case, we are left with three alternatives:

- (1) The identification was a "tactical ploy" by the author to bolster the importance of the work. The work would thus be pseudepigraphical.
- (2) The identification was a misunderstanding of the editor. This seems unlikely.¹⁷³
- (3) There is a third more plausible possibility -- *ὑπαρξας* is to be taken in its causative sense.¹⁷⁴ That is, "This is the disciple who caused these things to be written".¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³This is, of course, a possibility, but as an explanation it should only be resorted to if there is no viable alternative.

¹⁷⁴So A. Dauer, art. cit., p. 91.

¹⁷⁵It is sometimes maintained that "these things" refer only to the contents of chapter 21. Years ago T. Zahn, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1897-1899), ET: Introduction to the New Testament, III (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 237, made a point which is still valid: "If it was necessary to assure the readers that chap. 21 was written by the Beloved Disciple of Jesus, it was even more important to make clear to them who wrote chaps. i-xx".

In favour of this latter view is the fact that the causative is used elsewhere, for example 19:1.¹⁷⁶ Moreover, in 20:24b the emphasis falls on the witness of the disciple. We cannot agree with Bultmann that a definite circle is not meant by *οἱ μαθηταί*. He says, "For either the readers know the circle which is editing the Gospel, and then the appeal is superfluous; or they do not know it, and then it is meaningless".¹⁷⁷ The appeal is not superfluous if the attempt is to authenticate this community's standing in the Gesamtkirche.

This verse is important, for it shows the singular significance of the Beloved Disciple in the Johannine community as a witness of tradition. The truth of the Johannine Gospel depended on it.¹⁷⁸ Such an affirmation is also found in the Gospel proper in 19:35. The person who saw the blood and water gushing from Jesus' side is quite evidently the disciple who stood under the cross, i.e., the Beloved Disciple. Even from his different standpoint, Kragerud observes that this is the most explicit reference within the Gospel to the Beloved Disciple as Christ-witness.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶Blass-Debrunner, Grammar, para. 155, 7.

¹⁷⁷John, p. 718, n. 1.

¹⁷⁸Dauer, art. cit., pp. 91 f.

¹⁷⁹Op. cit., p. 140.

We are leaving out of our discussion the possibility that the Beloved Disciple is referred to in either 1:35 or 18:15 ff.¹⁸⁰ There is thus one other question left to consider before we proceed to a conclusion about the significance of the Beloved Disciple in the Fourth Gospel. That is the question of the anonymity of the figure. We have maintained that he is an historical figure with paradigmatic significance. But if he is historical, why is he not named? There have been various proposed resolutions to this problem.¹⁸¹ Of these, Roloff's solution seems the most plausible.¹⁸² He compares the

¹⁸⁰In 1:35-42 two disciples of John the Baptist follow Jesus. One of the two, Andrew, next brings Simon Peter (his brother) to Jesus. If the reading $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (1:41) be accepted, then the unnamed disciple would be one of a pair of brothers, i.e., James or John. However, the reading $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$ is probably to be preferred (so also Barrett, *John*, pp. 151 f.) and this reading does not allow such an inference. To assume that the reader is supposed to identify the Beloved Disciple with the unnamed disciple is entirely unwarranted by the text (so also Lorenzen, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-46). In the other pericope (18:15-17), "another disciple", known to the High Priest, brings Peter into the High Priest's courtyard. The fact that this disciple is not named and is associated with Peter has led many to speculate that he is the Beloved Disciple. But again, this is unwarranted by the text, which simply does not support the identification.

¹⁸¹For example, W. Sanday, *op. cit.*, pp. 75 f., says: "The Beloved Disciple had a special reason for not wishing to protrude his personality. He was conscious of a great privilege, of a privilege that would single him out for all time among the children of men. He could not resist the temptation to speak of this privilege. The impulse of affection responding to affection prompted him to claim it. But the consciousness that he was doing so, and the reaction of modesty led him at the same time to suppress, what a vulgar egotism might have accentuated, the lower plane of his own individuality. The son of Zebedee (if it was he) desired to be merged and lost in the 'disciple whom Jesus loved'". Such tortuous psychologizing explanations are neither convincing nor appealing.

¹⁸²J. Roloff, "Der johanneische 'Lieblingsjünger' und der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit", *NTS* 15 (1968), 129-151.

Beloved Disciple to the Teacher of Righteousness who also is not named, yet who was of great significance in the community. Lorenzen has appropriated this insight:

The parallels [of the Teacher of Righteousness] to the Beloved Disciple are obvious. Whereas the Teacher understands himself to have an intimate relationship to God, the Beloved Disciple stands in an intimate relationship to the revealer of God. As a result of this intimate relationship both are exegetes and interpreters of God and Jesus respectively. Where the Teacher grounds his authority in the words of the prophets, the Beloved Disciple depends on the way of Jesus; both distinguish themselves in that they are both initiated into the divine secret which they then communicate to the community. Both are crucial personalities in their communities and thus so well known¹⁸³ that they need not even be mentioned by name.

Our conclusion is that we do not know who the disciple is, and that the Evangelist makes no attempt to tell us. What we can say is that the Evangelist regarded him as an eyewitness to Jesus' earthly existence and that he was one of the disciples, though not necessarily one of the Twelve. It is quite possible that he was a Jerusalem disciple,¹⁸⁴ but beyond that we cannot go.

In conclusion, what is the significance of the Beloved Disciple for our particular question? How does he function in the redaction? There is no doubt that he is an important authenticator and witness

¹⁸³

Op. cit., p. 105.

¹⁸⁴

So Schnackenburg, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte", pp. 112 f.

of the tradition -- Roloff,¹⁸⁵ Dauer,¹⁸⁶ and Lorenzen¹⁸⁷ also draw this conclusion from their own studies. He witnesses to those things most important in the Christian faith -- the death and resurrection of Jesus (this is evidenced by his strategic placement in the redaction). His association with Peter is not to be seen as rivalry. The readership identifies with the Beloved Disciple but not against Peter. Rather the association is a further effort on the part of the Evangelist to legitimate the theology of the Johannine community.

Such a conclusion, if generally correct, has far reaching implications for any discussion of orthodoxy/heresy in the Fourth Gospel. The author of the Gospel is claiming through the figure of the Beloved Disciple to stand both theologically and historically within the Christian fellowship. The Beloved Disciple was the confidant of Jesus, whom the Lord recognized as understanding him well. The theology of the Johannine community is dependent upon this same person; it is through him that the Evangelist can claim that his work coheres with the truth of Divine Revelation.

¹⁸⁵ Art. cit., p. 141: the significance of the Beloved Disciple lies in his "Zeugenfunktion, die auf seiner besonderen Kenntnis von Jesu Weg und Werk beruht".

¹⁸⁶ "Art. cit., p. 92: the Beloved Disciple is the "Traditionsträger für den Evangelisten".

¹⁸⁷ Op. cit., p. 108: "The Evangelist projects this person back into the history of Jesus in order to emphasize against docetic extremists the unity of the earthly Jesus with the risen Lord, to demonstrate the reality and meaning of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus, and at the same time to emphasize the independence of the Johannine theology". Moreover, as he stood as mediator between the risen Lord and the community, he was therefore theologically a criterium for correct belief and Gemeindefrömmigkeit (109).

In conclusion, what can we say about the Fourth Gospel's concern for orthodoxy? One fact is clear: The Johannine concern for orthodoxy is organically related to the substance of Johannine soteriology. Salvation for the Fourth Evangelist, as for Paul, is contingent upon the grasp of the truly revealed, that which was revealed in Jesus Christ. Around the central affirmation that Jesus is the way to communion with the Father, the Fourth Evangelist has orchestrated "truth", "Paraclete", and "witness" to thematize communion with Jesus.

CONCLUSION

We have endeavoured in this study to offer a new perspective to the ongoing debate on orthodoxy and heresy in early Christianity. We have attempted to show in our review of the literature in Chapter One that the questions of many of the participants in the orthodoxy/heresy debate by-passes the recovery of the perspectives of the historical figures engaged in controversy. The choice of the question we have attempted to answer in this study (Does the Fourth Evangelist show a concern for orthodoxy?) focuses on an unknown-to-be-known not previously thematically treated in the debate. In Chapter Two we have endeavoured to give reasons for our definition of orthodoxy (that which coheres with Divine Revelation). It is offered as a formal definition, the material components of which are provided by the relevant data of history. We have further attempted to show in Chapter Two that Divine Revelation was a presupposition of orthodoxy in the early Christian mentality. Orthodoxy is then conceived as belief which responds to and is grounded in Divine Revelation.

In Chapters Three and Four we have focused specifically on the Fourth Gospel. In Chapter Three we have sought to ground our own suppositions and procedure in the inquiry into the Fourth Gospel. Chapter Four is the central statement of the

thesis. It is an attempt by exegetical means to discover whether the Fourth Evangelist does, in fact, show a concern for orthodoxy.

We have attempted to differentiate two phases in the Fourth Gospel's concern for orthodoxy: normative religion and normative Christianity. The first phase features the response to Jesus: salvation consists in communion with "the Father", a communion which is mediated by the gift of "eternal life" and this gift is nothing other than "truth". The second phase is secured by the Evangelist in his orchestration of such thematic complexes as "truth" and "Paraclete". In our study of the Fourth Evangelist's presentation of the figure of the Beloved Disciple we have sought to show that here the Evangelist has sought to secure the complimentary issue of the trustworthiness of the Johannine tradition. Moreover, the theme of Jesus' absolutely unique status as revealer is a paradigm for the Beloved Disciple's status in the community as the authenticator of its tradition.

If the results of our inquiry are generally correct, there is a concern for orthodoxy in the Fourth Gospel. The implications of such findings for our understanding of the history of early Christianity are important. Our study of the themes of the Paraclete and Beloved Disciple suggests that the Fourth Evangelist is to be located within an historical horizon where heresies were a problem, and that he himself is concerned to secure the faith of his own community as orthodox.

Our study has been narrowly defined and has obvious limitations. For instance, we have made no attempt to judge the

uniqueness of the theology of the Fourth Evangelist vis-à-vis pre-Johannine tradition. Furthermore, we have made no attempt to locate the Fourth Gospel in a precise locality and time. These are tasks which must be reserved for another study. But our present study has contributed positively to the orthodoxy/heresy debate by pointing out that the Fourth Evangelist is self-consciously concerned with the problem of orthodoxy and heresy. This is an aspect of the intentions of the Johannine redaction which cannot be overlooked when discussing orthodoxy/heresy in early Christianity if our evaluation of the early Christian mentality is to be essentially accurate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Texts and Tools

Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and notes on the Greek Text. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.

Bauer, W. Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934, 1965.

ET: Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, eds. R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Griechischdeutsches Wörterbuch' zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Lund: C. W. K. Gleering; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1952⁴.

ET: A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature, trans. & ed. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1957.

Blass F., and A. Debrunner Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.

ET: A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature, trans. R. W. Funk. Chicago: University Press, 1961.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and S. A. Briggs A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1952.

Brown, R. E. The Gospel according to John (i-xii). Anchor Bible 29; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966.

The Gospel according to John (xiii-xxi). Anchor Bible 29; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.

Bultmann, R. Das Evangelium des Johannes. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 15th ed. (with Ergänzungsheft). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.

ET: The Gospel of John: A Commentary, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

- Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1963.
- Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine, trans. H. L. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton. New York and Toronto: Macmillan, Vol. I, 1927, Vol. II, 1928.
- Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich, eds. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932.
ET: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Kummel, W. G. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1965.
ET: Introduction to the New Testament. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1966.
- Malatesta, E. St. John's Gospel 1920-1965: A Cumulative and Classified Bibliography of Books and Periodical Literature on the Fourth Gospel. Analecta Biblica 32; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.
- Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament; Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources. London-New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914-1929.
- Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden, eds. A Concordance to the Greek Testament; 4th ed. rev. by H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Nestle, E., and K. Aland. Novum Testamentum Graece; 25th ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1963.
- Schnackenburg, R. Das Johannesevangelium, I. Freiburg: Herder, 1965.
ET: The Gospel According to St. John, I, trans. Kevin Smyth. New York: Herder & Herder; London: Burns & Oates, Ltd., 1968.
- _____ Das Johannesevangelium, II. Freiburg: Herder, 1970.
- Turner, H. E. W. The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church. Bampton Lectures; London: Mowbray, 1954.

II. Books

- Bacon, B. W. The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1910.
- Baldensperger, W. Der Prologue des vierten Evangeliums: sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck. Freiburg i. Br., 1898.
- Bauer, W. Das Johannesevangelium (Handbuch zum neuen Testament 6). Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1933.
- Beare, F. W. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. London: A. & C. Black, 1959.
- Becker, H. Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede, ed. R. Bultmann (FRLANT 50). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Betz, O. Der Paraklet. Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannesevangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums II). Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Biemer, G. Newman on Tradition. London: Burns & Oates, 1967.
- Black, M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.
- Blinzler, J. Johannes und die Synoptiker. (Stuttgart Bibelstudien 5). Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1965.
- Boismard, M.-E. St. John's Prologue. Westminster: Newman, 1957.
- Borig, R. Der Wahre Weinstock. München: Kösel, 1967.
- Braun, F.-M. Jean le théologien et son évangile dans l'Eglise ancienne, Vol. I. Paris: Gabalda, 1959.
- _____ Jean le théologien. Vol. II, Les grandes traditions d'Israël et l'accord des Ecritures selon le quatrième Evangile. Paris: Gabalda, 1964.
- _____ Jean le théologien. Vol. III, Sa théologie. Le Mystère de Jésus-Christ. Paris: Gabalda, 1966.

- Brown, R. E. The Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1965.
- Büchsel, F. Johannes und der hellenistische Syncretismus. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1928.
- _____ Der Begriff der Wahrheit in dem Evangelium und in den Briefen des Johannes. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1911.
- Bultmann, R. Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958.
- ET: Theology of the New Testament, 2 vols. New York: Scribner's, 1951-1955.
- _____ Exegetische Probleme des Zweiten Korintherbriefs. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
- _____ Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- ET: The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Burney, C. F. The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel. London: O.U.P., 1922.
- Cerfaux, L. The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. New York: Herder, 1963.
- Colson, J. L'énigme du Disciple que Jésus aimait (Théologie Historique 10). Paris: Beauchesne, 1969.
- Colwell, E. C. John Defends the Gospel. Chicago and New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1936.
- _____ The Greek of the Fourth Gospel. A Study of its Aramaisms in the light of Hellenistic Greek. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1931.
- Conzelmann, H. Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1968².
- ET: An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. London: S.C.M., 1969.
- _____ Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas. Tübingen: Mohr, 1962.
- ET: The Theology of St. Luke. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

- Kelly, J. N. D. Early Christian Creeds. London: Longmans, 1960.
- _____. Early Christian Doctrines. London: A. & C. Black, 1960².
- Kingsbury, J. D. The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13. A Study in Redaction Criticism. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969.
- Knox, W. L. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1948.
- Kragerud, A. Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium. Oslo: Osloer Universit ts Verlag; Hamburg: Grossohaus Wegner, 1959.
- Lightfoot, R. H. History and Interpretation in the Gospels. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford: Clarendon, 1950.
- Lindars, B. The Gospel of John. (New Century Bible.) London: Oliphants, 1972.
- _____. Behind the Fourth Gospel. London: S.P.C.K., 1971.
- Linton, O. Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung: eine kritische Darstellung. Uppsala: A'Imqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri.-a.-b., 1932.
- Lorenzen, T. Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannevangelium. (Stuttgarter Bibel Studien 55.) Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1971.
- von Loewenich, Walther, Das Johannes-Verst ndnis im zweiten Jahrhundert (Beiheft 13 to ZNW). Berlin: Topelmann, 1932.
- Loneragan, Bernard J. F. Method in Theology. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972.
- MacGregor, G. H. C., and A. Q. Morton, The Structure of the Fourth Gospel. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1961.
- Martyn, J. L. History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Marxsen, W. Der Evangelist Markus. G ttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959².
- McLellan, D. The Young Hegelians and Karl Marx. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Merlier, O. Le Quatri me Evangile. La Question Johannique. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962.

- Meyer, B. F. The Church in Three Tenses. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1971.
- Michaelis, J. D. Introduction to the New Testament, III. London: F. & C. Rivington, 1802.
- Neill, S. The Interpretation of the New Testament. London: S.C.M., 1964.
- Newman, J. H. An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. (2nd ed. 1878.) Reprinted London: Sheed & Ward, 1960.
- _____. Oxford University Sermons. London: Rivingtons, 1972.
- Noack, B. Zur johanneischen Tradition. Beiträge zur literarkritische Exegese des vierten Evangeliums. København: Rosenkible, 1954.
- Norden, E. Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1913.
- Perrin, N. What is Redaction Criticism? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- de la Potterie, I., and S. Lyonnet, The Christian Lives by the Spirit. New York: Alba House, 1971.
- Rahner, Karl. On Heresy (Questiones Disputatae II.) New York: Herder & Herder, 1964.
- Richter, G. Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium: Geschichte ihrer Deutung. Regensburg: Pustet, 1967.
- Robinson, J. M., and H. Koester. Trajectories through Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Ruckstuhl, E. Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangelium (Studia Freiburgensia, n. s. 3.) Freiburg in der Schweiz: Ed. E. Paul, 1951.
- Sanday, W. The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Sanders, J. N. The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1943.
- _____. Foundations of Christian Faith. London: A. & C. Black, 1951.

- Creed, J. M. The Gospel according to St. Luke. London: McMillan & Co., 1930.
- Coreth, E. Grundfragen der Hermeneutik: ein philosophischer Beitrag. Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1969.
- Cullmann, O. The Early Church. London: S.C.M., 1956.
- Delafosse, H. Le quatrième Evangile. Traduction nouvelle avec introduction, notes et commentaire. Paris: Rieder, 1925.
- Denney, J. Jesus and the Gospel. Christianity justified in the Mind of Christ. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919.
- Dodd, C. H. Historical Tradition and the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1963.
- _____ The Johannine Epistles (The Moffatt Commentary). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946.
- _____ The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.
- Dungan, D. L. The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- Eckhardt, K. A. Der Tod des Johannes als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der johanneischen Schriften (Studien zur Rechts- und Religionsgeschichte 3). Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961.
- Eisler, R. The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel. London: Methuen, 1938.
- Ellis, E. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957.
- Fortna, R. T. The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1970.
- Gardner-Smith, P. St. John and the Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1938.
- Georgi, D. Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.
- Grundmann, W. Zeugnis und Gestalt des Johannesevangeliums. Eine Studie zur denkerischen und gestalterischen Leistung des vierten Evangelisten. (Arbeiten zur Theologie 7). Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1961.

- Guilding, A. The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. A Study of the Relation of John's Gospel to the ancient Jewish lectionary System. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960.
- Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction: The Gospels and Acts. London: Tyndale, 1965.
- Güttgemanns, E. Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr. Studien zur paulinischen Christologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Haenchen, E. Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Marcus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen. Berlin: Topelmann, 1966.
- Harnack, A. Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1910.
- Hoskyns, E. C. The Fourth Gospel, ed. F. N. Davey. London: Faber & Faber, 1947².
- Hunter, A. M. The Unity of the New Testament. London: S.C.M., 1943.
- Irenaeus, St. Selections from Adversus omnes Haereses (Early Christian Fathers, Library of Christian Classics I). London: S.C.M., 1953.
- Jeremias, J. Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960³.
- Johansson, N. Parakletoi: Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1940.
- Johnston, G. The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1970.
- Jones, G. V. Christology and Myth in the New Testament. London: Allen & Unwin, 1956.
- Kasemann, E. Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- _____ Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1966.
- ET: The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17. London: S.C.M., 1968.

- Schmithals, W. Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen (FRLANT NF 48.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956, 1965.
ET: Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians. New York: Abingdon, 1971.
-
- Paulus und Jacobus (FRLANT 85). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
ET: Paul and James (STB 46.) Naperville: Allenson, 1965.
-
- Paulus und die Gnostiker (Theologische Forschung 35.) Hamburg: Herbert Reich Evangelischer Verlag, 1965.
ET: Paul and the Gnostics. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1972.
-
- Die Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns, Eine Einführung. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1967.
ET: The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann. London: S.C.M., 1968.
- Schottroff, L. Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt. Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.
- Schultz, S. Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- Schweizer, E. Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959.
ET: Church Order in the New Testament (SBT 32.) Naperville: Allenson, 1961.
-
- Ego Eimi. Die Religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneische Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939, 1965.
- Sidebottom, E. M. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First Century Christian Thought. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Smith, D. M. The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Snell, Bruno. The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

- Sohm, R. Kirchenrecht I. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblet, 1892.
- Spitta, F. Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: McMillan, 1930².
- Sykes, S. W., and J. P. Clayton (eds.). Christ, Faith and History. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1972.
- Thyen, H. Tradition und Glaube: Festschrift für K. G. Kuhn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Torrey, C. C. The Composition and Date of Acts. Cambridge, Mass.: H.U.P., 1916.
- Tracy, D. The Achievement of Bernard Lonergan. New York: Herder & Herder, 1970.
- Welbourn, D. God-Dimensional Man. London: S.C.M., 1972.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Johannis. Berlin: Georg Riemer, 1908.
- Westcott, B. F. The Gospel according to St. John. (Speakers' Commentary, Vol. II.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880.
- Wilckens, U. Weisheit und Torheit. Eine exegetische-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu I Kor. 1-2. (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 26.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.
- Wilkins, W. Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums. Zollikon-Zürich: Evang. Verlag, 1958.
- Wilson, R. McL. Gnosis and the New Testament. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Zahn, T. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1897-1899.
ET: Introduction to the New Testament, III. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

III. Journal Articles and Essays in Collected
Volumes

- Barrett, C. K., "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians", NTS 17 (1971), 233-254.
- _____, "Christianity at Corinth", BJRL 46 (1964), 269-297.
- _____, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel", JTS 48 (1947), 155-169.
- _____, Review of R. T. Fortna, The Gospel of Signs, JTS n. s. 22 (1971), 570-574.
- Behm, J., *Παράκλητος* in TWNT.
- Betz, H.-D., "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Primitive Christianity: Some Critical Remarks on Georg Strecker's Republication of Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im Ältesten Christentum", Interpretation 19 (1965), 299-311.
- Bishop, E. F., "The Door of the Sheep in John 10:7-9", ET 71 (1959-60), 307-309.
- Blair, E. P., Review of W. Schmithals, Paulus und Jacobus, JournRel 46 (1966), 402-403.
- Blank, J., "Der johanneische Wahrheits-Begriff", BZ 7 (1963), 164-173.
- Boismard, M.-E., "Le lavement des pieds (Jn x iii 1-17)", RB 71 (1964), 5-24.
- _____, "Le chapitre xxi de Saint Jean: essai de critique littéraire", RB 54 (1947), 473-501.
- Bonsirven, J., "Les aramaïsmes de Saint Jean l'évangéliste?", Biblica 30 (1949), 405-432.
- Bornkamm, G., "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in Matthew's Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel", Jesus and Man's Hope I (Pittsburgh: Perspective, 1970), pp. 37-50.
- _____, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus", ZTK 53 (1956), 312-349.
- ET: "The Lord's Supper and the Church in Paul", in Early

Christian Experience (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), pp. 123-160.

Bornkamm, G., "Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium", in The Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology (Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd; Cambridge: C.U.P., 1956, eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube), pp. 222-269.

ET: "End-Expectation and the Church in Matthew", in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, eds. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held (London: S.C.M., 1963), pp. 15-51.

_____, "Zur Interpretation des Johannes-Evangeliums: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Kasemanns Schrift 'Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17'", EvTh 28 (1968), 8-25.

_____, Πέτρος in TWNT.

Bowen, Clayton R., "The Fourth Gospel as Drama", JBL 49 (1930), 292-305.

Brown, R. E., "The Kerygma of the Gospel according to John", Interpretation 21 (1967), 387-400.

_____, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel", NTS 13 (1967), 113-132.

Bultmann, R., "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums", ZNW 24 (1925), 100-146.

_____, "Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium", ZNW 27 (1928), 113-163 and 29 (1930), 169-192.

_____, "Johannesevangelium", RGK³ (1959), 840-850.

_____, Ἀληθεία in TWNT.

Cassian, Bishop, "John xxi", NTS 3 (1955-57), 132-136.

Chapman, C. Clarke, "Some Theological Reflections on Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum: A Review Article", Journal of Ecumenical Studies 7 (1970), 564-574.

Connick, C. Milo, "The Dramatic Character of the Fourth Gospel", ET 65 (1953-54), 173-176.

Conzelmann, H., "Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel I Kor. 15, 3-5", EvTheol 25 (1965), 1-11.

- Cadbury, H. J., "Acts and Eschatology", The Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology. Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd, eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: C. U. P., 1956), pp. 300-321.
- Dahl, N. A., "The Atonement -- An Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Ro 8:32)", in Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), pp. 15-29.
- Dauer, A., "Das Wort des Gekreuzigten an seine Mutter und 'der Jünger, den er liebte'", BZ 11 (1967), 222-239; BZ 12 (1968), 80-93.
- Davies, J. G., "The Primary Meaning of ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ", JTS n. s. 4 (1953), 35-38.
- Deeks, D., "The Structure of the Fourth Gospel", NTS 15 (1968), 107-129.
- Dibelius, M., "Joh 15, 13: Eine Studie zum Traditionsproblem des Johannesevangeliums", Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag 7. November, 1926 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), pp. 168-186.
- Ehrhardt, A. A. T., "Christianity before the Apostles' Creed", HarvThR 55 (1962), 73-119; reprinted in The Framework of the New Testament Stories (Manchester: University Press, 1964), pp. 151-199.
- Enz, J. J., "The Book of Exodus as a literary type for the Gospel of John", JBL 76 (1957), 208-215.
- Evans, C. F., "The Kerygma", JTS n. s. 7 (1956), 25-41.
- Filson, F. V., "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", JBL 68 (1949), 83-88.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., Review of U. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, TheolStud 21 (1960), 468-470.
- Friedrich, G., "Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief", in Abraham unserer Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel. Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag, eds. O. Betz, M. Hengel and P. Schmidt (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 181-215.
- Gaugler, E., "Die Bedeutung der Kirche im den johanneischen Schriften", Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift 14 (1924), 97-117; 15 (1925), 27-42.

- Giblet, J. "Aspects of Truth in the New Testament", in Truth and Certainty, eds. E. Schillebeeckx and Bas van Iersel. New York: Herder & Herder, 1973, pp. 35-42.
- Glasson, T. F. "Inaccurate Repetitions in the Fourth Gospel", ET 57 (1945-46), 111-112.
- Goodwin, C. "How did John treat his sources?", JBL 73 (1954), 61-75.
- Grayston, K. "Jesus and the Church in St. John's Gospel", LondQuartHolR 36 (1967), 106-115.
- Haenchen, E. "Neuere Literatur zu den Johannesbriefen", ThR 26 (1960), 1-43; 267-291.
- _____ "Johanneische Probleme", ZTK 56 (1959), 19-54.
- Hartmann, G. "Marie-Madéleine et les disciples au tombeau selon Joh. 20, 1-18", Judentum, Urchristentum und Kirche: Festschrift für J. Jeremias (Beihefte zur ZNW 26.) Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1960, pp. 141-152.
- Hoskyns, E. C. "Genesis i-iii and St. John's Gospel", JTS 21 (1920), 210-218.
- Hughes, J. H. "The Disciples of John the Baptist". M.A., University of Durham, England, 1969.
- Jeremias, J. "Johanneische Literarkritik", Theologische Blätter 20 (1941), 33-46.
- _____ "Artikkelloses Christos. Zur Ursprache von I Kor XV 3b-5", ZNW 57 (1966), 211-215.
- _____ "Joh 6:51c-58 redactionell?", ZNW 44 (1952-1953), 256-257.
- Johnson, L. "Who Was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 157-158; ET 77 (1966), 380.
- Käsemann, E. "Ketzer und Zeuge. Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem", ZTK 48 (1951), 292-311.
- _____ "Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche?", Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960, 214-225.
- ET: The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church", in Essays on New Testament Themes (STB 41.) London: S.C.M., 1965, pp. 95-107.

- Kasemann, E. "Aufbau und Anliegen des johanneischen Prologs", in Libertas Christiana, Festschrift für F. Delekat. München: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1957, pp. 75-99.
ET: "The Structure and Purpose of the Prologue to John's Gospel", in New Testament Questions of Today. London: S.C.M., 1969, pp. 138-167.
- Klappert, B. "Zur Frage des semitischen der griechischen Urtextes von I Kor XV 3.5", NTS 13 (1967), 168-173.
- Koester, H. "Häretiker im Urchristentum als Theologisches Problem", in Zeit und Geschichte, Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag, im Auftrage der Alten Marburger und in Zusammenarbeit mit Hartwig Thyen, ed. E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1964, pp. 61-76.
ET: "The Theological Aspects of Primitive Christian Heresy", in The Future of Our Religious Past, ed. J. M. Robinson. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper & Row, 1971, pp. 65-83.
- "GNOMAI DIAPHORAI: The Origin and nature of Diversification in Early Christianity", HarvThR 58 (1965), 279-318.
- Kysar, R. "The Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel: A growing consensus?", NovT 15 (1973), 134-152.
- Lohse, E. Review of U. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, TheolLitZeit 85 (1960), 357-359.
- Meyer, E. "Sinn und Tendenz der Schlusszene am Kreuz im Johannesevangelium (Joh 19, 25-27)", Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse (1924), 157-162.
- Michaelis, W. "Zur Herkunft des johanneischen Paraklet-Titels", Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI (in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen Sexagenarii edenda curavit Seminarium Neotestamentium Upsaliense). Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1947, pp. 147-162.
- Míchl, J. Review of U. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, MunchTheolZeit 12 (1961), 229-231.

- Mowinckel, S. "Die Vorstellung des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet", ZNW 32 (1933), 97-130.
- Nock, A. D. "Gnosticism", HarvThR 57 (1964), 255-279.
- Parker, P. "John the Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel", JBL 81 (1962), 33-42.
- _____ "Two editions of John", JBL 75 (1956), 303-314.
- Pierce, Edith Lovejoy, "The Fourth Gospel as Drama", Religion in Life 29 (1960), 253-254.
- Porter, J. R., "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 213-214.
- de la Potterie, I. "La Verita in San Giovanni", RivBib 11 (1963), 3-24.
- _____ "L'arrière-fond du thème johannique de vérité", Studia Evangelica I (1959), 277-294.
- _____ "ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς et ὁ ἄλλος les deux modes de la connaissance dans quatrième Evangile", Bib 40 (1959), 709-725.
- _____ "'Je suis la Voie, la Vérité et la Vie' (Jn 14, 6)", Nouvelle Revue Théologique 88 (1966), 907-942.
- Richter, G. "Blut und Wasser aus der durchbohrten Seit Jesu (Joh. 19, 34b)", MünchTheolZeit 21 (1970), 1-21.
- _____ Review of R. Schnackenburg, Das Johannesevangelium, MünchTheolZeit 18 (1967), 247-250.
- Riesenfeld, H. "Zu den johanneischen hina -Sätzen", StudTheol 19 (1965), 213-220.
- Rigg, H. "Was Lazarus 'the Beloved Disciple'?", ET 33 (1921-1922), 232-234.
- Robinson, J. A. T., "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community", HarvThR 50 (1957), 175-191. Reprinted in Twelve New Testament Studies. London: S.C.M., 1962, pp. 11-27.
- Robinson, J. M. "Basic Shifts in German Theology", Interpretation 16 (1962), 76-97.
- _____ Review of R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, II, Theology Today 13 (1956-1957), 261-269.

- Rogers, D. G. "Who was the Beloved Disciple?", ET 77 (1966), 214.
- Roloff, J. "Der johanneische 'Lieblingsjünger' und der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit", NTS 15 (1968), 129-151.
- Sanders, J. N. "Who was the Disciple whom Jesus loved?", in Studies in the Fourth Gospel, ed. F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1957, pp. 72-82.
- _____ "Those whom Jesus loved (John XI, 5)", NTS 1 (1954-1955), 29-41.
- Sasse, H. "Der Paraklet im Johannes-Evangelium", ZNW 24 (1925), 260-277.
- Schlatter, A. "Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten (BFCT, Jahg. 6, Hft. 4). Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1902.
- Schlier, H. "Über das Hauptanliegende des 1. Briefes an die Korinther: Eine Abschlussvorlesung", EvTh 9 (1949), 462-473.
- _____ "Meditationen über den johanneischen Begriff der Wahrheit", in Festschrift für M. Heidegger. Pfullingen: Neske, 1959, pp. 195-203.
- Schmidt, K. L. Ἐκκλησία in TWNT.
- Schnackenburg, R. Review of O. Betz, Der Paraklet, BZ 9 (1965), 138-140.
- _____ Review of A. Kragerud, Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium, BZ 4 (1960), 302-307.
- _____ "Zur Herkunft des Johannesevangelium", BZ 14 (1970), 1-23.
- ET: "On the Origin of the Fourth Gospel", in Jesus and Man's Hope, I. Pittsburgh: Perspective, 1970, pp. 223-246.
- _____ "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte", Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament: Vorarbeiten. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag; Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1970, Heft. 2, ed. J. Gnllka, et al., pp. 97-117.
- Schottroff, L. "Joh. iv 5-15 und die Konsequenz des johanneischen Dualismus", ZNW 60 (1969), 199-214.
- _____ "Heil als Innerweltliche Entweltlichung", NovT 11 (1969), 294-317.

- Schweizer, E. "Zu den Reden der Apostelgeschichte", TZ 13 (1957), 1-11.
- Smalley, S. S. "Diversity and Development in John", NTS 17 (1970-1971), 276-292.
- Smith, D. M. "The sources of the Gospel of John. An Assessment of the State of the Problem", NTS 10 (1963-1964), 336-351.
- Snaith, N. "The Meaning of the 'Paraclete'", ET 57 (1945), 47-50.
- Stanley, D. M. "The Conception of Salvation in Primitive Christian Preaching", CBQ 18 (1956), 231-254.
- Stein, R. H. "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?", JBL 88 (1969), 45-56.
- Strecker, G. "Report on the New Edition of Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum", Journal of Bible and Religion 33 (1965), 53-56.
- Teeple, H. M. "Methodology in Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel", JBL 81 (1962), 279-286.
- Temple, S. "A Key to the Composition of the Fourth Gospel", JBL 80 (1961), 220-232.
- Titus, E. L. "The Identity of the Beloved Disciple", JBL 69 (1950), 323-328.
- Torrey, C. C. "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John", HarvThR 16 (1923), 305-344.
- Turner, H. E. W. "Orthodoxy and the Church Today", The Churchman 86 (1972), 166-173.
- Wilckens, U. Review of W. Schmithals, Paulus und Jacobus, TheolLit 90 (1965), 598-601.
- _____ σοφία in TWNT.
- Wiles, M. F. "Does Christology rest on a mistake?", Religious Studies 7 (1970), 69-76. Reprinted in Christ, Faith and History, eds. S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton. Cambridge: C.U.P., 1972, pp. 3-12.
- _____ "In Defence of Arius", JTS n. s. 13 (1962), 339-347.
- Wilson, W. G. "The Original Text of the Fourth Gospel: Some Objective Evidence against the Theory of Page Displacements", JTS 50 (1949), 59-60.

Windisch, H. "Die fünf Paraklet-sprüche", in Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag 2b. Januar 1927.
Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1927, pp. 110-137.