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Abstract.

The study of the idea of knowledge in the Gospel and Epistles of John raises certain questions, the most important concerning the relationship of Gnosticism to the Johannine idea of knowledge. The problem is complicated by the late date of the Gnostic documents at our disposal. But Gnosticism did not suddenly develop in the second century A.D., though it is important to recognize post-Christian developments. There is a relationship between certain developments within Judaism and pre-Christian Gnosticism, and the important place given to "knowledge" in the Gospel and Epistles of John bears witness to the influence of the Gnostic development.

Professors Bultmann and Dodd disagree over the question of the relationship of Gnosticism to the Gospel and Epistles of John with consequences important for the idea of knowledge. The Gospel stands in a different relationship to Gnosticism than the first Epistle. The Epistle is controversial in purpose, the claims of the heretics being used as the structure and basis of the refutation. But no controversy with Gnosticism is apparent in the Gospel, though the language of the Gospel is closely related to that of the Epistle, and would seem to reflect indirect Gnostic influence.

In both the Gospel and the Epistles the idea of knowledge is wider than the specific vocabulary of knowledge. The content of, and means through which knowledge is communicated, presupposes the theme of revelation, and the means through which knowledge is experienced presupposes the examination of "seeing", "hearing", "abiding", "believing", "witness", and "love", as well as the specific verbs of knowing. From this examination it is clear that whereas "believing" is central in the Gospel, "love" is central in the Epistle, the change of emphasis being due to the confrontation with the Gnostic heretics.
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Preface

The study of the idea of knowledge in the Gospel and Epistles of John raises certain questions, the most important concerning the relationship of Gnosticism to the Johannine idea of knowledge. The problem is complicated by the late date of the Gnostic documents at our disposal. But Gnosticism did not suddenly develop in the second century A.D., though it is important to recognize post-Christian developments. There is a relationship between certain developments within Judaism and pre-Christian Gnosticism, and the important place given to "knowledge" in the Gospel and Epistles of John bears witness to the influence of the Gnostic development.

Professors Bultmann and Dodd disagree over the question of the relationship of Gnosticism to the Gospel and Epistles of John with consequences important for the idea of knowledge. The Gospel stands in a different relationship to Gnosticism than the first Epistle. The Epistle is controversial in purpose, the claims of the heretics being used as the structure and basis of the refutation. But no controversy with Gnosticism is apparent in the Gospel, though the language of the Gospel is closely related to that of the Epistle, and would seem to reflect indirect Gnostic influence.

In both the Gospel and the Epistles the idea of knowledge is wider than the specific vocabulary of knowledge. The content of, and means through which knowledge is communicated, presupposes the theme of revelation, and the means through which knowledge is experienced presupposes the examination of "seeing", "hearing", "abiding", "believing", "witness", and "love", as well as the specific verbs of knowing. From this examination it is clear that whereas "believing" is central in the Gospel, "love" is central in the Epistle, the change of emphasis being due to the confrontation with the Gnostic heretics.
Chapter One.
The Gnostic Theory of Rudolf Bultmann.

I. Introduction.

"Knowledge" is at the heart of the Johannine theology, but the use of the terms for knowledge varies in importance for our study. Sometimes these terms have no special significance and the sense is common to various areas of Greek literature as well as the Septuagint, the New Testament, and Gnostic literature. According to Bultmann the evangelist uses γνωσθείν to mean "to note" 2:27; "to recognize" 4:1; 5:6; 6:15; "to learn" 11:57; 12:9; "to confirm" 4:53; 7:51; (This use should be compared with the use of the formula ἐν τούτῳ γνωσθείν... in 1 John.) "to know" in the sense of awareness 2:24; 7:27; or "acquaintance" 1:48; 7:49; or even "understanding" 3:10.(1) But, even in the instances noted it is possible that the obvious ordinary meaning is also supplemented by a special understanding. This possibility may be indicated as we are able to ascertain the meaning of the idea of knowledge in what we may call the special uses. Most important of these are the references to "mutual knowledge". Jesus and the Father have "mutual knowledge" of each other - Jesus and "His own" have "mutual knowledge" of each other.

Here the problem is raised as to the background of these concepts. Are they the creation of the evangelist to represent the person and work of Jesus Christ, or were these concepts suggested to the writer from another context? Rudolf Bultmann is the foremost champion for the point of view that the writer of the Gospel is in debt to Gnostic literature for his special use of the concept of knowledge. His claim is more comprehensive, for he suggests that the writer is dependent on a Gnostic revelation source for much of what appears now as "sayings of Jesus", in fact that the presentation of the person and work of Christ has been subject to Gnostic influence. As far as Bultmann's presentation is concerned the existence of this Gnostic influence is of the utmost importance.

II. The Nature of Gnosticism.

Bultmann dispenses with the view which restricts the definition of Gnosticism to a Second Century Christian heresy. Rather this heresy is but an instance of a pervading phenomenon. Far from being Second Century A.D. in its origin, it is claimed that it can be traced back into the era before Christ. The Mandaean literature is of great importance in dating the
earlier stages of the spread of these ideas. From this material evidence is assembled to show the existence and connection of an ancient Iranian mystery of redemption which supposedly underlies the Johannine and Gnostic theologies. It is the Iranian myth in its Mandaean form which has influenced the Fourth Gospel. The essence of Gnosticism is not its syncretistic mythology, but an understanding of man and the world new to its time. This understanding is expressed in myth, and the mythologies are many and varied. But all are used to express "a definite attitude to life and an interpretation of human existence derived therefrom".\(^\text{(2)}\)

Attention is drawn to the work of Hans Jonas who has shown at length the unitary theme of existence in the Gnostic literature.\(^\text{(3)}\) Because this understanding of existence is expressed in many mythologies, evidence is drawn from different sources to display this theme. "The gnostic myth recounts - with manifold variations - the fate of the soul. It tells of its origin in the world of light, of its tragic fall and its life as an alien on earth, its imprisonment in the body, its deliverance and final ascent and return into the world of light".\(^\text{(4)}\) Man's true inner self is a splinter of light from the original man who was overpowered by the demonic powers in order to create a world of light. Removal of the sparks of light would return the cosmos to its original chaos. The demons stupify the sparks of light into forgetfulness of their heavenly home. Sometimes they awake or are awakened to consciousness of their heavenly origin and yearn for deliverance. The supreme deity takes pity on the imprisoned sparks of light, and sends down the heavenly figure of light, his Son, to redeem them. The Son disguises himself with a body, deceives the demons,\(^\text{(5)}\)awakens his own, reminds them of their heavenly home, and teaches them the way of return. He inaugurates the work which will be completed only when the light sparks, being set free at death, ascend to heaven and rejoin the figure of light who fell in primordial times.

Judgement is the separation of the light from the darkness and the return to the primordial chaos.\(^\text{(6)}\)

**III. The Evangelist's treatment of Gnostic themes.**

Bultmann is of the opinion that the evangelist had at his disposal a source with some such material which he employs for his own purpose. Gnostic themes are evident in the dualism, determinism, and the presentation of Jesus as the revealer. The world is the sphere of darkness
where men are under the power of the evil one, the prince of this age. Men are blind without knowing it; they believe the lie which issues from the originator of falsehood. The falsehood and the darkness are the denial of dependence on God. This denial is the claim of independence, the claim to self sovereignty. Such existence is death.

Over against this world of darkness, falsehood and bondage, which is referred to as 'below', is the possibility of existence from 'above'. The light shines and the truth is revealed. Existence is illuminated and man knows himself to exist from God. Knowledge of the truth brings freedom from the bondage of being determined by origin in the darkness of this world. The cosmological dualism of gnosticism has here become a dualism of decision. The possibility of existence in the light becomes the subject of the decision of every man.

Gnostic determination is radically altered in John. The salvation story of the Gnostics concerns only those who have the spark of light. These sparks are regathered and reconstitute the primordial existence. Only those who have the spark can be saved. The evangelist gives up the idea of pre-existence except in the case of Jesus. There are perhaps some indications of the idea where Jesus refers to 'his own'. John 1:11, 10:14, 18:37. However the emphasis is directed along the lines of election. Those who are drawn by the Father come to Jesus. Even so the demand for faith goes forth to all, for all are in darkness, under wrath. With words which call for decision, men are asked one and all whether they wish to remain in the darkness. Bishop Stephen Neill has made what seems to us to be a valid criticism of Bultmann's argument.

"It is against this background of Gnostic dualism that Rudolf Bultmann tries to interpret the Fourth Gospel. But, as a careful and honest expositor, he strikes again and again against the difficulty that this Gnostic dualism is wholly different from the dualism of the Fourth Gospel. The gnostic dualism is one of SUBSTANCE; matter in itself is evil, and the material world is necessarily identical with the realm of darkness. Light and darkness are in eternal antithesis. The sons of light are so by nature; this nature is unchangeable; what happens to them is IMPRISONMENT in the realm of darkness, but in no sense an identification
with it. They may FORGET their origin, but as soon as their true nature is revealed to them, they are saved by knowledge. But the darkness-light dualism in the Fourth Gospel is of an entirely different character; it is exactly parallel to the dualism of truth and falsehood, of righteousness and lawlessness. Man's situation is determined not by nature but by moral choice: 'This is the judgement, that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light BECAUSE THEIR DEEDS WERE EVIL' (3:19). What determines a man's standing is not an immutable nature but his relationship to God in Christ — whether of obedience unto life, or of disobedience unto death.

Moreover, the Fourth Gospel knows nothing of an eternal, self-existent world of darkness, separate from the world of light. It takes its stand firmly on the side of the Old Testament, with its doctrine of God as the creator of all things, of the sons of darkness no less than the sons of light — it was as a defence against Gnosticism that the Church inserted into the Nicene Creed the words 'by whom all things were made'.

Bultmann, therefore, is in the very curious position that, having laboriously built up the supposed 'Gnostic myth' as the background of the Gospel, he has then continually to knock it down again by showing that at every crucial point the Gospel is in tension with the Gnostic point of view, indeed repudiates it. Bultmann's own theology is one of ENTSCHEIDUNG ('decision', his great word); he sees very clearly that the Fourth Gospel, although there is in it an element of predestination, is not a Gospel of immutable destiny, but of choice and decision; faith and unbelief develop in men according to their response to the light that is manifest in Jesus Christ.

The Gnostic myth does not give us the clue that we need to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Can we look for it elsewhere?

It is here that the Qumran texts offer certain passages which are at least impressive in their approximation to the teaching of the Fourth Gospel. In the Book of the Rule of the Community (1 QS 3:15ff.), there is a long passage which deals with the spirits of TRUTH and FALSEH which are also the spirits of LIGHT and DARKNESS...

Jesus is presented in forms suggested by the Gnostic redee He is the Logos, the divine son who comes down from above. A
evangelist comes into conflict with the Gnostic viewpoint. There is a battle of dogma concerning the divine sonship of Jesus. John 7:16f, 7:26, 10:38, 14:20, 16:3, 17:7f, 17:23/25, etc. (9) The terms concerning coming from above were given historical meaning through attachment to the person of Jesus Christ. The knowledge which he brings is not of a cosmological nature, but simply the fact that he is the revealer. The act of revelation is constituted in the coming and going of Jesus. He brings the awareness of life in the world, and the possibility of life from above. Revelation, an important Gnostic theme, is the central issue of the Fourth Gospel. The death of Jesus is taken up into the idea of revelation, which is not complete until his lifting up, the perfecting of the coming and going of the revealer. Hence the question concerning glorification and not suffering as in the Synoptic Gospels.

For consistent Gnosticism, all knowledge is the gift of divine revelation, including the knowledge leading up to vision. Thus knowledge is essentially knowledge of God in mystical vision. Thus, knowledge centered in myth leads to ecstatic vision. With the Fourth Gospel it is different. The ideas of seeing and knowing are still together, but they are directed in an historical manner. The object of seeing and knowing is not given in mystical vision but in historic encounter. Whereas the mystic experience leads to ecstasy, knowledge of the historic person of Christ is expressed in λογία. (9) What the evangelist has taken over at this point is the fact of revelation in knowledge. The subject matter has been developed in a different way. But we note that Gnosticism is not the only religion of revelation, the Old Testament bears witness to the revealing activity of the God of Israel. (10)

The new understanding of existence, which is the essence of Gnosticism, also takes a new look in the Fourth Gospel. Judgement, expressed in the coming of the light, is both the denial of existence from below and the opening up of the possibility of existence from above. There is no place here for the crude cosmological knowledge which is often bound up with the Gnostic systems. The recognition of Jesus the revealer is sufficient knowledge to bring about the change from life to life. Jesus is the man in whom God reveals Himself and in whose life is displayed as existence in dependence and love. There
revelation in this man Jesus. That the revelation is in him and not someone else is the scandal, and can be known only by faith. Knowledge in faith is characteristic of Gnosticism, but there faith is inferior to knowledge, and is regarded as a prerequisite to vision. In the Fourth Gospel knowledge is promised to faith, but even so, the object of faith and knowledge is the same, and this knowledge is implicit in true faith. Jesus' knowledge of men's thoughts 1:42, 47f.; 16:3f. etc. is regarded by Bultmann as evidence of the influence of the Hellenistic θείος θεός, but as used by the evangelist Jesus' miraculous knowledge is placed in the context of the revelation, which Jesus is and brings. He knows what is to befall him 2:19, 21; 13:1; 18:4; 19:28. "For him, the perfect Gnostic' (i.e., knower), fate is no riddle". (12)

IV. The Offenbarungsreden.

Bultmann's theory of Gnostic influence is most important, but it needs to be tested at several points. Why does Bultmann claim that a Gnostic document was used as a source of the Gospel? The apparent unity of the Gospel makes this suggestion puzzling in the first instance. But there are three notable exceptions to this unity, John 1:1-18; 7:53-8:11; and chapter 21. 7:53-8:11 is almost certainly a later interpolation, being omitted by some of the most ancient authorities, and chapter 21, though there is no textual evidence that the Gospel ever circulated without it, appears to be an appendix added to the completed Gospel by the community from which the Gospel issued. Bultmann claims that it is one of the additions made by "the ecclesiastical redactor".

The Prologue, John 1:1-18, is of fundamental importance to Bultmann's source theory. Firstly, we notice that there are some words that are used here and nowhere else in the Gospel. Χάρεις is used in 1:14, 16, 17, and ἀγάπη is used in its place in the remainder of the Gospel. The evangelist probably preferred ἀγάπη because he wished to relate the love revealed in Jesus to the love within the Christian community. The use of καὶ θέλωμα 1:16 are not as significant as each occurs only once and καὶ θεόλογον is used frequently, see 3:29 etc. Although ἀληθεία is used frequently throughout the Gospel it is used in the formula ἐν καὶ ἀληθείᾳ which is a translation of ἀληθείας τούτων see Dodd Interp., pp.175f.) only in the Prologue. The sense of ἀληθεία in this formula differs from the characteristic Johannine use, but the
sense is related to John 3:21, ὁ δὲ αὐτῷ τὴν ἀλήθεια... Three further words κόλπον 1:18; ἐβγέγεγεν 1:18; and Λόγος used as a Christological title 1:1 etc. are to be found only in the Prologue. In the context where ἐβγέγεγεν could have been used we find instead γνωρίζειν 15:15; 17:26. As far as Bultmann is concerned the evidence of these words is unimportant because he attributes 1:17-18 to the evangelist. Thus we are left only with Χριστός and Χριστόμενος as evidence of the existence of a source. Apart from the Prologue Λόγος or the plural Λόγοι refer to spoken words. But what is said of Jesus as 'the Word' in the Prologue is presupposed in the rest of the Gospel in which Jesus is the one who has come from the Father and has intimate knowledge of him. What the evangelist has to say about the relationship of Jesus to his words, 6:35; 63:68, suggests that he may be developing the idea that Jesus is the Word. Jesus speaks God's word 17:14; that word is truth 17:17; and Jesus says "I am the truth" 14:6. In John 6 we have noted that Jesus' words are life giving, and that he says of himself "I am the bread of life".

The failure to use the Logos title raises problems that a source theory does not solve. If the evangelist was aware of the Logos title, and did develop in the Gospel themes which could be summed up in this title, why did he not use it along with his other Christological material? The evangelist was free to use ideas suggested by source material in any part of the Gospel. If there are reasons for restricting the title to the Prologue then the fact that it is found there alone cannot be said to indicate the existence of a source. The reason we suggest is that the Logos Christology, once suggested in the Prologue, becomes the presupposition of the whole Gospel which no longer needs to be mentioned. The fact that this aspect of Christology is not overworked gives it all the more effect in the Prologue.

The accumulation of words used only in the Prologue is not as impressive when it is remembered that some of these words are used once only in the Gospel, and that the Prologue, because of its special position, may state themes which lie beneath the surface of the rest of the Gospel. Further, it is misleading to emphasize these words and to ignore the fact that leading themes of the Gospel are introduced in the
The words 'life', 'light', 'witness', 'true', 'world', 'glory', 'truth', (see 1:4,7,9,10,14.) all introduce themes that are taken up in the Gospel, and although the Logos Christology does not appear outside the Prologue, it is consistent with the Christology of the rest of the Gospel. "In this respect, as in others, the Prologue and the rest of the Gospel are complimentary to each other. Like Logos in the one, Jesus in the other is pre-existent, the Son of God, the light of the world; he is rejected by those who should receive him, but gives to his own the grace and truth which are the life of the children of God." (13)

The real beginning of Bultmann's search for the Offenbarungsreden (the Revelation discourses) arises from the task of exegesis. He claims that the Gospel cannot be understood without the recognition of the Gnostic influence, a judgement based on his knowledge of the Gospel and the age in which it was written. In his exegesis of the Prologue he claims that certain difficulties are removed if 1:1-5,9-12,14,16 are regarded as the source and 1:6-8,15 the comment of the evangelist. This judgment is confirmed by the fact that the source sections are written in a rhythmic, poetic style, where an idea is first stated and then repeated. In John 1:1-4 the following development is noted: λόγος... λόγος, θεός...θεός, ζωή...ζωή, φῶς...φῶς, σκοτία...σκοτία.
The verses attributed to the evangelist are written in prose. The poetic style of the source betrays its Gnostic background as a comparison with Gnostic literature, and especially the Odes of Solomon, indicates. The source is identified as a cultic hymn celebrating the incarnation of the pre-existent Logos in John the Baptist. The hymn had been known to the evangelist because he had been converted from the 'Baptist sect' (which was supposedly a forerunner of the Mandaean sect.) (14)

Bultmann's argument needs to be questioned at several points. Firstly the style which he attributes to the source could perhaps be said to have been forced upon the text. Some commentators consider that the Prologue is written in prose. "The Prologue, then, stands before us as a prose introduction which has not been submitted to interpolation and was specially written (as it must be supposed) to introduce the Gospel." (15)

But even if it is admitted that there is evidence of the use of a hymn as
the source of the Prologue, and that the source contained precisely the
verses suggested by Bultmann, it would be far from admitting Bultmann's
claim that the hymn originated in the 'Baptist sect', and that it
originally expressed Oriental-Gnostic ideas. To suggest that the
evangelist's comment in 1:6-8,15 because it draws attention to the
Baptist's witness to Jesus, indicates that the Baptist was originally
the subject of the hymn is fanciful, even if the Fourth Gospel does make
more of the Baptist's witnessing role than the Synoptic Gospels, and in
doing this overlooks completely Jesus' baptism by John. But the fact that
John did baptize people is mentioned often (1:25,26,28,31,33; 3:23; 10:40),
and that he continued to baptize people during Jesus' ministry 3:22ff. If
we admit that a 'Baptist sect' continued and was a problem at the time the
evangelist wrote his gospel, and that the Gospel was written to refute the
sect, there is still an enormous gap to be bridged to show that the
evangelist was originally a member of that sect, and that the hymn in
question was one of the cultic hymns of the sect.

Thus far we have allowed the existence of the 'Baptist sect' to go
unchallenged. What is the evidence for the continued existence of this
sect towards the end of the first century?
1. The anti-Baptist polemic of the Gospel. The sitz-im-leben of this
material is said to be the Church's continuing conflict with the
'Baptist sect'. It is true that the evangelist makes more of the Baptist
as a witness to Jesus 1:7,8,15,32,34; 3:26; 5:33 than the Synoptic Gospels
(But see Mt.1; Matt.3; Mk.3; 5:33; 7:18-35; see also Acts 1:22; 10:37;
13:24f). But then he makes more of the theme of witness to Jesus. Others
who bear witness are, the woman of Samaria 4:39; Jesus himself 5:31?
8:18; the works commissioned by the Father and performed by Jesus 5:36;
10:25; the Father 8:18; the Scriptures 5:39; the crowd 12:17; the
Paraclete 15:26; the Apostles 15:27; and the beloved disciple 19:35;
21:24. Witness to Jesus is a major theme of the Gospel. It may be that
the evangelist has merely set the Baptist in the context of his theme of
witness borne to Jesus.
2. The Acts of the Apostles indicates that there were those who had been
baptized by John the Baptist, and evidently had not entered into the
Christian community because they had not received Christian baptism nor the
Holy Spirit Acts 18:25; 19:1-7. But there is no suggestion that these people were setting the Baptist over against Jesus. They were ignorant of Christian baptism which Paul makes clear is baptism by the Spirit. If this problem has been distorted by Luke, at least we would expect to find something in Paul's epistles which would indicate the existence of the Baptist sect. But such is lacking.

3. Bultmann places much weight on the evidence of the Mandaean literature and the 'Clementine Homilies'. The 'Clementine Homilies' cannot be earlier than the fourth century A.D. The reference which is important is 2:22-25, which deals with the way in which Simon Magus replaced Dositheus as leader of the Baptist sect after the death of John the Baptist. The whole account is in conflict with what we know of Simon from Acts 8, and from Irenaeus (Adv Haer. 1,23,1-4) who wrote in the latter part of the second century. The Mandaean literature cannot be earlier than 700 A.D. in its present form. The system probably arose in Southern Iraq about the fifth century A.D. under the influence of Dosithean, Marcionite, and Manichaean teaching. This could mean that the whole tradition of the rival 'Baptist sect' depends on the tradition of the 'Clementine Homilies'. The reliability of this tradition is questionable. G.R.Driver is of the opinion that the eponymous founder of the Dosithean sect is only a mythical figure (The Judaean Scrolls p.79.), and the relationship of John the Baptist to him and Simon Magus which we read of in the 'Clementine Homilies' is probably the creation of a later age which found in John the Baptist a worthy founding figure for a baptizing sect.

If a hymn was used as the source of the Prologue (the possibility that the Prologue is a specially written introduction to the Gospel cannot be overlooked), with or without verses 6-8,15, it seems more likely that it is of Christian origin, perhaps from the community from which the Gospel emerged. The early Christians sang hymns to Christ as God (Pliny Epp.X (ad Traj.) xcvi,7), and commentators have suggested that there is evidence for this in the New Testament in such passages as Philippians 2:6-11; Col.1:15-20; 1 Tim.3:16; 1 Peter 3:18-22; (and 1:20); Hebrews 1:1-4. (16) (See also Eph.5:19; Col.3:16.) If verses 6-8,15 are the evangelist's addition to the original hymn, it may be, as Bultmann has said that the evangelist is writing with the problem of the Baptist sect in mind.
But there are other reasons for introducing the Baptist's witness at this point. In a hymn it may be that there would be no place for the Baptist, but a Gospel is another matter. In Mark 1:1 the appearance of John the Baptist marks the beginning of the Gospel, and by introducing the witness of the Baptist in the Prologue the evangelist is in agreement with the Synoptic Gospels who introduce him at the commencement of Jesus' ministry, and has thereby introduced a major theme of the Gospel.

If there is evidence that a hymn was used as a source of the Prologue, there is also evidence that such a source has been woven carefully into the fabric of the Gospel and that major themes of the Gospel have been embedded in it. This process makes the discovery of an otherwise unknown source exceedingly difficult.

The evangelist's method of treating his sources is indicated by his use of the Synoptic Gospels, and his method of using the Old Testament. "If we did not possess Mark it would be quite impossible to separate the apparently Markan sections from the rest of John and recognize their origin in a distinct source." It seems certain that John knew a tradition like the Synoptic tradition if not the Gospels in their present form. His treatment of his source material in this case has made impossible the clear identification of his source with the Synoptic Gospels. The similarity of the material has led C.H. Dodd, who argues that the evangelist was independent of the Synoptic Gospels, to conclude that the evangelist was dependent on a tradition akin to the Synoptic tradition. He claims that the differences preclude identification of the source with the present Gospels. But the evangelist's treatment of his sources would also account for the differences. We cannot suggest from the evidence that the evangelist would be content to simply repeat the material contained in his source.

In the case of the evangelist's use of the Old Testament it has been argued that the texts were quoted from memory. Goodwin concludes "It is reasonable to suppose he (the evangelist) would have treated his unacknowledged sources in the same manner (as he treated the Old Testament)."

That is freely and from memory. Did the evangelist also quote from the Synoptic tradition freely and from memory? This would account for differences of detail.
V. The Composition of the Gospel - The Sources.

Using his Form and Source Critical methods Bultmann claims to have discovered three major sources, the Offenbarungsreden, of which the hymn in the Prologue forms part, the Semoeia source containing miracle stories, and the Passion source which may be connected to the Semoeia source.

Bultmann's work on the Prologue provides him with evidence of the evangelist's hand in the remainder of the Gospel. The insertion of 1:6-3,15 are an example of the evangelist's method of using his source in a polemical fashion. The evangelist uses the motif of misunderstanding. The words of Jesus are misunderstood by the hearers, e.g., 3:14. The scheme of rejection and acceptance is characteristic of the evangelist also (2:23). Bultmann finds confirmation to his view concerning passages ascribed to the evangelist in that he is able to identify common theological terms and motifs throughout. The effect of the evangelist's comments is to demythologize the crude Semoeia-source and especially the Offenbarungsreden. The signs are made vehicles of revelation and the Gnostic mythology is rejected by historicizing the discourses in the life of Jesus where they indicate the significance of Jesus as the revealer, and call for the crisis of decision. Bultmann recognizes that in doing this the evangelist uses certain techniques which both indicate and disguise his hand.

The nature of the sources defined by Bultmann as Offenbarungsreden, Semoeia-source, and Passion source, means that they are quite distinct from each other. The only problems are, the separation of the sources from the evangelist's comments, the reconstruction of the text which supposedly has been disarranged, and the removal of later redactions. The redactions are intended to bring the Gospel into harmony with second century Christianity. Passages concerning the Sacraments, and Apocalyptic eschatology are in Bultmann's opinion, out of harmony with the evangelist's work. The tendency to agree with the Synoptic Gospels and the emphasis on the beloved disciple as eye-witness and author are also said to be later redactions.

The Offenbarungsreden, with the exception of the Prologue, provide the sayings of Jesus which become the texts upon which the evangelist comments. It is this particular source that chiefly concerns us here.
That sources were used in the composition of the Fourth Gospel is almost
unanimously agreed, but the reconstruction and identification of any such
sources is uncertain, and the possibility of success in this task has been
denied by some scholars.(26) The difficulty of the task is recognized by
Bultmann. He admits that the evangelist sometimes copies the style of the
Offenbarungsreden and takes up its themes himself. It is not surprising
to find that Jeremias and Ruckstuhl, using the Johannine characteristics
of style suggested by E. Schweizer,(27) have indicated that these
characteristics are not limited by the strata of supposed sources, but
occur in the Offenbarungsreden, the evangelist's comments, and elsewhere.
The stylistic arguments for the use of such a source break down at this
point. Hence Käsemann asks whether the evidence of style and content
adduced by Bultmann really indicates a source plus the evangelist's
comments or merely that the evangelist has used Gnostic expressions.(28)
The importance of this distinction is crucial exegetically as is indicated
by the different conclusions each draws from John 1:14. Bultmann,
supposing that a pagan Gnostic source provides the details, considers the
meaning to be the concealment and paradox of revelation. Käsemann under-
stands the verse to mean the glory of the divine presence in the person
of Jesus. Thus Käsemann destroys to some extent the dichotomy Bultmann
posits between the Revelation discourses and the miracles source. If
Käsemann's exegesis is correct, Bultmann's source theory becomes super-
fluous, and it would seem that the evangelist used the discourses of
Jesus to express his Christological understanding. The use of traditional
Christian source material need not be denied, whether written or oral.
What seems plain is that all the material as it now stands, bears the mark
of the evangelist.

The external evidence, drawn from Gnostic writings to identify the
Offenbarungsreden, suffers from two deficiencies. All of the evidence
is demonstrably later than the Fourth Gospel, and the evidence is drawn
from different sources with varying likenesses. One of Bultmann's
students, Heinz Becker,(29) has attempted to show that a schema existed
in the Gnostic literature (including the Fourth Gospel), and was used to
convey the Gnostic themes. With the exceptions of Proverbs and Sirach,
all the literature referred to is later than the Fourth Gospel, and much
of it comes from heretical Christian sects. The form Becker seeks is obviously difficult to discover consistently. In Proverbs 8:14-14, 32-36, and Sirach 24:3, 6, 9, 10, 19-22, the form can be recovered after some manipulation. This leads to an interesting alternative to Becker's conclusion. Perhaps John's Kerygma form originated within Judaism, and was later developed in Gnostic writings. Even if it could be demonstrated that the evangelist used such forms, the discovery of any source, Gnostic or otherwise, is another matter. If such a form was known to the evangelist, there is no reason why he should not use it in his own writing. Kasemann seems to be right in concluding that the Gospel comes from the Christian tradition, and was intended for use in a Gnosticising situation.

The supposed redactions, according to Bultmann, intended to make a Gnostic-like document acceptable to the growing "Catholic" Church, are not convincing once the Offenbarungsreden has become doubtful. The extreme interpretation of such sections as 6:51c-58, seems to be unnecessary. Bultmann, taking this as an addition made by the redactor, understands it in the terms of the theology of Ignatius as "the medicine of immortality". (Eph 20:2.) But this is not the only interpretation of the passage, a fact which Bultmann fails to consider. The chapter can be interpreted quite consistently if verses 51c-58 are taken as the "Jews" misunderstanding of the words of Jesus. They understood him to mean that they should really eat his flesh and drink his blood. Jesus points out their error 6:63, and indicates that his words are open to a completely different interpretation, for it is in coming to him that one eats and is satisfied, and in believing in him thirst is quenched for ever 6:35. Not only is this interpretation consistent, the misunderstanding - motif is discovered in the suspect passage, and as Bultmann claims that this motif is characteristic of the evangelist's method this also seems to confirm our opinion of the unity of the chapter.

The validity of taking the Fourth Gospel as it stands depends on what it has to say to its readers. If it does not make sense at some point, it will be necessary to ask why. Was the evangelist inconsistent? (We may not rule out the possibility of conflicting statements by a single author). Is the document corrupt? Is there evidence of the existence of a source? But where the Gospel makes its point plainly there is no problem.
It has been said that Bultmann has undertaken the exegesis of an unknown source in the place of the Fourth Gospel. The removal of certain sections of the Gospel certainly leads in this direction, and it is true that it is the reconstructed Gospel that he makes the basis of his interpretation of the Johannine theology. But it is not an unknown source alone that is the basis of Bultmann's work. The work of the evangelist in commenting on this source is part of what Bultmann considers the authentic Gospel. Only later redactions are to be corrected. Of the evangelist's work he writes:

"These insertions are not to be eliminated as interpolations; they are the evangelist's own comments, (the ancient world has no knowledge of notes placed under the text), as is confirmed by the way he works throughout the Gospel. It goes without saying that the exegesis must expound the complete text, and critical analysis is the servant of this exposition. The case is only otherwise where glosses of a secondary redaction occur". (31)

But why should the work of editing done by the evangelist be applauded, and the work of a later editor (or editors) deplored? Bultmann's answer to this question is that the later additions confused and contradicted the earlier work of the evangelist. But even if Bultmann is right about the editing process we do not know if the evangelist finished his work in the first place, and the redactor may be more responsible for the present form of the Gospel than Bultmann has allowed. Further, according to Bultmann's own arguments the additions of the redactor were intended to make the Gospel acceptable to the Church of the second century. It was the Gospel in its present form that was accepted into the Canon, and if there was a pre-redactional stage of the Gospel it may have been just as unacceptable to the Church as the unedited sources posited by Bultmann. Further there is no textual evidence that the Gospel ever circulated in any other than its present form. There is, therefore, a strong case for interpreting the Gospel as it stands, and this reinforces the arguments of the commentators who find that the Gospel is intelligible in its present form.
"At present there is a widespread tendency to believe, in spite of a complete absence of evidence in the manuscripts to support the theory, that misplacement, either on a large or on a small scale, has occurred in the text of this gospel."

"It should not, however, be assumed that the reason for the maladjustments, if such they are, lies in dislocations of the text after it had left the evangelist's hands; and in the complete absence of textual evidence to support suggested rearrangements, it is reasonable to hold that no attempt should be made to alter the order of the text as we have it." (32)

VI. The Nature of the Gnostic influence.

The discovery of the fragment of John containing chapter 18:31-33, 37, 38 (Rylands Papyrus 457) which dates from the early second century, and is not likely to be the autograph copy, makes a date in the first century A.D. probable for the origin of the Gospel. The possibility for such a date has been supported to some extent by the discovery of the Qumran texts which have done much to show that the style, language, and thought of the Gospel are not necessarily late, but may well belong to the first century A.D. (33)

On the basis of date alone we may rule out of the question any suggestion that the evangelist was dependent on the Hermetica. (34) It does not seem possible that the date of the Poimandres Tractate can be pushed back any further than the second century. (35) The works of Philo are early enough to make possible a theory of the evangelist's dependence on his work, but the evidence for this is so slight that other possibilities are more probable. No direct quotation is discernable, and such words as are common to both writers can also be found in other places. The Johannine Logos could just as well be said to be dependent on the Stoics, from whom Philo also borrowed in the formation of his Logos doctrine, or the use of Logos in the LXX to translate Ἰάτ in the phrase Ἰάτ Ἰάτ. (36) Philo also is also aware of this tradition.

Bultmann considers that the real question is the origin of the Logos thought in Philo and the Hermetica. He regards their writings as documents from which he may illustrate the pervading Gnosticism of the time. It is his opinion that the Logos doctrine has its origin in the Gnostic redemption myth. He also claims that the Qumran texts are Gnostic
documents. But they cannot be the source from which the Gospel sprang because they present no redeemer myth.\(^{37}\) This may indicate some weakness in the theory. Not only is a source presupposed, but the subject matter has been decided and made the criterion of any evidence which is produced. The source must be Gnostic in its understanding of existence, and present a mythical redemption figure of the revealer who comes and returns to his place of origin. It is important to note that the New Testament provides the first evidence of the redeemer myth. What is more, not all Gnostic documents have a redeemer myth. We note the Qumran texts (Bultmann has drawn attention to the absence of the redeemer myth here), and the Hermetica. "There is in the Hermetica no trace of a 'saviour' in the Christian sense that is, of a divine supra-cosmic Person, who has come down to earth to redeem men, has returned to the world above, and will take up his followers to dwell there with him".\(^{38}\)

The Polymandres Tractate does portray a revealer figure, \textit{Noûs Mind}, who is God and at the same time the mind of Hermes. The point made is that revelation takes place when the human mind contemplates the knowledge sought and the divine mind communicates this knowledge. There is an identification of the human mind with the divine Mind, and a distinction from it. The human mind appears to have come from the divine mind and this explains the kinship between them. The Mind of the Polymandres is not the sort of revealer or redeemer that Bultmann presupposes lies behind the evangelist's presentation of Jesus.\(^{39}\)

The texts of Chenoboskion seem to indicate that the earliest presentation of the redeemer myth is to be found in writings strongly influenced by Christian ideas. The Gospel of Truth, which may have been written by Valentinus,\(^{40}\) is close to orthodoxy, and very much like some other writings which were not considered heretical. There is "nothing of what has frequently been considered the kernel of gnostic mythology viz. the journey of the soul to heaven or of the redeemed Redeemer".\(^{41}\) VanUnnik suggests that Irenaeus did not subject this work to close criticism, although he was aware of it, "because although the Gospel of Truth is gnostic its gnosticism is not emphasized".\(^{42}\) Professor Quispel argues that there is no discernible Iranian influence in the whole codex, and that heterodox Judaism supplied speculative ideas about Adam, which
in turn were borrowed from the Gnostics by the Manichaean. He continues, "There would appear to be good grounds for supposing that it was from Christianity that the conception of redemption and the figure of the redeemer were taken over into Gnosticism. A pre-Christian redeemer and an Iranian mystery of redemption perhaps never existed." (43) "The question of the Gnostic redeemer is remarkably difficult to answer. In pre-Christian Graeco-Roman religion there was no redeemer or saviour of a Gnostic type. There were gods who died and rose again, but they did not give saving knowledge to their followers... The most obvious explanation of the origin of the Gnostic redeemer is that he was modelled after the Christian conception of Jesus. It seems significant that we know no redeemer before Jesus, while we encounter other redeemers (Simon Magus, Menander) immediately after his time." (44) The conclusion which seems to suggest itself is that the Gnostic redeemer myth manifests an heretical development of Christian thought. If such is the case, the question of the influence of the Fourth Gospel on the development of the myth is important.

Certain aspects of possible Gnostic influence still need to be dealt with at this point. Bultmann is of the opinion that the essence of Gnosticism is the new understanding of existence which emerged. (45) The question is, "at what point does this new understanding first appear?" (46) The evidence would seem to suggest some date after the first century A.D. though certain tendencies are discernible at an earlier date. Before looking into this, the unified understanding of existence, which is claimed of the Gnostic writings, ought to be questioned, because this suggests a common origin for the various forms of Gnosticism in the Iranian redemption myth.

The essential message of gnosticism is built up into a unified whole only by disregarding chronology and piecing together material from different sources. This unity appears to be quite artificial. (47) The Poimandres of the Corpus Hermeticum does present an understanding of existence. This is far from admitting one understanding of existence common to this class of literature. The anti-Gnostic Fathers were not aware of any such unity. (48) Irenaeus says, "when two or three sectaries are together, none of them can express himself in the same way as the
others, but each one explains different things using different terminology". Doresse continues, "they borrow from one another, in defiance of all logic, mythical elements that are contradictory or incompatible..." Quispell has observed that almost the entire Near East made its contribution to the development of Gnostic theory. The important point is that we have no conclusive evidence for the combination of these ideas into a coherent system before the rise of Christianity. 

We have indicated some of the basic differences in the Fourth Gospel which distinguish it from Gnostic thought. Interestingly enough, these are the points where Bultmann suspects Gnostic influence. The great difference that separates them is viewed most clearly from the point of view of dualism. In the Fourth Gospel, all things were made by the Word of God. There is no real dualism in the sense of two eternal and separate principles. What does exist is a conflict between good and evil, and in this conflict evil is overcome. This leads to a different kind of eschatology. For the Fourth Gospel eschatology is the final triumph of God over evil. The last event in Gnostic thought is the final separation of the two principles, light and darkness, which had become mixed together in the created order. The idea of knowledge differs also. Because the spark of light existed originally in the world of light, knowing meant for the Gnostic, REMEMBERING that former state of existence prior to imprisonment in the world of darkness. In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus brings knowledge which opens up possibilities that did not exist before his coming. Knowledge is concerned with him.

These observations concerning the differences of thought of the Fourth Gospel and the Gnostic writings together with the reservation indicated with regard to a pre-Christian Gnosticism, seem to indicate that the Fourth Gospel originates in a tradition other than Gnosticism. The Apocalyptic writings of Judaism, including the Qumran texts, show an affinity to the Fourth Gospel which is much closer than the Gnostic writings. "But now we can see from the Essene Texts, for the theology of which dualism is fundamental, that there was also in Palestine a dualistic way of thinking. This Palestinian dualism exhibits three characteristics which completely differentiate it from Gnostic dualism:
it is monotheistic, ethical and eschatological. These are exactly the characteristics which are exhibited by the Johannine dualism.

The Fourth Gospel "is not to be interpreted against the background of Gnostic presuppositions, but against that of Palestinian Old Testament, theological thinking, and of a piety rooted and grounded in the Bible". (50)

With regard to the origin of this monotheistic, ethical, eschatological dualism, the possibility of Iranian influence must be recognized. Isaiah 45:5-7 has sometimes been suggested as an anti-Zoroastrian theme subordinating dualistic tendencies to a strict monotheism. But if Zaechner is right, (51) the original teaching of Zoroaster also subjected dualistic tendencies to a strict monotheism. Only in later Zoroastrian teaching did this develop into an absolute dualism.

The most important point is made by comparison of the teaching about the two Spirits in 1 QS III: 13-IV:26 and the Gathas. It would seem that the Qumran teaching bears the mark of Iranian influence which, according to Albright (52) cannot be detected until the Second Century B.C. During the Hellenistic age Iranian thought influenced many of the current religions. Judaism took over such elements as were reminiscent of their own religion, such as the doctrine of the two Spirits which is akin to the teaching of the good and evil inclinations which we meet in Rabbinic literature. Apocalyptic literature in Judaism seems to owe something to the Iranian influence. The question of Iranian influence is aggravated by the fact that the literary period of Zoroastrianism was not until about 250 A.D. (53) but Zaechner thinks that the Gathas have come down with little change from the time of Zoroaster.

If Zaechner is wrong about the original qualified dualism of Zoroaster, the qualification must be attributed to the monotheistic tendency in Israel.

At the same time, there is some indication of a link between Jewish Apocalyptic and the development of Gnostic ideas. The Gnostic documents discovered at Chenoboskion contain a high proportion of Apocalyptic writings. (54) Their writings appear to be nourished "by images from the books of Daniel, of Enoch, of the Ascension of Isaiah and of the Jubilees". (55) It could be that the Apocalyptic literature provides a
connecting link between the Fourth Gospel and Gnosticism. It has also
been pointed out that the writings of the Qumran sect contain many of the
ingredients of Gnosticism. At Qumran the Apocalyptic books of Daniel,
1 Enoch, and the Ascension of Isaiah have a significant place as they
appear to have also at Chenoboskion. That this observation is important
is clear when we notice the claims concerning the relationship of the
Fourth Gospel and the Qumran texts which have been made by such scholars
reveals many parallel ideas and expressions to the Qumran texts. This
does not prove any direct relationship of dependence one way or the
other. It does prove that these ideas and phrases were current in
Palestinian Jewish circles during the first century A.D. What is more, it
is in these matters that the Fourth Gospel is said to have been subject to
foreign influence. (57)
Chapter Two

Bultmann's presentation of the Johannine idea of revelation.

I. The origin of the revelation.

a. The Gospel is dominated by the concept of revelation which the evangelist expresses in his use of the Logos in the Prologue. God does not exist apart from his revelation. His being is expressed in revealing activity, and this has always been so. The world is God's creation, for everything was created by the Word. This means that God revealed himself in his creating. But the world did not know him through his revelation in creation. No mythical answer is given to the question of why this ignorance exists. It is expressed as the negative possibility created by the revelation. To say that God's being is expressed in revealing activity is to say that God is light, and from the point of view of the content of the revelation that God is love. God's being expressed in revealing activity is also indicated in the statements that God knows the revealer.

b. The statements concerning Jesus' knowledge of the Father indicate simply that he is the Revealer. He is nothing except what he is for God. The statement that God is never without his revelation is prior to and the basis for the statement that Jesus is the Revealer. The world did not know God in his revelation in creation. Jesus is the revelation for the sinful world, and there can be no knowledge of God apart from him. Before his coming all men were in the same condition, but with his coming there is a new possibility for those who believe.

II. The nature of the revelation.

a. The evangelist has taken over from Gnosticism the myth of the descending and ascending Revealer, but he has demythologized it by historicizing it in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. He does not intend to claim that the Revealer is a pre-existent being who miraculously entered the world. For him these assertions concern the revelation. The historical setting indicates that the revelation takes place in the life of this particular man, Jesus of Nazareth. He is the Revealer. Because the mythological element does not refer to Jesus himself, his teaching does not concern anything that he has seen during such a pre-existence.
The content of his teaching is simply that he is the Revealer, and the invitation to men to come to him. The paradox and scandal of the revelation is that it is encountered in this man, Jesus of Nazareth, in this context the myth is made to indicate the nature of the revelation that takes place in Jesus. The apparent Christological information really refers to the nature of the revelation. This is true also of the statements about the coming and going of the Revealer.

i. The "coming" indicates the "otherness" of the revelation, that is the exclusiveness, uniqueness, intolerance, for the revelation comes from outside man, it is alien to man, at least as he now is. This is the paradox, that the revelation that is alien to man is to be encountered only in this man. The "going" indicates the absoluteness of the revelation. The world cannot retain the revelation, for it is not relative, it is not a part of history in the ordinary sense. The unique and absolute nature of the revelation make quite clear that the usual methods of verification are not applicable in this case. The truth of what is revealed cannot be verified except by the response of knowledge in faith (the knowledge which faith receives) which is the experience of authentic existence and manifests itself as εὑρίσκειν. The verification test does not concern the revelation, but the knowledge a man may claim to have.

ii. The coming and going mark the essential beginning and ending of the revelation event. The revelation cannot be restricted to any single event, word or action, but takes place in the total life of Jesus of Nazareth.

iii. The revelation event is incomplete until Jesus has departed. His departure indicates the judgement on unbelief as the time of opportunity is past. Only when Jesus has departed can the revelation take on its true meaning, for until he has departed there is no real faith in him, i.e. faith that knows. But the meaning of this is not simply an historical note on the experience of the original disciples. We have here an indication of the fact that the revelation can never become a possession which has been acquired (in the past). The departure of the Revealer indicates that knowledge can only be acquired through the
experience of λόγον and παρασκηνή. The meaning is therefore that the revelation remains a possibility for those who through λόγον and παρασκηνή believe and thus come to knowledge as ἀπαράπατον and εἰρηνή. (19) It is the possibility to be experienced again and again. The revelation makes faith as the eschatological existence a possibility, (20) and this eschatological existence is also characterized by Χαρά and Εἰρηνή. (21) Thus the revelation does not become an event of history but ever retains its character as eschatological event. See Bull. Ephes. p. 16.

The departure of the Revealer also serves to emphasize the indirect nature of the revelation. The relationship to the Revealer can never be direct, as it is between two people, and it is by his departure that the Revealer makes clear that he is of no significance in himself, but only in what he is for God, that is the Revealer. God is encountered in him. But this is no direct relationship, as is made clear by the fact that the Revealer leaves the believers in the world. (22) Through the word of revelation that continues to be active in the community the revelation confronts the world. It is this situation where the Revealer has departed and yet the possibility of revelation continues that indicates the indirectness of the revelation. The response to the revelation must be appropriate to this, and the appropriate response is, as we shall see faith. For there is no direct relationship possible with God or the Revealer. Any attempt at such a personal and direct relationship with the Revealer overlooks the fact that he has no significance in himself. His significance is wholly the fact that he is the Revealer and that having departed he ever continues to be so. The response to the revelation must ever be faith, and all attempts to love the Revealer are redirected to faith. (23) To love the Revealer or to do something for him directly would be to fail to know him as the Revealer. (24)

c. Though the revelation is complete in the coming and going of the Revealer, the revelation occurs anew again and again. God is always revealing himself. But this is nothing different from the revelation in the coming and going of the Revealer. The revelation becomes event anew in the proclamation of the Church, in which the Spirit is active and the Word is present. The proclamation is not itself the Word of revelation,
but only the means by which faith encounters the Word. Because of this
the proclamation is open to criticism as is any other human speech. (25)
In as much as the existence of the community is grounded in the word of
revelation, God's revelation is present in the world in the eschatological
community which is one with the Revealer, and thus the world is given the
possibility of faith. (26)

III. The content of the revelation.

a. The revelation event only reveals its contents to faith. Unbelief
only hears the offensive claim that a man makes in claiming to be the
Revealer, a claim that negates and judges all human self-assertion. (27)
Man longs for life, but his longings are perverted and distorted. Thus
the revelation is the judgement of the world's quest for life, but at the
same time offers to every man the opportunity of authentic existence. (28)
The content of the revelation is first of all a question about man himself.
It puts man in question, on trial, to see if he has life. Because all men
are in the same condition, those who acknowledge their need to be other
than they are, when they are confronted by the Revealer find that this has
become a possibility. (29) In this way the revelation presents man with the
dual possibilities of existence.

b. Jesus' knowledge of "his own" indicates that as the Revealer he is
nothing apart from his "being for them". (30) This "being for them" is
revealed as the θεός in him. It is the disclosure of reality. This
is the light of the world which gives man correct self understanding,
which opens the "way" to him, guides all his conduct, and gives him
clarity and assurance. This is liberating knowledge, for it enables
men to live authentically, it is life. The life is manifest as ζωή,
because the response of knowledge in faith brings with it the awareness
of being loved and the ability to love. The Revealer's "being for us"
is the definition of what this love means, and this is the positive
side of the revelation. Of course this means that in the revelation event
this has become a possibility to every man who will choose authentic life
as it is in the Revealer. The revelation comes to the world that is in
falsehood, that denies 'reality', denies authentic existence, and claims
to live for itself and in its own power. This reality which the world
claims for itself is unreality, bondage and death. These concepts derive
their meaning from the search for human existence - for "life" as "eternal life" - and denote the double possibility of human existence. In this way the world shuts itself off from the revelation and even uses "religion" as a tool for this purpose. The coming of the Revealer is the judgement of the world and at the same time the opportunity of salvation. With his coming men are faced with the choice of life or death. It is a choice that every man must make when he is confronted by the Revealer. In this decision the world constitutes itself definitively and irrevocably as the world, and the response of those who believe reveals that their origin is in God. That is, God's reality is the reality of their lives. The coming of the revelation brings about this situation. The life which manifests itself in faith, knowledge, love indicates that the revelation has taken place. But this is no verification for a third party, it is the assurance of the one who believes, knows, loves.

The revelation as judgement brings back the lost possibility of creation in which the pre-existent Logos was revelation as creative power which would have been 'light' for men, had they understood themselves as creatures. The purpose of the revelation as judgement (in the ἰδρήθης ἡμῶν) can only be to free the world from the independence it has assumed and to make the believers 'children of light' (12:36) who know themselves to be creatures. The return of the Revealer to his heavenly glory makes clear that what is being done is to return to the possibility of understanding the world as creation. The word in creation had been ignored. Jesus' work is to make it perceptible again so that they can see the 'light of men' which is life for them. The revelation as the eschatological event means judgement for the world, but it also means the rediscovery of the world as creation.
Chapter Three

A theological analysis of Bultmann's understanding of the idea of knowledge.

Introduction. This study will not take account of the ordinary usage or the usage influenced by the Old Testament and Jewish usage, or the usage influenced by the Hellenistic θείος ἀνήρ. The theologically important uses are those which denote emphatically "the relationship to God and to Jesus as a personal fellowship in which each is decisively determined by the other in his own existence." The evangelist has taken this over from the language of mysticism. There are examples also in the Gnostic literature. There the meaning is the mutual determination of elements which have been combined together into a single whole. The idea of mystical absorption where all distinctions are removed cannot be the meaning of the mutual knowledge in the Johannine literature because it is set in the context of the revelation which never loses its character of address and challenge which comes to man from outside his own world. The mystical relationship is circular and thus man encounters only himself. The relationship set in the context of the revelation is established by God.

1. The knowledge (or revelation) which is the foundation of man's knowledge.

The mutual knowledge of Jesus and the Father and Jesus' knowledge of his own will be discussed in this section. The mutual relationship can also be described by the words εἰλικρίνεια ἐν or even ἐλικρίνεια. The description is clearly of the reciprocal relationship where the knower is determined by the one who is known. In the mutual relationship the being of one is for the other, and their being is realized in this relationship.

a. The reciprocal relationship between the Father and the Son.

i. The Father knows the Son. The meaning of this is that God is never without his revelation. It is this that establishes his relationship with the Revealer. God gives himself up in the revelation, and as we shall see in point b. he gives himself up to man.

ii. The Son knows the Father. The first statement is prior to and the basis of this one. The Son is nothing but what he is for God, that is the Revealer, and God is manifest in him. When it is said that the Revealer's knowledge of God is grounded in God's knowledge of him, this is not in-
tended as a description of the Godhead as a mystical circle of mingling waters. It is a description of the act of revelation.\(^7\)

b. One side of the reciprocal relationship between the Revealer and his own. The Revealer knows his own. If the Son is the Revealer because he is nothing but what he is for God, here we see that the being of the Revealer is nothing more nor less than his being for them. His activity as the Revealer has its origin in God, but it is "his own" who are the object of his activity. That is to say, God gives himself to man in the revelation.\(^8\) God who is \(\overline{\text{Zων}}\) and \(\overline{\text{Υδάχη}}\) has become accessible to man in the revelation so that the man who knows God in the Revealer is determined in his entire existence by \(\overline{\text{Zων}}\) and \(\overline{\text{Υδάχη}}\).\(^9\)


It is already clear that the meaning of this knowledge is that man is determined by \(\overline{\text{Zων}}\) and \(\overline{\text{Υδάχη}}\). It is also clear that this knowledge is possible only because of the coming of the Revealer. But the way in which some men come "to know" and others do not has yet to be treated. We have also to look at the way in which the claim to know may be verified.

a. Man's approach towards the knowledge of God in the Revealer.

The figurative expressions used to describe believing indicate this approach. Believing is described as 'coming' to Jesus, as 'following' him, as 'entering' through him, as 'drinking' the water he bestows, as 'accepting' or receiving him. (to love him is also to believe in him).\(^10\)

i. The relationship of believing and knowing. Both words have the same object, that is God as he is revealed in Jesus. But they are not always used synonymously. This is indicated by the fact that \(\overline{\text{Πιστεύω}}\) and not \(\overline{\text{Νομίζω}}\) is used of the mutual relationship between the Father and the Son. Faith alone is required by Jesus of his hearers, and knowledge is promised to those who persist in faith. But knowledge is not to be understood as a higher stage than faith, for the order is sometimes reversed.\(^11\)

ii. Faith and Semeia. The evangelist is aware of a kind of faith that develops through acquaintance with the signs performed by Jesus, or through hearing his discourses. This faith is dependent on external evidence which seemingly justifies such faith. The evangelist makes quite clear that this is not genuine faith, though it may be the first step in that direction.\(^12\)

iii. Faith and external verification. The real object of faith as we have said, is not anything that can be verified by any normal test. The object
of faith is God in Jesus, that is to believe in Jesus as the Revealer. There can be no verification of this claim that Jesus makes for himself. This is the scandal that faith must face. All attempts to find a proof receive an ambiguous reply.\(^{(13)}\)

iv. Faith as recognition. Faith is first of all the recognition of Jesus as the Revealer. Faith overcomes the scandal of the Word made flesh, that is, that the Revealer should be a man, in this recognition.\(^{(14)}\) Faith recognizes in the Revealer the authentic life for which all men search.

v. Faith as decision. It is the decision to accept the demand, made by the revelation, that the world give up the understanding of itself that it has maintained until this point.\(^{(15)}\) For the revelation is first of all the indication of man's need of miraculous change, and any one who does not recognize that need will not be able to see that this has become possible in the coming of the Revealer.\(^{(16)}\) Faith is the decision which rejects the world as that which determines existence. It is the decision to reject the old and false life of bondage. That is the negative side of faith. The positive side is the decision to choose the life that is revealed in Jesus. This decision is the overcoming of the offence that life only meets man in the word of a mere man — Jesus of Nazareth. With this possibility of faith the evangelist presents the idea of decision dualism. The coming of the revelation in Jesus divides men into two groups according to their decision concerning him, those who have faith, knowledge, life and love, that is authentic existence, and those who do not. The Gnostic cosmological and mythological dualism thus becomes a dualism of decision in John. The dualism does not tell the history of man's past but sets out the possibility of his future as he is confronted by the revelation event. The Gnostic idea that man is determined by his origin is modified in the context to mean that the revelation has given man the opportunity of choosing a new origin. The rejection of the revelation is the action which confirms man's present false origin. In this way the revelation confronts every man with his present situation of unauthentic existence, together with the question of whether he wishes to remain unchanged or not.\(^{(17)}\) The evangelist conceives the world as the situation where the Word rings out in judgment dividing men into two groups, believers and unbelievers. The problem concerning those who have not as yet heard is not properly raised.\(^{(18)}\)
though it is clear that they are in a different position from those who have rejected the revelation. In unbelief the world is revealed as the world. It always was the world, but now, in rejecting the revelation, this situation is made irrevocable. Those who believe reveal their relationship to God. In Gnosticism this was a natural relationship, but the evangelist understands this as the new possibility miraculously created by the coming of the revelation. The dualism between believers and unbelievers does not give the reason for belief and unbelief, but indicates the two possibilities of existence.

vi. Faith as a gift. In his encounter with the Revealer the believer understands faith as a gift. But faith is not predetermined by God. The possibility of faith is offered to every man in the revelation event. There is no idea of divine knowledge of man underlying and determining man's possibility of faith. Rather the knowledge is mutual, contemporary with and corresponding to man's knowledge of God. The meaning is that there is a full relationship where the knower is determined by the one known, that the one who knows finds the full meaning of his existence in the relationship with the one who is known. That faith is an impossibility apart from the revelation is indicated by the evangelist in his discussion of the new birth. The decision to choose authentic existence is possible only if God performs a mighty miracle by his Spirit, and this miracle is given in the revelation that takes place in Jesus. Thus faith understands itself as God's gift, not in the sense of having been predetermined by God, but faith knows itself to have been evoked in the encounter with the revelation.

vii. The assurance of faith. The faith which understands itself to have been evoked by the encounter with the revelation is the basis of the Johannine understanding of assurance. The revelation is the objective side, and the response of faith, that is the hearing and obeying, the subjective side of assurance. (The idea of assurance is also expressed in the reciprocal relationship of knowledge.) Because the encounter with the revelation is not a "this worldly" experience, this assurance cannot be shaken.

viii. The fulfilment of faith. It is clear that faith in its completed form cannot be distinguished from knowledge as a separate act, but such a
distinction may be made where faith indicates only the first turning to Jesus. Such incomplete faith is indicated as having begun through acquaintance with the miracles and discourses of Jesus. This faith is only genuine in as much as it continues, just as hearing is only a genuine hearing of Jesus when there is a keeping and abiding in his words. Unfulfilled faith stands with hearing as a description of the unfulfilled possibility. But when these terms denote the fulfilled condition there is also a synonymous use with the verbs of seeing and knowing. This knowledge or sight is the perception or recognition of faith. It is the recognition of Jesus as the Revealer. Thus the object of the verbs of hearing, believing, seeing, and knowing is always Jesus, the historical Jesus, who is recognized as the truth and the life. Knowledge has primarily the sense of recognition and reception of the Revealer, i.e., pistis. This identity of meaning is emphasized by the fact of the synonymous parallelism in 17:8 of the two verbs γινώσκω and ξένθημαι, and the fact that they are used with the same objects through the gospel. The objects in all their forms are indications that Jesus is the Revealer and what it means for him to be such. The Father has sent him, his teaching comes from the Father, he is the truth, he is the Christ, are all the content of both believing and knowing.

But if faith as the unfulfilled possibility can exist without knowledge, (that is the sort of faith in Jesus as a miracle worker or teacher which does not yet recognize him as the Revealer) knowledge of the Revealer cannot exist apart from faith as long as life in the world continues. This point is made where the order is not that of faith which comes to knowledge (6:69; 8:31ff., cf. 10:38) which denotes the as yet unfulfilled opportunity which is fulfilled in knowledge, but the reverse where knowledge precedes faith (16:30; 1 Jn.4:16). Knowledge cannot dispense with faith as long as this life continues. But genuine faith has knowledge within itself.

The Revealer's relationship to God is always described in terms of knowledge and never in terms of faith. Further, all human knowledge of God is knowledge of the Revealer, and this knowledge is always knowledge in faith until this life comes to an end and faith gives way to the direct vision of the 'glory' no longer veiled in flesh (17:24). Thus both
knowledge and faith may indicate the recognition and reception of the revelation, but faith further defines the circumstances under which this event takes place. (30)

The contrast between faith and the direct relationship of seeing serves to indicate the indirect nature of the revelation. (see note 31) It has already been pointed out that all knowledge and faith are directed towards the Revealer. It now becomes clear that faith indicates an indirect relationship to him, and to say that all human knowledge of God or the Revealer must be knowledge in faith means that the knowledge of God comes through the revelation, the Father is not known directly, and that the knowledge of the Revealer is also indirect. This is made clear by the withdrawal of Jesus from the immediate experience of his disciples. Until his withdrawal there was no true faith, and this is not meant merely as an historical note concerning the experience of the original disciples. His withdrawal indicates that the disciples' relationship to him is not a normal human relationship. Jesus' significance for them is not what he is in himself, but simply that he is the Revealer. Only when he has departed does it become clear that a normal human relationship is not implied in the terms used. Only when he has departed does it become clear that what is important is the recognition and acceptance of the truth manifest in the Revealer. The indirectness of the relationship is further emphasized by the continuation of the revelation in the mission of the community of believers whereby knowledge of the Revealer remains a possibility for the world.

Another question raised by the departure of Jesus makes the same point. How can the disciples love him now that he has departed? (His love for them remains rooted in the revelation event, and indeed it is not only his love but the love of God.) The way in which the answer is given to this question shows that the love for him has been interpreted in terms of faith. Their love for him is to be nothing other than the keeping of his commandments, the keeping of his words. To love him means to be obedient to his demands and this obedience is faith in him as the Revealer. The command of love is included in the challenge of faith, just as the command to ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους is included in the abiding in the love of Jesus. Any faith which does not have this quality is not authentic. Authentic
faith enables a man to decide beforehand the way all future action is to go. It is not that the future is known, but that having truly heard the word of revelation he is freed to love, and that love is directed towards the brother in such a way that it anticipates all the claims the brother may make. Faith and love form a unity. Love for the Revealer is nothing other than faith in him, and that faith is seen to be one with the love for the brother.

Just as faith is the condition for vision of the Revealer, it is also the condition which makes creation perceptible. Authentic faith and knowledge both indicate the recognition of the Revealer and the decision to receive him. But whereas faith is completely directed to the revelation, knowledge includes also a new self-understanding. Thus while eternal life is promised to faith, the knowledge of God is said to be itself the eternal life. To know Jesus as the Revealer is to receive a new self-understanding; it is to know oneself as God's creature, which is at the same time to see the world as God's creation. This knowledge is the realization of the possibility given in creation. To live as God's creature in the knowledge of his love, is to live in love, that is loving action arises out of the awareness of being loved.

The self-understanding is dependent upon the acceptance of the revelation in Jesus. As the Revealer he makes this self-understanding possible. To know life in terms of the life God bestows on his creatures is to be freed from the sham existence of the world which thinks that it is the source of life. Authentic life, or eternal life, is the true self-understanding given to those who recognize authentic life in the Revealer, and who choose to reject the sham life the world offers and to choose the life manifest by the Revealer. To such faith knowledge is given, that is the knowledge that one has this life, that one is a creature, that life is to be determined by love both in the sense of being loved and also as loving action.

b. The knowledge that belongs to faith.

In the gift of the knowledge of God in the Revealer the believer has eternal life. For to know Jesus and God who are and have life is to be determined by life. To know God as the life-giver is to know oneself as a creature whose life is given by God. This knowledge which is authentic
life is therefore a new self-understanding. Negatively this life manifests itself as freedom from the world's sham existence which is characterized by lust (in this way the believer is not of the world). Positively it is the awareness of being loved which necessarily leads to loving action. Thus the faith that overcomes the world leads man back into a full historical existence in the world.

Knowledge as this new self-understanding is the realization of the authentic existence for which all men long, even if their longing is so perverted and misguided that they fail to recognize true life in the Revealer. But this knowledge that is given to faith is not a permanent possession. It must be made actual again and again in the decision of faith. It can never dispense with faith for such a self-understanding is made possible through the acceptance of the Revealer. This sort of knowledge is appropriate to the life of the eschatological community in the world. Only when this earthly life is concluded will the mode of knowing be changed when faith is replaced by the direct relationship of seeing. Until then all knowledge is given only to faith which is directed towards the revelation event. It is only in faith that the believer recognizes authentic life in the Revealer and understands his own existence in terms of him.

The knowledge promised to faith may be described in terms of being determined by what is known, thus being determined by life and love. To be determined by life is to have life, that is the authentic life, and to be determined by love is to be aware of being loved, which leads to loving action directed towards the brother. This whole matter can be put another way by saying that the knowledge that is given is a new self-understanding. The believer understands himself as God's creature, loved by God, and whose life is to be lived in love.

The knowledge which is eternal life remains anchored to faith as is indicated in Jn. 8:31ff, where it is made clear that the eternal life as freedom is also a becoming-free in the future through the act of faith. Freedom is only a reality through abiding in Jesus' word, that is through faith, whereby the believer allows the revelation to determine his existence.
The marks or criteria of knowledge.

i. Peace and joy are two characteristics of the life that is given to faith. Peace is the gift of well being that the believer has in Jesus in the face of the θάνατος which he faces in the world. The same is true of joy. It is also the gift of the revealer. But neither of these gifts is a static reality. They are realities only in the act of faith, in the face of θάνατος and παρακλήσει. Because of the indirect nature of the relationship with the Revealer it is of the character of prayer. In this relationship the believer is sure of being heard and thus an inward manifestation of knowledge as eternal life is the confidence (καρποςία) which the believer has in this relationship.

ii. Knowing as abiding. This life is an abiding in the Revealer, which is at the same time his being in them so that they are bound together in themselves and in him, which is at the same time a unity with the Father, who is in the Son and the Son in him. The same thing is expressed in the statements about mutual knowledge. These statements do not refer to a direct personal relationship, and this is made clear in the farewell discourses. The faith-relationship is only possible when Jesus has departed. It is in this situation that the revelation takes on its true meaning, and faith overcomes this barrier. The believer is separated from God and yet is certain that he is united with him. This is the subjective side of assurance which may be described as the awareness of being loved. But it arises through encounter with the revelation. The abiding is from this point of view, abiding in the love which Jesus has for his own. But there is another aspect of abiding, abiding in the word of Jesus. This means obedience to his commands, and because the content of his commands is "to love" it means a life of loving action which is grounded in Jesus' loving act. Love is one of the criteria of knowledge.

iii. Knowledge and the possession of the Spirit. When Jesus foretold his departure he indicated that he was to come again. This coming is the coming of the Spirit. The possession of the Spirit is one of the criteria of knowledge. But it is not an external piece of evidence, it is a part of the believer's assurance. The Spirit is the power within the Church which brings forth both knowledge and the proclamation of the Word (Word). His teaching is not new for it concerns only Jesus, but what Jesus
said and did now appear for the first time in their true light. The Spirit causes the revelation in Jesus to be constantly occurring anew. The testimony of the Spirit concerning Jesus means that his word, and thus he himself are being constantly understood anew, though indeed he remains the same. This knowledge which is bestowed by the Spirit has its activity in the Church's proclamation. Thus the revelation becomes event anew convincing the world of sin, righteousness, and judgement. It becomes event also in the fellowship of believers as the revelation of brotherly love. The Church's commission arises out of its paradoxical situation of being in the world but not of it. For in turning away from the world to the Word it receives its commission to live for the world. Its life is impelled by the living Spirit who brings forth both the knowledge and proclamation of the Word. This expresses the same double-sided relationship of not living from the world but living for it. The life comes from God, but this life is given for the world.

The possibility of authentic existence remains because Jesus is present in the Church's proclamation, and the "other Paraclete" is also active in this proclamation in that he determines the Church's existence in the world. The offence of the Word made flesh, that is that the Revealer should be a man, is passed on in the proclamation which calls on men to believe in him. This of course means that the knowledge of faith of "second-hand hearers" is in no way inferior to that of the Apostles themselves. There is in fact no real difference.

d. The decision of unbelief and the failure to know.

The world which made its decision of unbelief in rejecting the Revealer will come to know that he is what he claimed to be. But this knowledge will come too late. What was meant for life will be death to the world. In its unbelief the world constitutes itself definitively as the world whose existence is unreal as it seeks to live from itself, and such existence is death.

e. Authentic life beyond death.

Knowledge as eternal life is not exhausted by historical existence. The believer has the assurance that beyond death he will be with Jesus. He will then be seen directly not as in faith, but in the direct vision of his unveiled glory.
Chapter Four

Criticism of Bultmann's position

1. Concerning Christology.

As we have seen in the exposition of Bultmann's interpretation of the Johannine idea of revelation (page 22ff. point 2.), the Christological statements are considered to be the residue of the Gnostic Redeemer myth. The evangelist used these statements, we are told, to indicate that the authentic life for man is revealed in Jesus. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (Jn. 1:14) seems to be telling a fact. "Bultmann assures us, however, that the appearance of these statements is deceptive, and that the words are used to pose a question for us about how we understand ourselves." (1) Such a position seems to deny that this statement made by the evangelist has any relationship to history or to metaphysics. But is such a position justifiable? Is this all that the evangelist meant? Granted, the existential interpretation is valid, but did the evangelist also wish to make an historical and metaphysical point?

Bultmann's argument for such an interpretation is weakened somewhat when it is pointed out that the Redeemer myth that the evangelist supposedly borrowed from a Gnostic source cannot be found in any document until a date later than that of the New Testament documents. There is grave doubt as to the existence of such a myth prior to the writing of the Fourth Gospel. Even if the evangelist did use a myth of this nature, he must have considered that it was a suitable means of expressing his message. The Christological statements must in the first instance refer to the person of Jesus though it is true that in the second instance they present a challenge to man's self understanding. But it seems clear that the evangelist would affirm the statement that Jesus saves us because he is the Son of God rather than the reverse. (2) Bultmann claims that Christology is mythology used to express the significance of Jesus to us as the revealer. But Jesus is what he is to us only because of what he is in himself, the eternal Word, the Son of God.

2. Concerning the revelation.

1. Bultmann is no doubt right in saying that 'John has subsumed the death of Jesus under his idea of Revelation,' (3) but to say that the 'death has no permanent importance for salvation, but is the accomplishment of the "work" which began with the incarnation; the last demonstration of the
obedience (14:31) which governs the whole life of Jesus' seems to be going too far. Apart from any other consideration it seems that the evangelist considers that the climax of the revelation is to be seen in the death of Jesus, it is in the laying down of his life that the greatness of his love is known (15:13) It is for this reason that the glorification of Jesus is to be seen in his lifting up, in which the crucial act of σταυρωσία was actually performed. Apart from this there is the question of the interpretation of such passages as Jn.1:29; 6:51c (which Bultmann attributes to the redactor); John 13, where the question of the relationship of Jesus' death to his purifying work is raised.

ii. The exaltation of Jesus, of which the resurrection stories are signs, indicates the victory of faith over the world, that is the overcoming of the offence of a man claiming to be the Revealer. The Easter-promise is at the same time the promise of the parousia, and the promise of Pentecost. They are not three separate events but one. The event is not external, but an inner occurrence; it is the victory of faith which overcomes the offence and recognizes Jesus as the revelation of God. (4) The exalted Jesus is the earthly man Jesus, but not as an event of past history, rather a constantly present reality dividing men in judgement as they are presented with the decision of faith. (5)

There are two problems to be raised at this point. Firstly, did the evangelist intend that these events should be understood as one event. As the Gospel stands the answer seems to be clearly no. The future eschatology must not be relegated to the work of some unknown redactor who has left no evidence for the textual critic. Such action would only be admissible if this thought is incompatible with the rest of the Gospel, and such, we claim, it is not.

Further, the resurrection does not seem to be equated with the ascension (20:17), and to confuse the coming of the Paraclete with the coming of Jesus does not do justice to the distinction made between Jesus and the Paraclete in the Farewell Discourses. (6) Nor is it adequate to say that "the Spirit is the Word at work in the community" indicating that the revelation continues. (7) The evangelist more than any other New Testament writer is responsible for personalizing the Paraclete as a third Divine person alongside the Father and the Son. Like Jesus, the Spirit is for us what he is because of what he is in himself.
The second problem raised is this. Did the evangelist intend to indicate simply the triumph of the Easter faith when he narrated these events? What of the events themselves? Did the evangelist intend his readers to believe that Jesus really did rise from the dead or did he simply intend them to believe that in the man Jesus God is revealed? From what has been said it would seem that Bultmann would contend that the latter was the case. But there is one point where a different point of view seems to be stated. Referring to the resurrection stories he says, 'So far as they are actual occurrences - and the evangelist need not have doubted their reality - they resemble the miracles in that ultimately they are not indispensable.' This seems to allow the possibility that the evangelist believed that Jesus did in fact rise from the dead and appeared to certain people. But even so this is just a possibility which is in itself unimportant. What is important is the fact that is brought out in the incident with Thomas. 'In it lies a criticism of the small faith which asks for tangible demonstrations of the Revealer. It is also a warning against taking the Easter-stories for more than they are able to be: signs and pictures of the Easter-faith or, perhaps still better, confessions of faith in it.' (8) It would seem that for Bultmann the events simply indicate the triumph of the Easter-faith. The fact that Bultmann allows that the evangelist may well have believed the resurrection appearances to be actual, though the implication at this point seems to be that they were not, strengthens the position that understands these events from the history of salvation perspective. It is not enough to say that these descriptions indicate the permanent significance of Jesus, though this much is indeed true. The evangelist also intends us to understand that Jesus rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and bestowed on the Church the gift of the other Paraclete who would enable men throughout the ages to come to faith in Jesus through the witness borne to him by the Church which had been sent into the world to bear witness to him.

In the reduction of Christology, and thought about the Spirit, to the idea of revelation, Bultmann has destroyed the relationship which reveals God as the one who ever loves.

3. Concerning the relationship of \( \gamma \nu \alpha \zeta \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \) to \( \nu \tau \). (9)

Bultmann rejects the idea that the evangelist builds his idea of knowledge on the basis of the Old Testament \( \nu \tau \), and suggests rather that
he paradoxically develops the Gnostic concept. This emerges:

a. In the way verbs of seeing are used with, or in the place of

\[\text{\textit{\(\psi\nu\phi\sigma\kappa\iota\nu\)}}\] (e.g. Jn. 14:9, 17:19f; 17:23, 25, etc.) though the author is opposed to the idea of non-historical vision and knowledge of God.

This difference from the Gnostic usage does not seem to have been sufficiently taken into account by Bultmann. For this difference and the import of other evidence suggest that the verbs of seeing as they are used in John cannot imply a Gnostic basis for the idea of knowledge.

Firstly, in the Old Testament \(\text{\textit{\(\psi\nu\phi\sigma\kappa\iota\nu\)}}\) is sometimes used synonymously with verbs of seeing e.g. Jer. 2:19; Isaiah 29:18; 41:20; 44:9; Ps. 19:1ff; 31:7. Secondly, Bultmann himself points out that the translation of \(\text{\textit{\(\psi\nu\phi\sigma\kappa\iota\nu\)}}\) by \(\text{\textit{\(\psi\nu\phi\sigma\kappa\iota\nu\)}}\) and \(\text{\textit{\(\epsilon\iota\acute{\iota}\beta\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)}}\) in the LXX indicates that the element of perception is maintained. According to Bultmann the linking of seeing and knowing is no more characteristic of Gnostic thought than the bulk of Greek thought. It is clear that this association of seeing and knowing is possible in the Old Testament, it is characteristic in Greek usage in general and it is called for by the subject matter in the Johannine writings. As has been pointed out by Ernst Percy these statements occur in the context of the theme of witness. Seeing and hearing are expressed as the presupposition of the witness. Even in 20:29 the theme of witness lies in the background, for the satisfying of the doubts of Thomas serve as a testimony to the validity of the apostolic witness to the resurrection, but there is another theme present as well.

The evangelist is anxious to show that though faith may be aroused by seeing, as some people came to believe in Jesus through seeing the miracles he performed, and as Thomas came to believe through seeing the miracle of the resurrection, this sort of seeing experience is not essential to faith. Throughout the gospel the evangelist has pointed out how faith aroused by seeing miracles very often did not develop into true faith. True faith regards Jesus not merely as a miracle worker but as the one in whom God is present. This faith may be reached with the aid of seeing miracles, or without this experience. The saying to Thomas indicates almost the irrelevance of such seeing for faith (though basic to the Apostolic testimony). Further in 20:29 faith and sight are so placed that it does not seem possible that the evangelist regarded faith as vision of God. Only when the eyewitnesses were believers does his language move in this
direction. In the light of this evidence it does not seem likely that the evangelist, though rejecting the idea of mystical vision, builds on the Gnostic approach as Bultmann argues. (15) His affinities are closer to the Old Testament (especially when it is remembered that the LXX already uses the Johannine vocabulary).

b. In the ὑμεῖς statements which describe the content of ἀνεύσκεται, The dogma (Jn.7:16) concerns the divine sonship of Jesus (7:26; 10:38; 14:20; 16:3; 17:7, 23, 25 etc.) though the real point at issue is the historical nature of the revelation. This is the offence of the dogma. But this does not seem to be contrary to the use of ἦν in the Old Testament as Bultmann suggests. There are many instances in the Exilic and Post-exilic literature where the LXX translates the Hebrew as ἀνεύσκεται ὅτι e.g. Is.37:12; (40:28); 41:20,23; 43:10; 45:3; 48:8; 49:23; 50:17; 60:16. Most of these references have as their subject the monotheistic dogma and seem to be of the same kind as the statements found in John. There are also numerous references of this kind in Ezekiel using ὕποσκέψεως, as well as ἀνεύσκεται.

c. In the use of obedience (ἀκολουθεῖν) as the criterion of knowledge. (16) Obedience is the criterion of ἀνεύσκεται and ἀνεύσκεται is actualised in obedience. This distinguishes John's use of ἀνεύσκεται from the Old Testament ἦν which itself signifies obedience to the revelation. (17) But Bultmann does not give attention to the fact that the prophets used obedience as the criterion of knowledge, and on the ground of disobedience declare that Israel does not know God. (Hosea 4:1ff.) This comes close to the criterion of knowledge in John. Secondly, knowledge can be regarded as an eschatological gift in the Old Testament (Jer.31:34) even as it is in John. Even in the Old Testament knowledge of God is not used exclusively of obedience.

d. In John ἀκολουθεῖν corresponds to the Old Testament ἦν while ἀνεύσκεται lies beyond. Obedience, or faith lead on to knowledge, and where faith is refused there can be no knowledge. (18) This point raises a further objection to point b. above because if the dogmatic statements using ἀνεύσκεται ὅτι indicate that ἀνεύσκεται cannot be used with ἦν in mind, then the same must also be true of the dogmatic statements using ἀκολουθεῖν ὅτι, which are the same in content as the ἀνεύσκεται ὅτι statements e.g. Jn. 8:24; 11:27,42; 13:19; 14:10,11; 16:27,30; 17:8,
The distinctions between faith and knowledge are firstly, that knowledge is used of the mutual relationship between the Father and Son as it is of the Son and his own. Thus γνώσκειν denotes the full relationship, whereas ἔκτενεύειν denotes the first turning which is promised knowledge if maintained. There is no knowledge without faith is clear. ἔκτενεύειν is said to indicate the obedience (Τ) to which γνώσκειν is promised. But Bultmann does not make clear here as he does elsewhere that he is not referring to authentic faith in making this distinction between faith and knowledge. "Genuine faith must not be confused with seeming faith... such faith may be a first tentative step towards him, but it has yet to prove itself as genuine faith".

Further, "Only in cases where 'believe' means a first turning towards Jesus, not yet developed into full faith, can 'know' be distinguished from 'believe' as a distinct act". Where this distinction is made (8:30-32; 10:38; and perhaps 6:69) and knowledge is promised to faith it is only the 'seeming faith' that is being discussed. What Bultmann does not make really clear at this point is that ἔκτενεύειν and γνώσκειν may be used synonymously as he points out elsewhere. If γνώσκειν can be used synonymously with ἔκτενεύειν the case against the relationship of γνώσκειν to Τ seems to be weakened considerably.

The relationship of γνώσκειν and ἔκτενεύειν is not always clear in Bultmann's exposition as we have pointed out. The problem may be set out as follows:

1. Knowledge is promised to faith, but this is only seeming faith not authentic faith.
2. Authentic faith and knowledge are not two stages as in Gnosticism.
3. Faith takes the Old Testament meaning of obedience Τ.
4. Materially γνώσκειν is understood as love.
5. The content of obedience (αγάπα) is loving action.

The problem may be further clarified however, when it is noted that there are certain points that are clearly fixed by the material.

a. Faith describes a wider area than knowledge. Faith can be used to describe the relationship of the crowd (which regards Jesus as a miracle worker) to Jesus. Faith is the way to come to knowledge.

b. It is clear that 'knowledge' describes the full relationship because knowledge is used to describe the mutual relationship between the
Revealer and God and it is never described as believing (10:15; 17:25). Though the Christian's relationship to the Revealer can be described in terms of mutual knowledge (10:14,27) it is also described in terms of faith in him, and described in such a way that it is clear that faith is not superseded by knowledge. Faith and knowledge can be used synonymously, and here it is clear that we are referring to authentic faith which contains knowledge within itself. Where knowledge and faith are synonymous the recognition and reception of the Revealer are indicated. But even here the insistence on the continuing necessity of faith has a special point to make. Whereas the Revealer's relationship to the Father is described in terms of knowledge, that is as a direct relationship, the community's knowledge of the Revealer is always faith-knowledge, that is the relationship is indirect as faith indicates in contrast to sight. The indirect relationship continues until earthly life is concluded and faith gives way to the direct vision of the glory. Faith indicates that there are two ways of knowing, the way of faith which is indirect as is the revelation, and the way of direct vision which the Revealer enjoys and which is promised to the community when earthly life has concluded. In both ways, believing and seeing, knowledge has the same meaning.

C. Knowledge (γνῶσις) in the distinctive Johannine sense, which is apparent in the instances of mutual knowledge between the Revealer and God, and the Revealer and his own, indicates the relationship where the knower's existence is determined by the one known. This makes clear what knowledge means for the Father, for the statement that he knows the Revealer means that he is never without his revelation. The Revealer's knowledge of the Father indicates that he is nothing but what he is for God, that is the Revealer, and that the Revealer knows his own indicates that the revealing activity which has its origin in God has 'his own' as the object of this activity in that God gives himself up to man in the revelation. Finally, to say that man knows the Revealer, and in him also knows God is to say that his life is determined by life and love. That is, he has eternal life and this life is expressed in terms of love. This means that knowledge of the Revealer is also a new self-understanding in terms of the revelation of life and love in him. Knowledge as the determination of the knower by what is known involves a new self-understanding in terms of eternal life and love. But this knowledge comes
only to authentic faith which like knowledge describes the recognition and reception of life and love in the Revealer.\(^{35}\) In this knowledge the love of God is bestowed on his own, that is, the eternal love of God becomes the determining power of the believer's life.\(^{36}\) This life that is given is such that the historical existence cannot exhaust it and Jesus assures the believer that beyond death he will be with him.\(^{37}\)

The development of thought on the relationship of knowledge and faith seems clear as far as we have gone. It is when Bultmann, in arguing that \(\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\nu\) and not \(\gamma\iota\nu\iota\sigma\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\) take over the meaning of the Old Testament \(\upsilon\tau\eta\), says that \(\kappa\iota\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\nu\) means obedience and \(\gamma\iota\nu\iota\sigma\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\) lies beyond and is promised to obedience that the whole matter is far from clear. It would seem that this must mean that faith as obedience must indicate only seeming faith, and if this was so the question of whether authentic faith and knowledge are identical is still open, but it would be clear that neither mean obedience, and thus neither would be related to the Old Testament \(\upsilon\tau\eta\). But this is not what Bultmann means. The seeming faith is exhorted to obedience by Jesus and it is said that such obedience will know the truth (8:30ff\(^{38}\)). It seems that in saying that faith and knowledge may both indicate recognition and reception of the revelation Bultmann has admitted that authentic faith and knowledge may both mean obedience. True knowledge is claimed also to mean more than this but it is not completely opposed to the Old Testament concept even in Bultmann's view.

4. Concerning the use of \(\gamma\iota\nu\iota\sigma\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\).

The knowledge is the life which is given to authentic faith (thus it is given to knowledge where knowledge is used synonymously with authentic faith). Authentic life is given to the believer, who, in the jeopardy of existence, by the decision of obedience again and again makes this life actual. But this does not seem to be the sort of distinction that the evangelist makes between believing and knowing. This emerges further in reference to the idea of mutual knowledge.

The idea of mutual knowledge suggests an equality in the relationship, in that the subject (the one who knows) is determined in his whole existence by the object (the one known). This mutual determination is inappropriate in the Johannine meaning, and Bultmann does point out that
the reciprocal relationship, in fact, is not one of equality. This inequality is noted by Bultmann with reference to John 15:16: 'You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you.' This inequality seems to be forgotten where knowledge for both parties in the reciprocal relationship is said to have the same meaning. Rather the inequality which Bultmann himself draws attention to seems to indicate that knowledge on the one hand indicates 'election', and on the other the response to having been chosen. This means that the meaning of knowledge is not primarily determined by the object but by the subject. The kind of knowledge is always appropriate to the one who knows. The Father's knowledge will be seen to be exactly the opposite of being determined by the object of his knowledge, as is also the Son's knowledge of his own. The object is also important in defining the meaning of knowledge as is to be seen from the change in meaning when the Father is the object of the Son's knowledge. The meaning of knowledge is thus appropriate to those involved in the relationship. This usage is like that of the Old Testament where knowledge on God's part means election, and where man's knowledge of God can never be understood as choosing God, but only as the obedient response to having been chosen by God.

A further objection to the idea that knowledge means such a determination of the knower by what is known is that this idea makes what the evangelist portrays as a loving gift into an automatic result of knowledge. But this criticism is not quite fair because Bultmann views knowledge as God's gift to the believer. Even so the automatic determination of being through knowledge is not in keeping with Johannine thought.

A more serious objection to the idea that knowledge means the determination of the knower by the one known is that knowledge is not used of the relationship between believers. Jesus' knowledge of his own, which is said to indicate his 'being for' them, is expressed also in terms of his love for them. Believers are told to love one another in the same way that Jesus loved them. (15:12) If knowledge means 'being for' the one known, then this is exactly what Jesus has told them to do in the 'new commandment' and yet their relationship is never described in terms of knowledge.
Bultmann's statement that Χριστός means obedience while ἔλευθερεῖον lies beyond is misleading. If this was the real distinction we would expect Χριστός to be used of Jesus' relationship with the Father because his whole life and mission are depicted in the gospel in terms of obedience to the Father's will. The real distinction is that Χριστός is only used of man's relationship to the revelation. For this reason Jesus' relationship with the Father is never described in terms of Χριστός. On the other hand man's knowledge of God is always mediated through the revelation and is always synonymous to authentic faith.

It is surprising that Bultmann does not emphasize the fact that what comes closest to expressing the subject's determination by the object is the evangelist's use of Χριστός. In believing the believer allows his whole being to be determined by the revelation. But to express this in terms of such a determining by the object of faith takes away from, and distorts, the volitional element in faith, for faith is indeed a real decision. In as much as man's knowledge is synonymous to authentic faith it approaches the meaning of being determined by the object of knowledge, i.e., the revelation. But when knowledge is attributed to the Father and the Son a direct relationship is in view.

Bultmann's attempt to show the starting point for John's idea of knowledge seems to have been unsuccessful. On the contrary, the varied use of the Old Testament seems to provide a much closer parallel. This is not to suggest that the evangelist simply took over the Old Testament concept, but the sort of relationship he describes is akin to that which we meet especially in the Old Testament prophets. But the evangelist develops such themes in his own way so that his meaning is to be discovered, not from any presupposed background of thought, but by the way he makes his own meaning clear. The importance of the background is that the evangelist used already existing words to express his own ideas, but the use of words does not necessarily mean the same use of meaning. Though the evangelist writes in Greek, his meaning is closer to the Old Testament than Greek thought, and this is indicated by the same sort of combination of words.
Chapter Five.

The need to treat the Gospel and Epistles separately arises basically from the judgement of Professor Dodd that the Gospel is not the work of the same author as the Epistles. Though the author of the Epistles was a student of the Gospel he did not fully comprehend the thought of the Gospel, nor did he simply repeat what he did understand, but also developed some of his own ideas. Separate treatment is also necessitated by the development that has taken place in the thought of Professor Dodd since his work on the Epistles. At that time it was his opinion that the Gospel and Epistles were to be understood against a common background, that of Gnosticism. His interpretation of the Epistles in fact arose out of his studies on the Fourth Gospel in its contemporary setting. "In common with the Fourth Gospel, the First Epistle of John shows the influence of Gnostic ways of thought." His definition of Gnosticism includes the second century Christian heresy as well as what he describes as "Hellenistic mysticism" or "the higher paganism". It is said that the use of this name 'Gnostic' is used with advantage in its widest denotation to bring out "the common element in a great variety of religious beliefs."

The nature of the 'Gnosticism' confronted by the author of the Epistles is illustrated by quotations from Irenaeus and Hippolytus in their works against the Gnostics. The Gnosticism met in these quotations is the same phenomenon as that met in the Epistles, but at a later stage of development. In his own description of "the central Gnostic dogmas" he is fundamentally in agreement with Bultmann concerning the nature of Gnosticism. But there is an indication that there were certain qualifications of this position. After the Apostolic age the Church is said to have entered into a 'tunnel period', out of which it emerged in the middle of the second century. Heretical Gnosticism arose in the tunnel period, and there is a lack of clarity about the process which brought this phenomenon into being. When we turn to the 'Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel' we find that Dodd has defined Gnosticism in terms of the second century Christian heresy as the layout of the section on 'the Background' makes clear. The reason for this change of opinion seems to be due, in part at least, to the failure of some scholars to recognize the importance of Chronology when dealing with Gnostic documents. Defined as the second
century Christian heresy there can be no question of Gnostic influence on
the New Testament rather Gnosticism is itself, in part, the product of the
thought of the New Testament. Professor Dodd is right in his insistence
that due regard be shown for the date of a document before the conclusion
is drawn that the borrowing was done by the New Testament writers, and not
the Gnostics. Nowhere is this point more valid than when dealing with the
question of the origin of the 'redeemer myth'.

Dodd's change of position includes a change of opinion about the
nature of knowledge in Gnostic thought. Bultmann(12) says that what is meant
is knowledge of God. In his commentary on the Epistles(13) Dodd shows
himself to be in agreement with this statement. But when we turn to his
work on the Gospel we find that it is said that "Gnosis is not in fact so
much knowledge of God, in any profoundly religious sense..."(14) This change
of opinion is partly due to a more restricted definition of Gnosticism.
But there is also a change of some importance in that the common sharing of
basic Gnostic dogmas seems to have been denied. At this point we agree
with Bultmann against Dodd, and assert that the idea of knowledge in such
writings as the Hermetica is akin to that of second century heretical
Gnosticism. The presuppositions of this idea of knowledge almost certainly
ante-date the Christian era. But this idea of knowledge has little in
common with the Johannine concept.

There is also some indication that Dodd has changed his opinion about
the purpose of the Gospel. In his commentary on the Epistles he indicates
that the theology of Christianity was becoming confused with the general-
ized religion of higher paganism through the missionary work of pagans and
also the efforts of ill-informed converts to Christianity who were eager to
reinterpret the faith in terms of the modern thought. The Fourth Gospel is
a brilliant attempt to undercut this whole process. The result of the
evangelist's reinterpretation of "alien categories" was that the gospel was
expressed in universal terms.(15)

As stated here the purpose of the Fourth Gospel was to clarify the
meaning of the gospel message in the crisis of its confrontation with pagan
thought. But when we turn to the work on the Gospel Professor Dodd claims that
the evangelist's aim was to write an 'apology' to the higher paganism
represented by the Hermetica.(16) The change may be slight, but it is
Important because the readers in mind initially were Christians whose thought needed clarifying, but with the shift of opinion the readers in mind are said to have been pagans.

The purpose of the Epistles is clearly stated as the correction of false teaching within the Church which led to the later Gnostic heresies. The writer attacks those who use language, which properly defined may have a truly Christian sense, in a misleading and unworthy manner. It is noteworthy that these expressions are analogous to Gnostic language as Dodd indicates. The aim of the Epistle as stated by Dodd seems to be perfectly correct.

That the evangelist has mastered 'alien categories' and consequently expressed the Gospel in universal terms is a claim that needs to be examined. What evidence is there that the terminology of the Gospel was ever 'alien' to the evangelist or the Church in which he worked? It cannot be argued that the ideas and language of the Fourth Gospel are necessarily the result of DIRECT Hellenistic influence because the evidence of Hellenistic influence on Palestinian Judaism opens up the possibility that the 'categories' may have been part of the evangelist's Jewish heritage.

Contemporary writings indicate that there were numerous sects within Palestinian Judaism. The Qumran Texts give us first hand knowledge of one of these sects. Christianity was itself at first regarded as a sect within Judaism; see Acts 5:17; 15:5; 23:6; 24:5,14; 26:5; 28:22. Christianity also showed tendencies in the direction of division Acts 6:1; 1 Cor.11:19; Gal.5:20; 2 Peter 2:1. "The actual situation in Judaism in the first century B.C. appears in fact to have been one of widespread and dangerously proliferating and fissiparous heteropraxis, a kind of baptizing non-conformity, with many splinter groups, extending from Judaea to Samaria and beyond into the Diaspora itself". The difference which Professor Dodd presupposes between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism probably did not exist in the first century. The similarities between the language of the Fourth Gospel and the Qumran Texts open the possibility that the categories used by the evangelist may never have been alien to him.

In his latest book on the Fourth Gospel Professor Dodd has questioned the value of describing the Qumran Texts as Hellenistic literature. He also indicates that he is unable to see the value of the Qumran Texts for Johannine studies. We agree with Professor Dodd that those who claim a
direct dependence of the evangelist on the Qumran Community have gone beyond the scope of the evidence, and also that the Qumran Texts are simply evidence of the diverse types of life and thought within Judaism. But this is precisely the point that we would emphasize. In Palestinian Judaism, in writings without any apologetic aims, categories akin to those used by the evangelist are found. It is our opinion that these documents reflect the impact of the Hellenistic age, in fact that before the Hellenistic age these documents could not have been written. That the evangelist had inherited the categories he used from Judaism seems to be indicated by the lack of awareness of the different meaning his words could have to a pagan reader. The evangelist shows no concern to exclude alien meanings by defining his terms precisely. He understood, and expected his readers to understand these categories from the point of view of the primitive Christian tradition, which of course included the Old Testament. The evangelist presupposes his readers are aware of the themes of the Old Testament and gospel tradition. For instance, he does not relate the events of the institution of the Lord's Supper, but presupposes that his readers know the details. What he is concerned to teach them is the theology of this event, see John 6. The problems reflected in the Gospel are those of Jewish Christians in the latter part of the first century. The relationship of Judaism to Christianity is a major theme of the Gospel, 1:17; 5:39ff, etc. The problem raised for Jewish believers in their relationship to Judaism is also reflected in 9:22; 12:42f; 16:2; 19:38. The situation seems to be related to the time of the promulgation of the "Test Benediction" דְֹּ יְנַן סָדְנָה which took place about 85-90 A.D. A time prior to this is probable as there is no indication of the use of any set form of benediction. It was the great achievement of the evangelist that in the crisis of this situation he related the gospel (Jesus' saving mission) to the ongoing life and work of the Church (the Church's mission). The Gospel is not an apology to higher paganism, but, if we have to name its central motif, it is a theology of mission written for the Church in a time when pressures were being brought to bear on Jewish believers to make them forget the mission that was part and parcel of the eternal life which they had through Christ.
Chapter Six
The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel

I. The Theme of Revelation

Professor Bultmann has drawn attention to the fact that the idea of revelation is not treated by Dodd in his section on 'Leading Ideas'. Bultmann considers this to be a serious failure. In defence of Dodd we may say that the evangelist does not use the vocabulary of revelation frequently. He uses only nine times. When we look through the list of the leading ideas we note that they are by and large 'word studies', but the title 'Leading Ideas' is more comprehensive than vocabulary, and the fact that John develops the idea of revelation apart from the technical vocabulary of revelation makes Dodd's failure to analyse this theme a serious defect. But he does treat the theme of revelation incidentally, for instance in his chapter "Light, Glory, Judgement", where he speaks of the "revelation of the eternal majesty of God in His love for mankind." When he speaks of the "Christian revelation" it is clear that what is meant is the historical tradition concerning Jesus of Nazareth. What Bultmann means by revelation concerns the activity of God. Dodd indicates that the revelation is historical, and that in the life of Jesus of Nazareth the eternal Logos is apprehended, which is the eternal thought of God, the meaning of the universe. But here Dodd has failed to appreciate the fact that it is the sense of the spoken word that predominates. In Jesus God has spoken, that is has revealed himself. Because God was never without his Word he has always been the God who reveals himself. As Bultmann has said, "the Logos doctrine of the Prologue gives expression to the concept of revelation which dominates the whole Gospel."

In the context of Dodd's emphasis on the historical nature of the revelation his interpretation of John 1:9 in terms of the essential humanity which dwells in every man is quite strange. He concludes that "the evangelist intended to indicate a metaphysics of this kind as the presupposition of his theology." What is meant is rather that the light shines on every man in judgement, a theme which Dodd himself recognizes in the Gospel. It may be that the presupposed Greek background has caused Dodd to go astray in his interpretation at this point.

Dodd recognizes that the revelation event was incomplete until Jesus
had been 'lifted up', and the Spirit of Truth had come. But his conclusion that "knowledge and vision of the Father, of the Son, and of the Paraclete are equipollent", is an oversimplification of the evangelist's treatment, for it is he more than any other New Testament writer who develops the teaching of the three divine persons.

II. The Idea of Knowledge.

Because Dodd considers that the Gospel was written as an apology to the 'higher religion of Hellenism' he claims that the sense of the Gospel must be determined by the Greek meaning of the words used. But this position is modified somewhat. Though Dodd agrees with Bultmann concerning the basic difference between the Greek and Hebrew meaning of knowledge, he indicates that Bultmann has failed to recognize the Hebrew influence on the Greek usage of the Hellenistic period, and particularly in the literature of the "higher paganism" where knowledge of God had come to mean "communion with God". He claims that the Gnostic idea of knowledge has diverged more from the Greek sense in the direction Hebrew than Bultmann recognizes. Behind the use of 'mutual knowledge' in the Hermetica lies the prophetic idea of God's election and concern for his servants, and their obedience to him. In the LXX where the Hebrew יְהֹונֵי had become ἤνωθεν, the sense had become 'Gnostic' as it had in the Hermetica. Consequently Dodd considers that Bultmann has drawn the contrast between the Gnostic and Old Testament concepts too sharply.

Because of the connection between the Old Testament and the higher religion of Hellenism Dodd considers that the LXX may be used to illustrate the development of the Gnostic usage. Before looking into the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the usage of the LXX two criticisms need to be made. Firstly, though Bultmann indicates that the Classical usage prepared the way for the Gnostic development he also notes that the Gnostic usage diverges from the Greek usage through other influences, and notable among these is the influence of the Mystery religions. Further, the difference between the Gnostic idea of knowledge, and the idea of knowledge in the Old Testament is under-rated by Dodd. Not only are they different, but they are probably derived from different origins.

Professor Dodd uses his section on the comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the LXX to indicate its relationship to the higher religion of
Hellenism. Dealing first with the negative statements, he claims that the evangelist has interwoven Hellenistic and Old Testament ideas in developing the theme that the world does not know God or the Logos. The sense includes the Hebraic overtone of the failure to acknowledge God, but ινα δεξιαίων unavoidably carries a non-Hebraic sense. The ethical criterion of knowledge of God is also used by the evangelist as in the Old Testament, but in dealing with the idea of knowing God and being his children the evangelist has again brought together Hebraic and non-Hebraic ideas. In Judaism it was assumed that God was the Father of Israel, and Israel was supposed to know God. "Hellenistic mysticism" taught that man was deified through knowledge, and Dodd claims that the evangelist has developed both lines of thought in a unity. But the evangelist has said nothing about deifying knowledge. Just as God declared that Israel was not his people (Hosea 1:9-10) so Jesus declared that the Jews were not God's children because by their actions they demonstrated that they did not know God.

In John 8:31-36, which deal with the liberating knowledge of the truth, Dodd claims that the Hellenistic sense is prominent, in fact that here the theme has "almost entirely shed the Hebraic associations which lie behind it in the LXX." But in Judaism the study of the Law is said to make a man free. The Law as the truth of Judaism could make a man free, thus it cannot be maintained that the evangelist is on peculiarly Greek ground when he deals with this theme. But his idea of freedom is not that of the Greeks, Stoics or otherwise, or the Jews, Rabbis or otherwise. It is Jesus, not the Law, who brings freedom, and the context of the thralldom is not the flesh, but sin. For the evangelist freedom is a synonym for eternal life or salvation.

In the positive statements made in the Fourth Gospel there is a marked difference from the Old Testament where, though God's knowledge of man was certain, man's knowledge of God was secondary and uncertain. But the double role of Jesus has altered this situation in the Gospel. As the Logos he is the divine object of man's knowledge of God, and the subject of God's knowledge of man. He is as man the subject of man's knowledge of God and the object of God's knowledge of man. While Dodd is right in seeing the centrality of Christology in the new possibility of knowledge of God through the incarnation, the other aspects which he mentions are not
developed by the evangelist. Jesus does demonstrate his supernatural knowledge of men, (John 2:24f.) but the evangelist does not suggest that it is through Jesus that God knows man, nor is it suggested that God knows man in Jesus. On the contrary, when the mutual knowledge of Jesus and God is spoken of Jesus speaks of his relationship to 'the Father' implying that it is 'the Son' that he shares in this relationship, (John 10:15). The division which Dodd makes in the activity of the human and the divine in Jesus is altogether too artificial.

In dealing with God's knowledge of man Dodd draws attention to the fact that in the Old Testament God is said to know Israel and his prophets in the sense of electing them for his purpose and judging their misdeeds. This knowledge includes also insight and care for his people. In the LXX where ית has become יְהוּדֶה יַסְדֵה יְבַעְנָה the thought of God's insight into man has become more important and the resultant idea is a personal relationship of God with men where the ideas of penetrating insight and concern are prominent. (22) This is true of the sense in the Fourth Gospel as Dodd indicates, though it is probably more correct to say that the evangelist believed that the prophetic relationship to God was modelled on the primary relationship of Jesus to the Father rather than as Dodd says, that Jesus' relationship with the Father was based on the prophetic model. It is as the Son, not as man that Jesus' relationship to the Father is the model for the relationship of men, not to the Father, but to himself, see John 10:14-15.

One further point that Dodd has overlooked is the fact that penetrating insight and concern had also become prominent in the Hebrew idea of God's knowledge of man as Psalm 139 makes quite clear. The Qumran texts also indicate that the Hebrew concept of knowledge had undergone development in this direction.

In the LXX man's knowledge of God is expressed in two ways, 'God' may be the direct object of the verb or a ὑπό-clause may be used. Both forms are used in the Fourth Gospel. The association of the ideas of knowledge of God and life are found in John 17:3, and the thought and expression is illustrated by the LXX of Hosea 6:2-3, and a passage from the Hermetica. (23) There are also future promises of knowledge, but more important are the affirmations that the disciples already have knowledge, which are made from the standpoint of Christ's finished work through which the expectation of the prophets was fulfilled. (24) In the farewell discourses vision of God
is often associated with knowledge of God. This is said to be characteristically Greek, because orthodox Judaism assumed that vision of God was impossible for man in this life. The evangelist also affirms this in John 1:18, where Christ alone is said to have the vision of the Father which the Hellenistic mystics falsely claimed to have. In John the verbs of seeing are often used with Christ as object, sometimes merely in a physical sense, but elsewhere with a more pregnant sense as in John 1:14. "The meaning is that those who, whether in actual physical presence, or in retrospect through the witness of the Church, contemplate the historic life of Jesus, and recognize the divine quality in it - His 'glory' - have attained a knowledge of Him which is the real 'vision of God'."

The evangelist's understanding of the person of Christ together with the Hellenistic ideal of the vision of God give the Johannine conception of knowledge as vision of God a peculiar character of its own.

But Dodd has already indicated that the vision of God was an essential part of the age to come, which in the evangelist's view had dawned with the coming of Jesus. Further Dodd has failed to show that the evangelist spoke of seeing Jesus as an alternative of knowing him. It is true that some of those who saw Jesus also knew him, but knowing, like believing, is a possibility for those who have never seen Jesus. We will return to this point when we deal with the idea of faith.

The content of knowledge is sometimes supplied by a δικε-clause as in Isaiah 43:10-11, where γνωσθησασθαι is linked with θεοθετησασθαι and followed by δικε εγώ εγώ (ναί ἵνα). This is a most important construction where it is used to express the majesty of God in terms of the unity of the Father and the Son, and finally the content of knowledge is expanded to include "the unity of men in and with Christ, in God". "At this point knowledge has passed into union". This knowledge is said to be in essence faith in Jesus. Knowledge "takes the form of love, trust and obedience directed to Him, whereby they are united to Him,..." The connection of knowledge and faith in the Old Testament to which Dodd has drawn attention in this construction is, as he has indicated, most important for the usage of the Fourth Gospel.

The merging of Greek and Hebrew ideas is also said to be the significant point concerning the evangelist's development of the idea of faith. What
Professor Dodd has to say about the various constructions seems to be largely true. He notes the Greek influence in the one use of ἀπέλθη followed by the dative and having the sense of 'trust'. The use of ἀπέλθη followed by the dative is common in ordinary Greek and the LXX, but in the latter the meaning is 'trust' while the meaning in John is 'believe' as in ordinary Greek. Using the ἀπέλθη construction in the sense of 'to believe' or 'to be convinced' concerning the nature, mission and status of Christ the evangelist develops a construction found in the LXX translating ὁ Ἰησοῦς. In this construction faith is closely connected with knowledge. The use of ἀπέλθη εἰς with the accusative is without parallel in profane Greek or the LXX. It is possibly an alternative way of translating ὁ Ἰησοῦς, but the meaning differs from the sense of ἀπέλθη with the dative which has the sense of credance. The meaning is rather personal trust or reliance which is integral to both the Hebrew and Christian conceptions of faith. Intellectual acceptance of the claims made concerning Jesus' person is included in the sense so that the meaning is related to the sense of the ἀπέλθη εἰς construction. There is no difference in meaning whether ἀπέλθη εἰς is followed by the name Jesus or ἄνωυν or ἀπάνω ἀνον. At this point Dodd refers to Bultmann who, he says, indicates that "ἀπέλθη εἰς takes over in the Johannine language an element of the meaning of the Hebrew ᵀ Ṭ which the Greek ὑιοθέτην was incapable of expressing..."(30) that is the idea of acceptance and acknowledgement. But the Greek idea of ἀπέλθη seems as little able to express this meaning as the Greek sense of ὑιοθέτην, and if the Hebrew sense is expressed by ἀπέλθη why could it not be expressed by ὑιοθέτην? Further, Bultmann does not say that ὑιοθέτην was incapable of expressing the Hebrew sense of ᵀ Ṭ, in fact he notes several instances in John where it has just this meaning(31) What Bultmann says is that "In John, therefore, ἀπέλθη corresponds to the Old Testament ᵀ Ṭ, while ὑιοθέτην lies beyond.(32) We also note instances in the LXX where ἐκάθως translates ᵀ Ṭ in contexts where the meaning of obedience could not be overlooked(33) Dodd also indicates that the knowledge which Christ has of God is associated with his obedience to the divine word(34) and that the knowledge which men have takes the form of love, trust and obedience. (35) "Knowledge" can and does mean obedience in John.
In dealing with the absolute use of **κατέθευσ** Dodd excludes those uses where the sense is supplied by the context or where the meaning is 'to be a Christian', which is a primitive Christian idiom. In the truly absolute usage **κατέθευσ** occurs with verbs of seeing, and an analysis of these passages indicates that one may see in the physical sense but have no faith, John 6:36. Sight accompanied by faith leads to vision in a deeper sense, John 11:40. But we must note that the glory of God was manifest in the raising of Lazarus and was seen by the physical eyes of believers. Dodd also suggests that there is a connection between the idea of life-giving vision of God and faith. No one has seen God, but faith is said to be the equivalent of this, John 6:46-47. But nowhere in the Gospel is it said that those who see have eternal life. The fact that faith without physical sight is compared favourably with faith with sight proves only that it is possible for those who have not been to believe as well as those who have seen Jesus. In fact John 20:29 seems to preclude the identification of faith with sight. Dodd's conclusion that faith is a form of vision is not justified and is misleading.

In his latest book on the Fourth Gospel while commenting on John 19:35 Dodd indicates that he cannot believe that the evangelist was the sort of person who could affirm the veracity of his evidence while only offering a suggestive symbol. But he considers that John 11:14 does not refer to the eyewitnesses of the life of Jesus, at least not exclusively. In his commentary on the Epistles Dodd indicates that the 'we' of John 11:14 is the we of the Fellowship of the Church in their solidarity with the Apostles. The idea of solidarity is illustrated by the 'I' of the Psalms and in particular by Joshua 24:17; and Amos 2:10. Dodd cites with approval this interpretation in his latest book. But if this is the sense of John 11:14 what is the supposed relationship to mystical vision that is postulated in 'The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel'.

Dodd is right in seeing that knowledge and faith may be used in the same sense, but that sense is not 'vision'. The idea of faith and knowledge as vision has overshadowed completely the importance of faith as 'decision' in the Fourth Gospel. This is the predominant sense. The decision to obey the revelation of God in Jesus is only briefly touched on by Dodd in dealing with **κατέθευσ εἰς**. The real significance of faith does not come out in this exposition.
Dodd considers that the distinction between knowledge and union with God to be merely formal. He tabulates the parallelism between the statements about knowledge and union, but a reversal of the parallelism is to be noted in the fifth line. Whereas in the first four lines the one known is said to be in the one who knows, in the fifth line it is said, "Men know (see) Father and Son...Men are in Father and Son." If the first four lines are correct, it would seem that the correct parallel of the fifth line would be "Men know Father and Son...The Father and Son will be in men," John 14:23. But it seems to us that the order of the first four lines should be changed. That the Father knows the Son indicates that he is in him, that is, he authorizes and empowers him in his work. That the Son knows the Father means that he abides in him, keeping his word and obeying his will. Dodd has also missed another point of parallelism where it is said that the disciples know the Spirit who will be in them, John 14:17. This relationship is described from both sides but using a different description on each side. The disciples recognize and obey the Spirit who is in them leading them and empowering them in their mission.

Dodd assumes that the general concept of ἐπὶ θέλει lies behind the Johannine idea of union with God. This is connected to the ideas of knowledge and vision of God in mysticism. The Pauline usage is said not to be the basis of the Johannine idea because of the differences that exist between them. But Dodd underrates the likenesses. Both Paul and John speak of men being 'in Christ', and of Christ being in men. Both speak of God being in Christ, 2 Cor.5:19, and Paul speaks of Christ and men being in God, Col.3:3, and the evangelist speaks of men being in the Father and the Son. The fact that Paul does not present the relationship in mutual terms, at least he does not state both sides of the relationship at the same time, cannot exclude the possibility of a relationship between the Pauline and Johannine usage. In spite of this difference, the Pauline use is closer to the Fourth Gospel than the usage of mysticism where the distinction of persons is lost in this relationship. It may be that both Paul and John drew upon the use of primitive Christianity. The difference that Dodd has drawn attention to does make it unlikely that one borrowed the idea from the other. But the likenesses also make it unlikely that they both started with
the pagan mystical idea. It is more likely that they both drew on ideas which were the common property of early Christianity. It may be that the relationship to mystical thought is secondary.

The Son's union with the Father is expressed in that "to see the Son is tantamount to the visio Dei." This relationship is such that the works of the Father are performed by the Son. The relation may be described in terms of the Son's imitation of the Father but at a deeper level it is the sharing of the one life of God which is rooted in his love. Mutual abiding is therefore closely related to mutual love which establishes the community of life between the Father and the Son and through which the Son performs the Father's works and speaks his word.

The Son's relationship with the Father provides the pattern for Christ's relationship with his disciples. They are loved by him and returning his love in obedience share his life and this is manifest in that they do his works. John 15 expounds the theme using the symbol of the vine. The unity of the disciples in love is manifest in their obedience to the word or command of Christ. The expressions "Abide in me and I in you, 15:4; Abide in me and let my words abide in you, 15:7; Abide in my love, 15:7; are all equivalent. The mutual abiding is by virtue of love which is the life and activity of God. The whole activity of God revealed in Christ and consequently in believers may be described in terms of love.

In John 17 Jesus' prayer for unity is said to exclude the idea of absorption because it is described in terms of personal relationships. "By becoming objects of this love, (God's love in Christ) and then subjects of it, directed towards Christ and one another, we become one by mutual indwelling with the Father and the Son and with one another in Him." Dodd does not indicate the precise relationship between the ideas knowledge, union and love. The problem can be seen in a statement made by Dodd, "Secondly, that knowledge of God, or union with God, which is eternal life is here interpreted in personal and ethical terms as ἐγκαταστάσεως. God's knowledge of man, in Christ, is his love for man. Man's knowledge of God is his response to the love of God in Christ, by love trust and obedience to Him and charity towards his fellows." In this statement the terms appear to be synonyms, but the terms do not cover the same semantic area. Because of his failure to recognize the distinctions which must be made between these terms Dodd assumes that as Christians are told to love one another so
they must abide in each other. (51) But the evangelist does not say this. Jesus' prayer that the disciples should be one concerns their relationship to the Father and the Son, not to each other, John 17:21. As a consequence of the relationship of oneness with the Father and the Son they are able to love one another. Nowhere in the Gospel are the disciples told to abide in each other or know each other. Jesus' relationship with the Father is described in terms of mutual abiding, loving and knowing, as is also Jesus' relationship with his disciples. But we have noted that the disciples' relationship to each other is described only in terms of love. Further it is said that God loved the world, John 3:16, but never that he knows or abides in the world.

For men, knowledge and abiding can describe only their relationship to the revelation of God in Christ because these words describe their commitment to the revelation in which God makes his claim on the lives of men. As a consequence of this response believers act in charity towards their fellows. God's love opens up the possibility of knowing and abiding, and knowing and abiding denote that the possibility opened up by God's love has become actual. The failure to recognize these distinctions seems to have led Dodd into another error. He describes the relationship of love as a more or less circular relationship. (52) The love of the Father for the Son is returned by the Son and his love for his own is mentioned in second place. In the same way it is said that Jesus love for 'his own' is returned by them and in a secondary position comes the command that they should love one another. But this is not true of the evangelist's emphasis. The Father's love for the Son is spoken of constantly, but the evangelist "hardly ever speaks of the love of the Son for the Father. He emphasizes the more strongly, however, the love of the Son for those the Father has given Him." "It is quite of a piece that John, too, allows love for God or for Christ to be overshadowed by love for the brethren which has its origin in God and its example in Christ. (53) The suitability of speaking about men loving God perhaps needs to be raised in the context of the evangelist's understanding of the condescending nature of the divine love. It is at least true to say that in their relationship to God or Jesus, the evangelist prefers to speak of the knowledge, or faith, or abiding of men, while when speaking of the relationship men have to each other he emphasizes strongly the command to love. It may be that the evangelist himself was
questioning the validity of talking about men loving God, (see especially John 15:13 and 13:36-38).

We have not touched on Dodd's understanding of the death of Christ. We are told that the cross is the absolute expression of the divine love. Through his death and resurrection the life of Jesus was liberated for the life of the world. This is his return through which ὕπάτη is realized in the Christian Community. His return is also spoken of in terms of the coming of the Paraclete. But this does not seem to be the sense in which Jesus is said to give his life, John 6:51. The alternative interpretation which Dodd gives for such passages as John 1:29, where the sacrificial interpretation is denied, is not satisfactory. The interpretation in terms of Jesus' victory over sin depends on a connection between this theme and the 'kingly ram' of the Apocalypse. But the words used are different, ὄμος is used in the Gospel and ἀπαγωγός in the Apocalypse, the contexts are different, and we do not even know if the evangelist knew the Apocalypse or of the idea of the 'kingly ram'.

Dodd understands the Spirit as the Church's experience of the life released through Jesus' death and resurrection, and this experience of him is expressed in the love within the Community. But this interpretation overlooks the fact that the evangelist develops the teaching concerning the Spirit in more personal terms than any other writer in the New Testament. The name Paraclete is masculine gender, and personal functions, such as teaching, are ascribed to him. Further, the evangelist develops the idea of the relationship which exists between the Father, the Son and the Paraclete, so that it seems to be an over simplification simply to confuse the Spirit with Jesus. Dodd's understanding of 'truth' as 'reality' has led him to understand the 'Spirit of Truth' as the divine Spirit. He has overlooked the idea of revelation which is fundamental to the evangelist's understanding of truth. His understanding of truth has obscured a point which Bultmann makes strongly. The Spirit "is the power within the Church which brings forth both knowledge and the proclamation of the Word."
Chapter Seven.

The Johannine Epistles.

The treatment in this chapter is based on Professor Dodd's commentary on 1 John. Nothing of significance for our subject is added in his treatment of the other Epistles. Professor Dodd interprets 1 John from the point of view of its relationship to Gnosticism, Primitive Christianity, and the Fourth Gospel.

I. Gnosticism.

The Epistle is said to be related more closely to Gnosticism than the Gospel. This is revealed in the use of the expressions; "God is light", "God is love", the divine "seed", "unction" or "chrism", together with the argument implied in the statement, "We know that if He is manifested we shall be like Him, because we shall see Him as He is."\(^1\) He shares with the evangelist certain other Gnostic expressions such as "life-giving knowledge", "knowledge of the truth which liberates", "regeneration", though the method of regeneration differs from the Gospel, "vision of God", "union with God", and also the dualistic tendency to divide mankind into two classes, though in this respect the Epistle is less guarded and closer to Gnosticism than the Gospel. Of course the Gnostic expressions are radically modified in their meaning by the use to which they are put in both the Gospel and the Epistle.

The common background of the Epistle and the Gospel is the idea of knowledge and union with God as mystical vision.\(^2\) But the idea of mystical vision of God is modified in two ways. Firstly, in the Epistle and the Gospel alike, to see Jesus is to see God. Thus vision is regarded as a present reality, though in the Epistle this vision is also the hope of the future, and is connected with Jesus' eschatological coming. In the Gospel this future aspect is said to be fulfilled in the resurrection of Jesus and the coming of the Paraclete. In the Epistle the future hope of seeing Jesus is related closely to the idea of transforming vision. In this aspect of thought the Epistle is closely related to Gnosticism.\(^3\) The idea of the knowledge of the truth, "the Real", is related to this point. Ultimate reality is revealed in Christ. The background of this thought is Platonic, but the meaning is transformed in that the Real is not the world of ideas, but the Word of God in Christ. The Real is to be
seen, not in the act of contemplation, but in the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth. The Reality to be seen in him is that of the Real God in contrast to the sham unreality of idols.\(^4\)

Secondly, the idea of vision of God is modified in the affirmation, "we have seen", which is not the claim to mystical vision, but the claim to possess eye-witness evidence of the revelation in Christ. This does not mean that some Christians have seen and others have not seen in this sense. In the fellowship of the Church all share in the Apostolic witness to the revelation and can say "we have seen".\(^5\)

But this identification of faith and sight does not do injustice to the emphasis on first hand eye-witness testimony at the opening of the Epistle. The illustrations given certainly indicate that in the Old Testament we meet the corporate sense of 'we' which Dodd claims is used in the Epistle and the Gospel. The alternative which Dodd rejects, that the evangelist, and the author of the Epistle, if they are to be distinguished, claim first hand knowledge of the historical Jesus seems probable because nowhere is it suggested that faith or knowledge and sight are identical. As we have argued, in the Gospel this seems to be flatly denied, John 20:29, and in the Epistle the opening verses demand to be taken at their face value. Whether or not the evangelist or the author of the Epistle were ever in such a position is another matter, and beyond the scope of this discussion. It must also be questioned whether the future aspect of eschatology is altogether missing from the Fourth Gospel, and if the coming of the Paraclete can be understood as the return of Jesus. If, as we think, it cannot, the future aspect remains.

Dodd considers that the Epistle deals with two methods of initiation into knowledge, one of which, though related to a theme in the Gospel, is developed in a different way, and the other is not related to the Gospel. The idea of regeneration, which is found in both the Gospel and the Epistle, is derived from Hellenistic Mysticism where initiation into gnosis is sometimes described as regeneration.\(^6\) Whereas in the Gospel the Spirit is said to be the agent of regeneration, in the Epistle it is the divine \(\chiρ\nu\alpha\) which constitutes regeneration by abiding in the person. The "seed" is not understood in the Gnostic sense, but as the Word of God.\(^7\) While the Word abides in the Christian it is impossible for him to sin.
Initiation into knowledge is also said to take place through ἁγιάζω or unction. This anointing is an initiation into a knowledge of the truth, and it is an abiding source of a growing knowledge of God. The anointing is connected to the Christian rite of baptism, but is not related to the teaching about the Spirit. It is not a direct reference to baptism. Just as the ἀγιάζω refers to the Word of God, so does the ἁγιάζω. It is the true teaching communicated in the rule of faith to catechumens, and confessed in baptism.

Dodd assumes too readily that the background of the Johannine idea of regeneration is Hellenistic mysticism. In John 3, the evangelist is building on traditional material as his use of "the kingdom of God" John 3:3,5; which is used only here in the Fourth Gospel though common in the Synoptic Gospels, would seem to indicate. The traditional material dealt with the question of entry into the kingdom of God. Compare Matt.18:3; Mark 10:15; Luke 18:17. The idea of the new birth is found also in James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:3,23; Titus 3:5. Bultmann acknowledges the influence of the Christian usage on John 3:3,5. He claims that the Gnostic source document used the idea of being begotten from above, and thus being saved by nature, and that this is reflected in John 3:16, which speaks of being born of the Spirit. In the Gospel the evangelist changed the meaning "from above" to "anew" under the influence of the Christian usage. But if Bultmann's source theory is rejected, as it seems it must be, there does not seem to be any reason for looking any further than the Christian usage for the background of the Johannine teaching. Behind the Christian usage we probably should recognize the influence of Jewish ideas, and Gnostic ideas also. We note a parallel in the Qumran Texts where in 1 QS III:19 one possible translation is "those born of the truth..." In the case of the Epistle it may be that the added prominence of the idea of regeneration is the result of the conflict with Gnosticism. The theme occurs in 1 John 2:20; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1,4,18; but only in John 1:12f; 3:3-8, in the Gospel. But to some extent this emphasis should be expected for the subject of the Gospel is Jesus, whereas the Epistle is more concerned with the life of believers.

The contrast Dodd makes concerning the Word as the agent of regeneration in the Epistle, and the Spirit as the agent in the Gospel is not really valid. Firstly, he fails to deal adequately with the reference to ἁγιάζω in 1 John 2:20 where τὸ ἄγιον almost certainly refers to the Holy Spirit.
Secondly, though the Gospel does not mention the Word in connection with regeneration, it is clear that faith in Jesus is a pre-requisite for the new birth, see John 1:12ff; 3:14ff. Because the Gospel portrays Jesus as Present in the world during his ministry it draws attention directly to him rather than referring to the gospel message. The relationship between the rule of faith, the Spirit and baptism is closer than Dodd allows.

II. Primitive Christianity.

The author of the Epistle shares with the Primitive Church, but not the evangelist, his views of eschatology, the Spirit, and the work of Christ. He knows nothing of the evangelist's interpretation of eschatology in terms of the resurrection and the coming of the Paraclete. Eschatology for him concerned the future coming of Christ, the coming great day of judgement. Nor is he aware of the evangelist's teaching about the Spirit as the Paraclete. His teaching about the Spirit is in keeping with the teaching of the Primitive Church. The Spirit is primarily the Spirit of prophecy, the inspiration granted to individuals by which the truth of the Gospel is confirmed to those who hear. But as there is a false inspiration as well as an authentic inspiration, inspiration cannot be used as a criterion of truth. The confession of the rule of faith is the criterion of true and false inspiration. The manifest presence and activity of the Spirit is the evidence of the truth of the Gospel and the reality of Christian experience.

There is a development of thought about the work of the Spirit which does not seem to be part of the teaching of the Primitive Church or the evangelist, but which may be shared with Paul. The thought about the interior witness of the Spirit is an important contribution of the Epistle. The gift of the Spirit is the token of union with God, and as the interior witness, is the immediate, spontaneous, unanalyzable awareness of the divine presence which has as its external complement the external testimony to Christ as Saviour, that is the rule of faith. The claim to have the interior witness is not valid without the external counterpart.

We have already pointed out the fact that Dodd is in error in not allowing for the emphasis, in the Gospel, on the Spirit as the one who inspires the Church's witness, see John 15:26-27. The contrast between the Gospel on one side and the Epistle and Primitive Christianity on the other is false concerning this aspect of teaching about the Spirit. Further, the
presence of the Spirit as the immediate, spontaneous, unanalyzable awareness of the divine presence does not appear to be taught in 1 John. The presence of the Spirit is manifest in the confession of faith in Jesus. The possession of the Spirit spoken of in 1 John 3:24 is said to be manifest in the confession of faith in 1 John 4:13ff.; and this is true also of 1 John 4:13-15. Nowhere in 1 John is there any mention of the possession of the Spirit in terms of the subjective experience.

At the heart of the rule of faith of the Primitive Church was the belief that God was to be known in Christ. In the crisis faced by the Johannine Epistle and Gospel this article of faith came into focus and is expressed in a characteristically Johannine form as the Incarnation. "Whatever else the heretics might affirm of Christ, they would not confess the reality of the Incarnation. By that test their teaching, however powerfully 'inspired', was condemned." (20) In the crisis of the time the teaching about the Incarnation was emphasized, but it is clear that the rule of faith also included statements about the work of Christ.

The author of the Epistle expresses the same thought as the Primitive preaching, whereas the evangelist has offered a clarification of the thought about the Atonement, as well as Christology and the Trinity. The Epistle is closer to the early kerygma in all of these matters. (21) The Gospel avoids the use of ἐλασμός, and the Epistle does not develop the evangelist's understanding of the work of Christ. (22) The description of Jesus as ἐλασμός indicates that he is the one through whom forgiveness and cleansing are effected, though we are not told how this work is achieved. But it is clear that Jesus acted within a situation representative of human history at large, and in a desperate conflict with evil, acted in such a way as to display the character which he ascribed to God. His suffering was borne alone to the extremity, and in this evil situation, from which none is guiltless, he suffered in undiminished loyalty to God and goodwill towards men. At the point of defeat death was overcome, and his return to the faithless disciples was an act of forgiveness out of which sprang the conviction that in his death and resurrection sin had been neutralized and its corruption sterilized by the love of God. (23) The means by which this was accomplished is not clear, and it is the task of Christian theology to understand this. (24)
Though the evangelist avoids the use of ἐλάσμος, he teaches that Christ bears away the sin of the world, brings knowledge of God, and that through his death the prince of this world is cast out, John 1:29; 12:31. The author of the Epistle takes up the same themes of forgiveness, knowledge of God, and victory, 1 John 2:12-14. Dodd uses the Fourth Gospel to illustrate the meaning of 1 John concerning sin and forgiveness. That Christ laid down his life for us is taught by the Epistle and the Gospel, as is also the fact that Jesus as the incarnate Son is the Saviour of the world, and not merely its enlightener. What is said here would seem to suggest that the evangelist's view of the work of Christ included what is taught in the Epistle in spite of the fact that he does not use the term ἐλάσμος. But as we have noted, in "The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel", Dodd uses an alternative interpretation for this strand of teaching, and the ideas of sin and forgiveness are not treated.

The idea of Christ's victory is common to the Gospel and the Epistle. His coming was in order to accomplish this victory over the powers of evil. This theme is not treated in the same way in "The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel" where John 12:31 is interpreted in terms of the culmination of the revelation by which men and the powers of evil are forced to make their choice. Corresponding to the theme of Christ's victory in the Epistle is the idea of victorious faith. Faith in the love of God revealed in Jesus overcomes the world. This is the victory over paganism, or the godless world-order. Bultmann's exposition of the scandal which faith must overcome is close to this idea, though it may be that what he says of this theme concerning the Gospel has been influenced by the Epistle, as Bultmann treats the thought of the Gospel and the Epistle as a single source of information for Johannine theology.

It is surprising that Dodd does not think that the Epistle teaches what he claims to be the evangelist's special understanding of the death and resurrection of Christ as the release of his life for the world, because this idea was first made popular by B.F. Westcott in his commentary on the Johannine Epistles. No doubt his view concerning the difference in the eschatology and understanding of the Paraclete in the Epistle has influenced his view. But in our opinion this idea is not taught in the Gospel either, and when it is seen that the evangelist does not think of
the coming of the Paraclete as the return of Jesus, it is very difficult to see in what way the evangelist is supposed to think that Jesus' life has been released for the world.

The idea of revelation in the incarnation is made quite clear from the beginning, and reference is made to the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel by way of comparison. The divine life is revealed and made accessible to human knowledge in the incarnation and the revelation is attested by eyewitnesses. It is implied that the revelation continues to be effective in the testimony of the eyewitnesses. The content of the saving, or life-giving knowledge is contained in the rule of faith which embodies the Apostolic witness to the incarnate Christ. The idea of access to the Father dependent on the Son is common to the Gospel and the Epistle, and though presupposed by Primitive Christian thought, the clear statement of this is a contribution of the Johannine Literature. Related to the idea of access is the description of Jesus as the Paraclete. This description is peculiar to the Epistle, though the Gospel describes the Spirit as "another Paraclete" ἄλλον παρακλήτον, which may indicate that the evangelist considered that Jesus was the original Paraclete. With this in mind John 17 could be read as the portrayal of the advocacy of Jesus. But Dodd does not suggest this. The idea of Jesus as our Advocate with the Father concentrates attention on his work as the Mediator who brings, knowledge of God to us, and our cause to God. This is a clarification which we owe to 1 John and also the Epistle to the Hebrews.

III. The Fourth Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel was an authoritative source of material for the author of the Epistle. We have already noted in passing some of the ideas which are common to the Epistle and the Gospel in relationship to Gnosticism and Primitive Christianity. From the Gospel the author of the Epistle draws his understanding of the true nature of knowledge. The knowledge of God in Christ is eternal life. To know God is to experience his love in Christ, and to return that love in obedience. Another way to speak of this life-giving relationship is "remaining in", or "abiding in God". The knowledge which is eternal life may also be spoken of in terms of regeneration or the possession of the Spirit. Knowledge or union with God in Christ is the result of the love of God manifest in the life and death
of Jesus. That knowledge is expressed by the response of love in obedience
and trust. The command to love is clearly connected to the idea of union
with God which is eternal life, because the command is related to the
fact that "God is love." In this definition the Epistle goes beyond the
thought of the Gospel in defining God in terms of being, a characteristic
of Greek thought, but God's being as love is understood in terms of
activity because God's love is expressed in the mission of Christ. Thus
the treatment is kept within the bounds of Hebrew thought where communion
with God is thought of in terms of hearing and obeying the word of the
Lord. In the Epistle and the Gospel alike communion with God is established
in the act of loving, not in mystical vision. The content of knowledge
is God's love in Christ, and knowledge is dependent on the witness of the
Church which is itself dependent on the original eyewitnesses. The
knowledge is not simply awareness, but abiding in the word of love, and
letting the word of love abide also. This is the experience of regeneration
which enables the Christian to lead a Christ-like life. This life is
manifest in the activity of the Spirit, but predominately, it is life lived
in the awareness of being loved which in turn leads to loving action. This
love is not man's achievement, for in reality it is God's own love.

The Epistle notes three criteria for testing the claim of those who
say "I know Him". One of these the Epistle has in common with the Gospel,
another has its authority in the Fourth Gospel but is developed along
lines suggested by Primitive Christian thought, on the one hand, and in a
manner peculiar to the Epistle on the other. The third has its authority
in the Gospel but is stressed more clearly in the Epistle. Religion is
verified by ethical living. The exercise of love is the sole and sufficient
assurance of Christian standing. Because knowledge brings men into a
relationship with God whose love is the basis of the command to love,
to know is to love and to love is to know. This love is not simply emotion
aroused by the contemplation of the divine being unless it also includes
concern for some fellow man which will lead us to serve him at our cost.
There is little in common with mysticism in this. The love revealed in
Christ's activity is the only valid basis for ethics, and because
knowledge of God is union with God, knowledge is manifest in the life where
the ruling motive is love to God and man, and where this love is not man's
achievement, but in reality God's love. (48) Love is discharged along the lines which form a triangle, whose points are God, self and neighbour; but the source of all love is God. (49) The stress is placed equally on love to God, which is the heart of religion, and love to man which is the foundation of morality. Religion and ethics are bound inextricably together so that the unseen may be tested by the visible, that is, religion is tested in terms of the imitatio Christi. (50)

We have already criticised Dodd's view for its lack of clarity concerning the relationship between knowledge, union, and love when treating this theme in the Gospel. The same criticism applies to his work on the Epistle. We also criticised what Dodd describes as the triangular relationship in dealing with the theme of love. Does the Epistle stress man's love for God equally with man's love for his neighbour? Does the Epistle even encourage the use of the word love to describe man's response to God apart from the love which issues in action for other men? The author stresses that the fundamental point is not our love for God but his love for us, 1 John 4:10. The claim to love God was evidently made by the heretics, 1 John 4:20, and while our author does not deny the validity of this claim he continually refers it to the ethical sphere. We agree with Dodd in understanding 1 John 5:2 to mean "By this we know that, when we love God, we love the children of God." (51) As the love in question is God's love, to speak of love for God is to turn this love into a sort of spiritual narcissism which is quite out of character with the love revealed in the descent of God into the world in the incarnation. When the Epistle does speak of love of God, it is defined in terms of obeying the commandments, 1 John 5:3; and the commandments are to believe, and love one another, 1 John 3:23. We will take up the details of this argument in our own exposition.

We have already noted that knowledge is indicated by the presence and activity of the Spirit, an idea which the Epistle develops along the lines of Primitive Christian thought in terms of prophetic inspiration, but also in its own way in terms of the immediate, spontaneous awareness of the divine presence in our lives. (52) But neither of these evidences are valid unless they issue in the confession of the rule of faith and the life of love. The rule of faith is, with the ethical test of the life of love, a
conclusive test of knowledge. Those who cannot affirm the rule of faith do not know God. We have already pointed out that the idea of the prophetic inspiration is present in the Gospel and that the subjective experience of the Spirit is not spoken of apart from the confession of faith in Jesus, which the Spirit is said to inspire.
Chapter Eight
The Johannine Literature and the Quaran Texts

A. M. Hunter (1) has drawn attention to the considerable scholarly agreement concerning the likeness of the dualism expressed in the Quaran Texts and the Johannine writings. He makes the point that the dualism is monotheistic, that is, it is not thorough-going dualism between two eternal and equipollent powers. It is ethical dualism because in the last analysis it concerns the behaviour of men. It is eschatological dualism, and history is the scene where darkness and evil are brought to an end. We would do well to note that this type of dualism has its roots in the Old Testament, though nowhere in the Canonical literature is the dualism expressed as clearly and at such length as in the Quaran Texts. It is noteworthy that Gnostic dualism is also eschatological, but the end characteristic of the Gnostic theology is a return to the original dualism, though there are variations on this point.

The fact that the Johannine Literature shares with the Quaran Texts certain dualistic tendencies cannot be taken as proof that there is a relationship of direct dependence, because it is certain that these tendencies were shared by other sects within Judaism, and the Apocalyptic Literature partly confirms this. The dualism is expressed by the use of the antitheses, light and darkness, John 1:5; 8:12; truth and falsehood, John 8:44ff.; flesh and Spirit, John 1:12f.; 3:15ff.; 6:63; freedom and bondage, John 8:31ff. The conflict rages between good and evil, John 3:19-21; Jesus and the prince of this world, John 12:31. In this conflict men are called to the crisis of decision. They must range themselves with the light or with the darkness, with Jesus or the devil, John 3:19-21; 8:12,31ff.

The Manual of Discipline gives a clear statement of the basic creed of the Quaran Community in 1 QS III:13-IV:26. As in the Fourth Gospel, though without reference to the "Word", it is stated that the whole of existence comes from God, 1 QS III:19ff. Mysteriously, in this order created by God, there is a conflict, one side God supports, the other he actively opposes, 1 QS III:24-IV:1; and see also 1 QM XIII:9-12. Men are divided into two groups, those who belong to the light and the truth, and those who belong to the darkness and the falsehood, 1 QS III:17ff. The conflict between the light and the darkness is worked out in the lives of
men in ethical action. The ways of light are opposed to the ways of
darkness as the behaviour of the sons of light is opposed to the behaviour
of the sons of darkness, 1 QS IV:2-14. K.G. Kuhn notes that "in the Qumran
dualism there is no trace of that thinking in terms of substance and matter
- none of that physical dualism which is so characteristic of Gnosticism.
This dualism is rather ethical in character. The dualistic conflict
between the two powers is accomplished by means of the righteous or sinful
actions of men."(2) This statement seems to be largely true, though traces
of a Gnostic dualism can be found especially in the Hymn Scroll as we shall
see. But as Kuhn indicates the predominant theme is ethical in character.
The vital issue concerns belonging to the Community which is joined by a
free act or decision, 1 QS IX:7-18. A person who renounced this decision
was excommunicated and refused readmittance until he had repented and
sought afresh the ways of light, 1 QS III:26-111:6. Thus choosing the "Way"
was as important at Qumran (1 QS IX:17; X:21) as it was for the evangelist
(John 14:6), though it should be remembered that for him Jesus was the
"Way" whereas the authentic knowledge and keeping of the Law was the "Way"
for the Qumran Sect. (3) "Decision dualism" is a description used of the
Fourth Gospel to make plain that the nature of the dualism is ethical. (4)
This description is also applicable to the dualism of the Qumran Texts.
But the fact that Jesus, in the Fourth Gospel, has the place of the Law in
the Qumran Texts, means that even when we have whole phrases to compare,
the Johannine theology differs radically from the theology of the Qumran
Texts.

The dualism of the Qumran Texts and the Johannine Literature is
expressed in antithetical statements, and we note the following where there
are verbal similarities between the two sets of writings. (5)

I. The antithesis of light and darkness is expressed in a similar way in
the Qumran Texts and in the Johannine literature. We note the following
expressions, "those who walk in darkness", 1 QS XI:10; "and walk in the ways
of darkness", 1 QS III:21; and John 8:12, "shall not walk in darkness";
John 12:35, "he who walks in the darkness"; 1 John 1:6, "and walk in the
darkness"; 1 John 2:11, "and walks in the darkness". The Qumran Sect
regarded themselves as "the sons of light", 1 QS I:9; etc. and according
to the Fourth Gospel men become "sons of light" through faith, John 12:36.
Upon entering the Community, the sectary was able to contemplate "the light of life", 1 QS III:7; and John 8:12 where it is said that those who follow Jesus shall have "the light of life". See also John 1:4. God revealed himself "as perfect light", 1 QH IV:23; and 1 John 1:5, "God is light".

II. The antithesis of truth and falsehood. In the Qumran Texts the most important reference to truth and falsehood concerns "the Spirits of Truth and Falsehood", 1 QS III:19; IV:23; (See also the Testament of Judah 20:1-5). The whole of the section 1 QS III:13-IV:26 concerns the functions of these two spirits. W. D. Davies has set out the teaching of this section in a clearly tabulated form, and we will be looking into these details in a later chapter. For the moment we note that the title "the Spirit of Truth" is used in the Fourth Gospel, see John 14:17 etc., but not "the Spirit of Falsehood", but in 1 John 4:6 there is the contrast between "the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error", and this is close to the Qumran idea. In the Fourth Gospel the devil performs, to some extent, the functions ascribed to the Spirit of Falsehood in the Qumran Texts, see John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11. The devil is the prince of this world which is the realm of darkness, and he is described as the originator of lies, John 8:44. In 1 QM XIII:11 we learn that the Spirit of Falsehood, the Angel of Malevolence is Satan. But we should note that whereas in the Gospel and Epistle of John the role of Satan and the Spirit of Error is minute compared to the significance of the Spirit of Falsehood in the Qumran Texts, the teaching about Satan belongs to a much wider group than the Qumran Sect and is developed to some extent in the Old Testament.

The Spirit of Truth is identified with the "Holy Spirit" 1 QS VIII:16; IX:3; CD II:12. The identification is also made in the Fourth Gospel, John 14:16,17,26. A third name is given to the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel which has no parallel in the Qumran Texts, "the Paraclete", John 14:16 etc. The title ἀνακαίνωσις is difficult to translate, and amongst the various translations are "Comforter", "Counselor", "Advocate", "Helper". There are some functions ascribed to the Spirit of Truth at Qumran which may perhaps fill in the background of words drawn on by the evangelist when writing of the Paraclete. The Spirit of Truth is said to succour (or help) all the sons of light, 1 QS III:24f. The Prince of Light has been
appointed to come to the support (help) \( \text{יָשָׁב} \) of the sons of light, 1 QM XIII:10. But more prominent in the work of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel is the function of teaching. In 1 QS III:16, the Spirit is described as 'the Spirit of true counsel concerning all the ways of man...'

Two qualifications need to be made concerning the comparison of the Spirit of Truth in the Qumran Texts and in the Fourth Gospel. Firstly, many of the functions ascribed to the Spirit of Truth in the Qumran Texts are applied to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. He brings light to the world 1:9; 3:19; 8:12; 9:5; 12:16; he brings judgement to the world 12:31; he is the leader of the sons of light 8:12; 12:36. Secondly, as we have pointed out, though there may be a likeness of terminology, for as at Qumran, the Spirit of Truth in the Fourth Gospel is said to 'help' the sons of light 14:16; and to be in opposition to the Prince of this world 16:8; the theology is quite different because the main task of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel is to bear witness to Jesus, and his other functions have their meaning in this context 15:26. Further, the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel is not a created being, but, together with the Father and the Son, is God.

"...that they may purify their knowledge in the truth of God's precepts..." 1 QS I:12; and "God will then purify every deed of man (Man) with his truth;" 1 QS IV:20-21. Compare John 17:17; 15:3. In 1 QS IV:20-21 the idea of purification by the 'truth', the Law, and the Spirit, should be compared with the idea of regeneration, especially in 1 John where the rule of faith and the Spirit, in connection to baptism, are related to regeneration. "Thy word (mouth) is truth;" 1 QH XI:7; and John 17:17; and with these we should note Psalm 119(118); 142 variant S of the LXX which reads \( \delta \lambda \delta \gamma \alpha \sigma \sigma \nu \alpha \kappa \gamma \varepsilon \eta \mu \alpha \). "For Thou Thyself art truth;" 1 QH IV:40, (10) and John 14:6, which also presents the idea of "Truth as personal", as we would say today.

"They shall practise truth..." 1 QS VI:3; see also 1 QS VIII:2,4; X:17; 1 QM XIII:2-3; and John 3:21. This is a typically Hebraic expression. "They shall bear witness to the truth at the judgement, " 1 QS VIII:6; and John 5:33; 18:37. The witness to Jesus by the Baptist, John 1:5ff; 15:29ff; etc., and the Spirit and the Apostles, John 15:26-27; and others, is also to be understood as the witness to the truth.
"...know Thy truth," or "knowledge of Thy truth," 1 QH (IX:35); X:20,29. In 1 QH X:20,29; knowledge of the truth is spoken of using the noun נְחָשׁ, but in 1 QH VI:12 the verb is used. "All nations shall know Thy truth, and all peoples Thy glory." Compare John 8:32, "and you will know the truth..." and for the idea of future universal knowledge compare John 17:20-23. This is of course a theme which we find in the Old Testament in such passages as Isaiah 9:11; Jeremiah 31:34; Habakuk 2:14, "The sons of the truth..." 1 QH VII:29; VII:29-30; (IX:35); X:27; should be compared with the Johannine phrase "everyone one who is of the truth..." John 18:37; 1 John 2:21; 3:19.

III. The antithesis of life and death: "...life without end (eternal life)." 1 QS IV:7; and John 3:15ff.; etc. The theme of eternal life is more prominent in the Johannine Literature wherein one of the central themes. "...the light of life" 1 QS III:7 and John 1:4; 8:12 have already been noted with regard to the antithesis of light and darkness. "May He lighten your heart with life-giving wisdom and grant you eternal knowledge!" 1 QS II:3; and John 17:3. In both passages life is said to be obtained through knowledge. The contrast between the end of the righteous and the end of the wicked is made in terms of life, eternal life, and the wrath of God, 1 QS IV:6-8, 11-14; compare John 3:36.

IV. The antithesis of flesh and spirit. The basic meaning of the "flesh" concerns man in his weakness as mortal and sinful, 1 QH IV:29. As such the flesh requires cleansing, and this is done through God's truth and his Holy Spirit, 1 QS IV:20-22. There is a contrast between God who is Spirit and man who is flesh, although as we shall see, the Hymn writer can refer to his own "spirit of flesh" 1 QH XIII:13, but "spirit" is being used in a different sense here. The contrast between "flesh" and "spirit" is not to be understood in terms of the Greek contrast between the material and the ideal where υλή and νοῦς are normally used, but never ὅμος and πνεῦμα. The background is rather that of the Old Testament where יָלַע indicates the contrast between man as "flesh" and God who is "Spirit". See Isaiah 31:3; 40:6-8; Psalm 56:4; 73:39; 103:14-16; Job 10:4; 34:15; Jer 17:5, (11) The flesh can be cleansed and the sactary can serve God while in the flesh. Compare John 1:12ff.; 3:5-7. Salvation is not through the flesh but through the Spirit. The paradox of the incarnation is also to be understood against this background, John 1:14.
V. The antithesis of love and hate. The Qumran Community had "the Precept for the age", 1 QS IX:14; and John 13:34; etc., speak of the new commandment to love one another. At Qumran, the command to love was accompanied by the command to hate, 1 QS X:3-4. (12) The Johannine literature does not develop the theme of hating, though some scholars think that it is implied in that the disciples are told to love one another, in reality meaning "only one another." But this conclusion is not justified in the context of the Gospel where we note God's love for the world, John 3:16; and in the Farewell Discourses, the concern that the world should be saved rules out the possibility that the disciples were to hate those outside the Christian Community, see John 17:20-23. "Truth abhors the works of falsehood, and falsehood hates all the ways of truth, and their struggle is fierce for they do not walk together," 1 QS IV:17-18. Compare John 3:19-21. The parallel is closer when we note that at Qumran truth and light are used interchangeably as are falsehood and darkness.

VI. The antitheses are modified by the doctrine of creation. Millar Burrows thinks that the comparison between 1 QS XI:11, and John 1:3 is the most striking comparison that has been noted. (13) We will be looking into this comparison more closely later. All we need to note at this point is that in the Qumran Texts and in the Fourth Gospel dualism is limited by the doctrine of creation which states that God is responsible for all that exists.

VII. We note also the following points of likeness which are unrelated to each other. "...God will deliver... because of their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness." 1 QPhab VIII:2-3. Compare John 3:15f.; etc. But whereas faith in the Teacher of Righteousness probably means accepting his teaching, faith in Jesus means accepting him as Saviour and Lord. There is no indication that the Teacher of Righteousness ever claimed or received such dignity from his followers. (14) Faith in Jesus is central to the Johannine writings, but we have only this passing reference to faith in the Teacher of Righteousness.

The Qumran Sect were those who had chosen "the Way", 1 QS IX:17; X:21. The "Way" was the study of the Law, 1 QS VIII:13-15. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is "the Way", John 14:6. The basic contrast between the Fourth Gospel and the Qumran Texts is the fact that for the one Jesus is what
the Law is to the other. There are parallels between some things said about Jesus and the Maskil, such as "He shall freely delight in all that befalls him and nothing shall please him save God's will. He shall delight in all the words of His mouth and shall desire nothing except His command." 1 QS IX:24-25. In John 4:34 Jesus says, "My meat is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish his work." See also John 5:30; 6:38; 14:31. But it should not be thought because of this that Jesus is the Maskil of the Fourth Gospel, though this is in a sense true, for he is more than a teacher in a line of succession. He is the teacher and that which is taught at the same time, thus the real point of comparison is between the Law in the Qumran Texts and Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.

It seems likely that the Teacher of Righteousness was referred to as "a faithful shepherd" (15) and in John 10:11 Jesus describes himself as "the Good Shepherd." The idea that God is the shepherd of Israel, Psalm 23(22); 80(79):1 should be noted and also the fact that the rulers of Israel were called shepherds.

"Hoist a banner, O you who lie in the dust! O bodies grained by worms, raise an ensign for the destruction of wickedness!" 1 QH VI:34. The "ensign" δ' is translated θησαυρόν in the LXX of Isaiah 11:12; note also Isaiah 5:26; 10:13; 11:8; 30:17; 31:9; and we note that δ' is translated θησαυρόν in Numbers 21:8 which is important in relation to John 3:15, "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." In John 12:32-33 the verb θησαυράσω is used "to signify by what manner of death he should die", and it is by his "lifting up" that wickedness is destroyed, John 12:31. The idea of signs is in mind in John 3:2, but John does not call the lifting up of the Son of Man a sign because he is here dealing with the reality to which the sign pointed.

"...the fountain of living waters." (Vermes p.106) Compare John 7:38; "rivers of living water", and also John 4:14. The theme is to be found in Jer 2:13; see also Psalm 36:19; Proverbs 13:14. Though the expressions have a common origin the meanings are diverse. At Qumran the well is said to be the Law, CD VI:4; but in the Fourth Gospel it is Jesus who gives the life-giving water, not Moses, and the water is that which gives eternal life, and in John 7:38 is interpreted in terms of the Spirit. (See also Numbers 21:18; Ezekiel 47)
In the Qumran Texts and the Fourth Gospel there is a strong stress on unity. The Johannine phrases, "that they may be one," "become perfectly one" (John 17:11, 21, 23), are typical of the language of the Qumran Sect. Compare ἀδιαίρετος... εἰς ἕν, John 17:23 and τὸν ἄγαν, 1 QS V:2; ὑπακούων εἰς ἕν John 11:52 and ὁ δύναμις ἀπόδημος, 1 QS V:7. There is need to stress that we are drawing attention only to the linguistic likeness because the nature of the unity of the Qumran Community which was withdrawn from the world differs greatly from the unity of the Community which exists in order that the world may come to believe and know through it, John 17:21ff. And whereas the unity at Qumran was based on the Sect's interpretation of the Law, the unity spoken of in the Fourth Gospel was dependent upon abiding in Jesus and his word abiding in the Community.

The Johannine Literature shares some striking features with the Qumran Texts, but there is nothing which would indicate that there is a relationship of direct dependence. The ideas and expressions used in the Qumran Texts were almost certainly more widely known throughout Palestinian Judaism, but we must emphasize that the evidence of the Qumran Texts makes us aware of the "sectarian" nature of Judaism in the first century. With the similarities of vocabulary we have from time to time emphasized the theological differences. The real difference is the significance that Jesus Christ has in the Johannine Literature. In the Qumran Texts Legalism is driven to the utter limit. The Fourth Gospel is to be interpreted against the background of the question of the nature of the authority of the Law. The evangelist was no legalist. For him, Jesus had done away with any independent authority the Law may have been thought to have. The only function left for the Law was the witness that it was to bear to Jesus. The full treatment that the evangelist gives to the question of Jesus' relation to the Law suggests that the Gospel was written with Jewish Christians in mind.

The complex Messianic hope of the Qumran Community throws some light on the Fourth Gospel. In particular there is the reference to the coming Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel, see 1 QS IX:11; and compare Dout 18:15, 18. This complexity is matched by the Messianic thought of the Fourth Gospel, see John 1:19-28. The evangelist appears to portray Jesus as the coming Prophet, John 1:21; 4:19-30, 44, 45; 5:45-47; 7:50-52. This complex of Messianic thought was of course more widely known, and is another indication of the lack of uniformity in first century Judaism.
Chapter Nine
Gnosticism and the Qumran Texts

That the fundamental authority for the Qumran Sect was the Old Testament can hardly be doubted in the light of their attitude to the Law and their possession and interpretation of the Canonical Books. In the Old Testament, although knowing requires an intellectual activity, the knowledge is normally that which is directly useful for living. "Seeing" is often spoken of as a means of knowing, Jer 2:19; Isaiah 29:15; 41:20; 44:9; Psalm 19:1ff.; 31:7. But knowledge through "hearing", Isaiah 40:11, 28, became more prominent with the growing importance of the Law, see Malachi 2:7. The nature of the Old Testament revelation necessitates an emphasis on hearing the word of the Lord, but we must not overlook the eschatological hope of seeing the glory of the Lord, Isaiah 40:5. But there is nothing of the Greek idea of contemplation in the Old Testament. Because the knowledge was of a practical nature it could be tested, and the phrase ἔν τούτῳ γνώσφ Psalm 41:11(40:12) should be compared with the use of ἔν τούτῳ γνῶσκαμεν in 1 John.

The description "the God of knowledge", 1 Sam 2:3, (compare 1 QS III:15; see also Psalm 73(72):11; Proverbs 3:20 in the LXX) indicates God's design and control over the events of history. Knowledge is also used in the sense of "election", Jer 1:5; 12:3; Hosea 13:5; Amos 3:2; Psalm 144:13; and in Psalm 139 the Psalmist is aware of God's knowledge of him prior to his birth and as a controlling factor in it. God's knowledge of the Psalmist is firstly awareness of him, it is also his control over the Psalmist's situation, and finally it is his presence with the Psalmist.

When man is spoken of as the knowing subject knowledge may express the experience and corresponding activity as in Isaiah 51:7 where obedience to the Law is included in the idea of knowledge. See also Isaiah 59:8 where it is clear that the idea goes beyond theoretical knowledge. In the same way to know a person emphasizes the aspect of experience, Genesis 29:5; and "knowledge" may be used to express the intimate sexual relationship between a man and his wife, Genesis 4:1,17, 25; etc. In the Hellenistic period γνῶσκέω is also used in a sexual sense, but this is possibly to be explained as a Semitism.(1)

Knowledge of God, in the Old Testament, is the basis of a positive
relationship to him. The heathen do not know God, Psalm 79:6; and they are not his people, but Israel, who considered herself to be God's people is on occasions said not to know him, Isaiah 1:3; Hosea 1:2; 4:11; etc. This failure to know God brought judgement upon Israel, Isaiah 5:13; Hosea 4:6; but out of this judgement grew the hope of a restored Israel and a universal knowledge of God, Jer 31:34; Isaiah 11:9; Habakkuk 2:14. Knowledge of God indicates an exclusive relationship which presupposes the covenant of God with Israel, Hosea 13:4. Because of this knowledge, He is often linked with תֹם and יְהֹוָה, Hosea 4:1; 6:6. Man's knowledge of God is consequent on God's knowledge of man, that is election, and leads on to the imitation of God in terms of acts of תֹם and יְהֹוָה(2). To know God is to enter into communion with him, and this is to participate in a history which is of God, and this participation is faith. Faith has a threefold aspect in the Old Testament: it is knowledge...it is trust...it is active obedience in which the believer struggles along with God in the fulfilment of his plan. In this movement the faith of man experiences the faithfulness of God and through תֹם man best attains to the imitation of God, and the תֹם he shows to his neighbour is always the דִּינָו תֹם, 2 Sam 9:3; 1 Sam 20:14. This point is made more explicit in Lev 11:44; 19:18 where "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" applies to the human realm: God's method who by creating man in his image and clothing him with dignity like his own, loved him as himself.(3)

Although "mutual knowledge" between God and man is not spoken of precisely in the same terms as John 10:14-15 for instance, the mutual relationship is presupposed, and in 2 Sam 7:20-21 is quite explicit: God knows his servant and gives him knowledge of a.) his word, or b.) his plan, or c.) his action. The mutual relationship is clear especially between God and his prophets as Dodd has rightly shown with regard to the Johannine usage. Sigmund Mowinckel has also drawn attention to the meaning of knowledge of God as a mutual personal relationship of community with him in which he reveals his Name and his will so that one receives the whole direction and quality of life from that revelation, and in as much as one's personal will is subordinated to his will and one's life is surrendered to him.(4) In the Old Testament
God is said to have revealed himself, and Israel is said to know him in his acts of **YHWH**. Thus in the Covenant Community knowledge is above all the acknowledgement of his acts (Dt. 11:2; Is. 44:20; Hos. 11:3; Mi. 6:5; etc.), to confess him as God (Dt. 4:39; 8:5; 29:5; Is. 43:10; Ps. 46:10), to give him honour and obey his will (1 S. 2:12; Is. 1:3; Jer. 2:8; 9:2-5; Ps. 9:10; 36:10; 87:4; Job. 18:21; Da. 11:32). The "knowledge of God" (Hos. 4:1; 6:6; Is. 11:2, 9), or "knowledge" in the absolute (Hos. 4:6; Prv. 1:7; 9:10), is almost identical with the fear of God with which it is linked in Is. 11:2, and it implies the doing of what is right and just, Jer. 22:16. (5)

What we have said here of the Old Testament is by and large true of the Qumran Texts, and we note in particular the mutual relationship which knowledge of God presupposes in the Old Testament as a most significant presupposition of the Johannine idea of knowledge. The relationship of knowledge, faith and love in the Johannine writings arises out of the evangelist's understanding of the Old Testament, and the new subject matter that he has to deal with in his Gospel.

I. The Idea of Knowledge in the Qumran Texts.

"The God of knowledge" is a title that we have noted in the Old Testament, and it appears also in 1 QS III:15-17; 1 QH I:26; XII:9-11. Knowledge indicates rational design and plan in creation, and this knowledge includes the will and power to bring that plan into being. We have already compared 1 QS XI:11 with John 1:3, noting in particular the phrase "and without him nothing is done." To be compared with these passages is also 1 QH XII:9-11 where everything is said to have been established "by the certain Law from the mouth of God... Without it nothing is nor shall be, for the God of knowledge established it and there is no other beside him." We should compare this with Psalm 33:6, noting that the Word of the Lord has been identified with the Law. In the Hymns, Wisdom is given a creative role in 1 QH I:6-20; XIII:1-13; compare also X:2f. In Sirach 24 Wisdom had been identified with the Law, and it is probable that this identification is in mind in the Hymns. It is right that we should draw attention to the relationship of the Qumran material to the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. It has been suggested that "knowledge" at Qumran refers to the creative intellect of God in much the same way as the Logos in the Fourth Gospel. (6) But this is to
claim too much significance for the Qumran Texts. The Johannine meaning
of Logos is not "the creative intellect of God", nor is there any
suggestion that the "knowledge" spoken of in the Qumran Texts was in any
sense personal. The connection with the Fourth Gospel is rather through
the connection of Wisdom with the Law, and the God of knowledge which we
have noted. The Qumran statements are of significance only when they are
seen in the context of the Wisdom literature where Wisdom is personified,
and as identified with the Law is said to tabernacle with Israel. See
Proverbs 8; Wisdom 7; and Sirach 24.7 Thus in the Fourth Gospel the
fact that what the Jews claim for the Law is said to be true of Jesus,
John 1:17, whose coming had rendered Judaism obsolete, John 2:10,19, and
had left for the Law only the function of bearing witness to him,
John 5:39-40,46.8

God's knowledge is also the power which controls the events of
history, 1 QS IV:15. The idea of knowledge includes the activity of the
will, 1 QH IX:8-10. God's control over history includes the experience
and actions of individuals, 1 QH IX:23,27,28; VIII:13-16; IX:12; XI:32-33.
As in the Old Testament God's knowledge can be used to express the idea
of election, 1 QH IX:29. It is said that God knows the δ' of his
servant, 1 QH VIII:16; he has determined what kind of person he should
be. See also 1 QH IX:12. It seems clear that when God is the knowing
subject, knowledge is inseparably connected with will and the ability to
bring what is known into being.

"The God of knowledge" is the source of all knowledge, 1 QS XI:11-12;
XII:3; 1 QH XII:29. Time and again it is said that it is God who gives
knowledge, 1 QS XI:15-20 (compare Daniel 2:20-23); 1 QH X:9. The theme
of God's gift of knowledge receives a more individualistic treatment in
the Hymns. The Hymn writer speaks of God's gift of knowledge to him,
1 QH IX:21; X:14-17; XI:15-18. There are many thanksgivings for the gift
of knowledge, 1 QH X:14; XI:27-35; XIV:8-11,23-27. Because God has given
him knowledge he is able to say "I know", 1 QH XII:11; XIII:18-19;
XIV:12,17; XV:12-14,22-24; XVI:1,2,11,15-16. It is clear that the claim
to have knowledge is made in the awareness that such knowledge is the
consequence of God's revelation, 1 QH IV:5-6,27-29; V:8,9,11; VII:26-27;
IX:26-27; XI:3-4,9,10,15-17,27-28; XII:11-13; XIV:8-12,17,25; etc. The
emphasis on the enlightenment of the individual in the Hymns is in keeping
with what is said about the knowledge granted to the "Maskil" בִּינְדָּא in 1 QS IX:12ff. and the "Mebakker" לִבְרֹא in CD XIII:7ff., and 1 QH XII:11-13 confirms that the individual granted knowledge is, at least on one occasion, the "Maskil". But the individual who best explains the claims of the Hymns is the Teacher of Righteousness, of whom it is said that God made known to him all the mysteries of the words of his servants the Prophets, 1 Q pHab VII:4-5. With this statement should be compared 1 QH IV:27-29 which fits well the situation of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Community, and we notice again mention of the "mysteries" מִרְמָא.

Our knowledge of the Teacher of Righteousness comes from the Damascus Document and the Habakkuk Pesher, and probably to some extent from the Hymns. The Teacher of Righteousness was raised up by God at a time of crisis close to the founding of the Sect, CD I:11. His role is defined in terms of teaching the Law, CD XX:27-34. His departure (probably his death) was used by the Sect as a fixed point for dating the beginning of the period which would end with the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel, CD XX:1,13-14. Thus, while it is true that יְדֵי נַעַר and נַעֲרוּ could mean simply "a right teacher" and "a teacher", a specific individual seems to be in mind. Further, the Habakkuk Pesher, 1 Q pHab I:13; (II:2) VI:10; VII:4; VIII:3; IX:9-10; XI:5; and the Pesher on Psalm 37, 4 Q pPs 37 III:15, have יַדְנָא נַעֲרוּ which must be translated as "the Teacher..." Thus there can be little doubt that the specific events narrated in the Damascus Document and the Habakkuk Pesher refer to a specific individual.

It has been suggested that some of the Hymns, notably nos. 1,2,7-11, may have been composed by the Teacher of Righteousness because these Hymns seem to fill out what we know of him from the Habakkuk Pesher, his persecution by his enemies, 1 QH II:1-39; and his abandonment by his friends, 1 QH IV:8-9; compare with these 1 Q pHab I:13; II:1-10; VI:9-12; XI:4-8. The hymn writer functioned as teacher of the congregation, 1 QH IV:27-29; compare 1 Q pHab II:1-3; VII:1-5. An individual in the Hymns often refers to himself as God's servant, "Thy servant" יְדֵי נַעַר, 1 QH V:15,28; VII:16; IX:11; XI:29; XI:27,30,33; XIII:18; XIV:8,25; XVI:10; XVII:23, 25,26; XVIII:6. The question is raised as to whether a
specific person is in view, and if so who that person could be. In 1 Q pHab VII:5, the prophets are referred to as his (God's) servants מְלֹאךְ יְהוָה, and in the context of this passage it is implied that the Teacher of Righteousness belonged to the prophetic tradition, because God even made known to him the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets. It is therefore quite probable that the Teacher of Righteousness should have referred to himself as God's servant. The whole question is complicated by 1 QH XII:11 where the individual speaking in that passage identifies himself as the "Maskil". It is possible that this individual may also have referred to himself as God's servant. The question must be asked concerning the relationship of the "Maskil" to the Teacher of Righteousness. To do this we will have to discuss the relationship of the Manual of Discipline to the Damascus Document.

The Damascus Document seems to be more primitive than the Manual of Discipline in that it deals with the origin of the Sect and the role of the Teacher of Righteousness while the Manual of Discipline deals with neither. Further, while the central teaching of the Damascus Document concerns the Sect's interpretation of the Law, the Manual of Discipline develops at length the dualistic doctrine of the two spirits. In the situation reflected in the Manual of Discipline memory of the Teacher of Righteousness had grown dim and the need for a contemporary teacher had become apparent with the result that the functions of the hierarchy of the Community had changed, at least in emphasis. In the Damascus Document the most prominent official is the "Mebakker", CD IX:18, 19, 22; XIII:6-7; XIV:8-11; XV:8-11, 14. But in the Manual of Discipline this title is not frequently used, 1 QS VI:12-20; though מְלֹאךְ in 1 QS VI:14, probably refers to the same official in his function of governing the Community. But it is clear that from the beginning some teaching was involved in his work. In CD XIII:2-3, instructions are given to an official who is to be a Priest or a Levite, learned in the Book of Meditation (the Law), who would rule the Congregation. This is evidently the same official who is called the "Mebakker" in CD XIII:6. It is thus made clear that if the "Mebakker" was not a Priest he must not perform priestly functions, but this would mean that no Priest could be found who was learned in the Book of Meditation, and in this situation
it would be the task of the "Mebakker" to instruct the Priest in the procedure of the Law, ensuring that the priestly functions were performed correctly. In CD XIII:7 it is said that the "Mebakker" will instruct the congregation דֶּבֶנ מֶבֶאֱקֶק. The verb בְּנָשׁ comes from the same root as בְּנָשׁ. We note that in Daniel 11:33 (compare Daniel 12:3,10) the יָבְנָשׁ are said to instruct the דֶּבֶנ. Though the Qumran Community regarded themselves as those who were wise דַּבְּנִין, see 1 QH 1:35; 1 QSa 1:28; XII:16:3 יָבְנָשׁ is never used of the Community. The singular is used יָבְנָשׁ only as the title of a particular official. The reason for this restriction appears to be the fact that the Community is referred to as the דֶּבֶנ, CD XIII:7. It would seem that "Maskil" was an alternative title for the "Mebakker". This judgement seems to be confirmed by the fact that on either side of the account of the work of the "Mebakker" in CD XIII:1ff. we have reference to the "Maskil", CD XII:21; XIII:22.

In the Manual of Discipline we find that "Maskil" is used in 1 QSa 1:1; XIII:13; IX:12,21, but in fact the reference to the "Maskil" is much more inclusive because 1 QSa XIII:13-IV:26, deals with instructions given to him and the content of his teaching, while in 1 QSa IX:12-X:14, further instructions concerning his teaching and conduct are given. The emphasis is clearly on his teaching role. The whole treatment is in contrast to the small use made of this title in CD XII:21; XIII:22. There are certain points of relationship between the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document that we should note. It is clear that CD XIII:1ff., and 1 QSa VII:6, refer to the same situation, the only difference being that in the latter the qualification that this person should be a Priest or a Levite has been removed, and he is described simply as "a man... who shall study the Law continually,...concerning the right conduct of a man with his companion." His study is aimed at ensuring right conduct in the Community, thus it would seem to be implied that the Community was ruled by him, and that he was in fact the "Mebakker" referred to in 1 QSa VII:12. We note that the instructions given to the "Maskil" in CD XII:21 are similar to those given in 1 QSa IX:12. But before the reference to the work of the "Mebakker" in CD XIII:1ff., we note "until the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel" CD XII:23-XIII:1, which appears to be the basis of 1 QSa IX:11, "until there shall
come the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." We note the development of the Messianic hope from one document to the other indicating again that the Manual of Discipline is later than the Damascus Document. But what interests us at this point is the fact that the instructions to the "Maskil" follow in 1 QS IX:12ff, whereas the instructions to the "Mebakker" are given in CD XIII:1ff. It would seem that the two names refer to the same official, whose functions had evolved from more or less sheer administration in the direction of teaching so that it was through his teaching that he exercised oversight in the Community, and as his teaching functions increased the use of the title "Maskil" increased also. We return now to the question of the relationship of the "Maskil" to the Teacher of Righteousness in the context of the Hymns.

The nature and purpose of the Hymns may be indicated to some extent by Philo(11) in an account he gives of a Banquet celebrated by the Essenes, or Therapeutae at Pentecost. He notes that at the end of the exposition of Scripture, the President rose and chanted a hymn, one of his own making, or an old one, and after him members of the Sect did likewise. The liturgical setting of the Banquet was probably the admission of initiants at the Covenant Renewal Ceremony. Gaster is of the opinion that 1 QS XI:4-XII:22 was a hymn for initiants, (pp.120ff.) but as the hymn follows the instructions concerning when the "Maskil" should bless God, 1 QS IX:26-X:4, it seems more likely that this is a "Maskil's" hymn (See 1 QH XIII:11 for another "Maskil's" hymn). It may well be that this hymn was used in a Covenant Renewal Ceremony at which initiants were admitted to the Sect. It is possible that some of the hymns were "private" compositions, but the whole collection now bears the mark of liturgical use. We note in particular the opening words of many of the Hymns, (א"כ) י"ל מ"ה, see 1 QH II:20,31; III:19,37; IV:5; V:5,20; VII:6,26,34; VIII:4; IX:37; XI:3,15; (XIV:8,23; XVII:17,26) and the form מ"ה, see 1 QH (V:20); XI:14; XI:27,29,32; (XIV:8ff.) XV:8; XVI:8. We note that 1 QH V:20 has been altered from מ"ה to מ"ה, which is a more developed liturgical form, and also 1 QH XIV:8ff. has been compared with the fourth of the Eighteen Benedictions. (12) Thus while it seems likely that the claims to have knowledge refer largely to the Teacher of Righteousness and the Maskil,
we may not exclude the possibility that the Community at large should be included.

Even in the revelation event the distinction between God and man is not removed. Rather it is in the context of those passages which give thanks for the revelation, see 1 QS XI:15-16, that we find that the writer is vividly aware that man is but moulded clay, 1 QS XI:20-22 (Compare Psalm 8:4). The theme is most prominent in the Hymn Scroll where it is set in the context of the theme of revelation. Even the teacher of the Congregation is himself only a man of flesh, a creature of clay, sinful and unfaithful, unable to keep God's Law, 1 QH IV:27-30; see also 1 QH I:21-22; IV:32; XI:3-7; XI:3-4; XII:24-28; XIII:13-16; XV:12,21; XVIII:1-32. (13) It is clear that the authority of the teacher in the Community was not vested in his own significance, but in his dependence on God's gracious gift of revelation. In this context reference to himself as "flesh" is in fact a dual claim of dependence on God, and authority over the Community. In John 5:19-20, 36, Jesus also makes such a dual claim for himself, but with the difference that he never speaks of his own weakness or sinfulness as the Hymn writer does.

What has been said of the individual in the Hymn Scroll seems also to be true of the Community as we may indicate from the Manual of Discipline. There are passages where seems to be used to mean "mind", "intellect", or "interest", 1 QS I:11-13; III:2; and in IV:3, \( \aleph \), \( \aleph \), and \( \aleph \), seem to be used in the same way, thus indicating that man was regarded to be a thinking intelligent being. But man's intelligence is regarded as futile if God does not enlighten him, and thus intimate dependence on God for knowledge is clear in such passages as 1 QS II:2-4; XI:15-16; XII:15-17. There are certain questions which must be asked about this enlightenment or revelation. How does this revelation take place? What is the nature of the knowledge that is communicated? What is the benefit of the knowledge to those who are enlightened?

In 1 QS XI:3-6, there is a passage which seems to indicate the direct communication of knowledge from God to the individual. It may be that the language is metaphorical, but the straightforward meaning is of enlightenment through vision, which is common to mysticism. In
1 QH XVIII:19-20,25-31, the Hymn writer claims to have heard a revealed word. Again the language is akin to that of mysticism. But there is an indication that the meaning may be other than what it at first appears to be. In 1 QH IV:27, the writer says, "through me Thou has illumined the Congregation." The "Teacher" or the "Maskil" is evidently the individual in view, and as the student and teacher of the Law he enlightens the Congregation. The place of the Law and the tradition of the Sect qualify the meaning of what appears to be the language of mystical enlightenment. Further, as we have already noted, it is in these passages that the distinction between God and man is most apparent. see 1 QS XI:10ff., 20-22; 1 QH XVIII:21-31.

Enlightenment is also said to take place through the counsel of the Spirit of Truth, 1 QS III:6-7, who is described as the Spirit of true counsel, see also 1 QS IV:6. The Spirit is an enigmatic figure in the Manual of Discipline. At times he appears as a personal figure, as the Angel of Truth, the Prince of Light, and the Spirit of Falsehood is described as the Angel of Darkness, see 1 QS III:17-IV:1; who is identified with Satan in 1 QH XIII:11. But sometimes the Spirits of Truth and Falsehood appear to be dual aspects of man's nature, see 1 QS III:17ff.; and IV:15-26. It would appear that all men are subject to the influence of the two Spirits, and that even the sons of light were prone to "evil inclination", י"ל 1 QS V:5. There seems to be some connection to the Rabbinic teaching concerning the good inclination י"ל י"ל and the evil inclination י"ל י"ל. W.D. Davies has drawn attention to certain points which we find to be significant for what is said about the two Spirits in the Qumran Texts. Firstly, it is said that both inclinations were created by God. In the Qumran Texts it is made clear that both Spirits were created by God, 1 QS III:17f., 25; IV:25. Secondly, the evil inclination could be controlled most effectively by the study of the Law, and in 1 QS V:5ff. it is said that the evil inclination is to be controlled through life in the Community whose task was to lay a foundation of truth for Israel in the study and practice of the Law. In 1 QS IV:2-11 it is made clear that the way of the Spirit of Truth is in knowledge and obedience to the Law, while the way of the Spirit of Falsehood is in ignorance and disobedience. Thirdly, there is
to be an end of the evil inclination when God would slay it in the presence of the righteous and the wicked in the world to come. In 1 QS IV:18-19 it is said that God has ordained an end for Falsehood when he would destroy it for ever. The connection of these ideas seems to be clear, but where the two Spirits become more personal figures we note a connection with Apocalyptic tendencies, see Daniel 10:13-21, on the one hand, and some Gnostic tendencies on the other. In 1 QS III:17ff., it is said that those who belong to the Spirit of Truth are born of the truth and spring from a fountain of light, while those who belong to the Spirit of Falsehood are born of falsehood and spring from a source of darkness. In short, men are divided into two groups according to their origin in the light or in the darkness. At this point there seems to be no suggestion that all men share the influence of both Spirits, though on both sides of this statement this point is made clear. There is therefore some contradiction at this point in the Manual of Discipline. On the one hand it is said that all men experience the influence of the two Spirits, but that within the Community the Spirit of Error is controlled. On the other hand it is said that some men come from the source of light and are led by the Angel of Truth, the Prince of Light, while others come from the source of darkness and are led by the Angel of Darkness. In 1 QS IV:18ff., which deals with the end of Falsehood and the purification of man it would seem that the two spirits are understood in terms of two aspects of man’s nature, or the two inclinations of the Rabbinic Literature, but in the War Scroll the end of Falsehood is interpreted in terms of the division of men behind their leaders the Prince of Light and Satan. The end of Falsehood takes place through a 'holy war' fought out between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, see 1 QM I:1; XIII:4-6,9-16; XVI:11; XVII:4-9.

In the Hymns we do not meet the conflict between the two Spirits. Many of the references to Spirit have a psychological sense and refer to the spirit of man, and in this context the יי of man is mentioned. What is said here should be compared with the Rabbinic teaching about the two impulses, but the ideas are not identical. Alongside these ideas there are references to God’s Holy Spirit who purifies and enlightens the
We turn first to the references which have a psychological sense. God has given his servant a spirit and knows his intent, 1 QH IX:12. God has shaped the writer's spirit, 1 QH X:6-7; and this is a human spirit, "a spirit of flesh" 1 W 11, 1 QH XIII:13. He has knowledge by means of the activity of this spirit, 1 QH XIII:18-19. Men are divided into two groups "in accordance with the spirits of their lot," 1 QH XIV:11-12. God had favoured the writer with a spirit of knowledge, 1 QH XIV:25-26. The inclination YX, of every spirit is ordained by God so that some men obey him while others are destined for wrath. The fixedness of their destiny appears to be absolute, 1 QH XV:12-22. But although this is presented as a "fate accompli", the Hymns also present the idea of the free choice to enter the Community, 1 QH XV:10-12. The statement that the inclination of every spirit HNR 312 325 327 is in God's hand, 1 QH XV:13, that is, is determined by God (See also 1 QH VII:3,13,16), diverges from the idea in the Manual of Discipline that even members of the Community are influenced by the evil inclination, the Spirit of Falsehood, and is more in keeping with what is said about men being divided into two groups according to their origin in either the light or the darkness. In the Hymns God is the giver of all spirits whatever their inclination, but in the Manual of Discipline, although it is affirmed that God is the creator of all things, the statement that "those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness" 1 QS III:19 seems to indicate the influence of a more thorough going dualism. But the Gnostic character of the idea that the inclination of men's spirits is determined one way or another, or that men's lives are determined by the kind of spirit they are given, is clear.

The teaching about God's Spirit, the Holy Spirit, does not fit easily with what has been said about the spirit given to man. It is more in keeping with what is said about man's freedom of choice, 1 QH XV:10-12. The Spirit must be sought and obeyed, 1 QH XVI:12-7. Man is made righteous only through the purifying activity of God's Holy Spirit, 1 QH XVI:11-13. The teaching activity of the Holy Spirit is related to the Law, 1 QH IX:31-33, and what is taught is obedience to the Law, 1 QH VII:6-7. The activity of the Spirit is able to change
men's lives, I QH XVII:25-26. In I QH XII:11-13, the "Maskil" speaks of the spirit which God has given him alongside reference to the Holy Spirit. It would seem that if man is to know God he must have the right kind of spirit as well as experiencing the activity of the Holy Spirit. We should point out that what the "Maskil" means by knowing God is explained in terms of obeying the Law, "I have faithfully hearkened to Thy marvellous counsel".

In the Hymns all the references to the activity of the Holy Spirit occur in passages using the first person singular so that the question must be asked as to whether only the "Teacher" and the "Maskil" experienced the activity of the Holy Spirit while the Community was dependent upon them for enlightenment. This is improbable because, as we have seen, the knowledge communicated by the Spirit was obedience to the Law. Thus the whole Community, as those who obeyed the Law, would be dependent on the Holy Spirit. It would seem to be right to relate this teaching about God's Spirit to the idea in the Old Testament.

The "Maskil" mediated knowledge to those admitted to the Sect, I QS IX:12-14, as had the Teacher of Righteousness, CD I:10-11. In I QH IV:27 an individual, possibly in the first instance the "Teacher", but no doubt each "Maskil" in turn, claimed to be the one through whom God enlightened the Congregation. It seems likely that the Sect's authentic understanding of the Law was given by the "Teacher" and that it was kept alive through the succession of men who held the office of "Maskil". As we shall see the knowledge communicated through the Maskil included more than an interpretation of the Law, and it is not clear how much of this additional teaching should be attributed to the "Teacher". But it seems that the "primitive precepts" which were binding on the whole Sect until the coming of the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel were part of the original instruction of the Teacher of Righteousness, I QS IX:9-11.

Enlightenment took place through the study of the Law, and as we have seen the "Maskil" was to be an expert in the Law through the continuous study of it, I QS VII:6-8; CD XIII:1ff. It would seem that the activity of God's Holy Spirit may be thought of in terms of bringing about the understanding, acceptance, and obedience to the Law, see
1 QH IV:2-6; thus enabling the members of the Sect to purify (correct) their knowledge (mind) in the truth of God's precepts, 1 QS I:12.

(Perhaps we should compare with this the idea that the Paraclete enlightens the disciples through the word which Jesus had spoken to them, John 14:26.) Time and again the writer thanks God for enlightening him through his truth, the Law (See Psalm 119:142, 151, 161), 1 QH VII:26-27; IX:9-10. Enlightenment through the Law and the Holy Spirit are connected also in 1 QH IX:31-32, and in such a way as to indicate that the Spirit makes the Law effective in men's lives. It could be that this is connected with the Sect's interpretation of the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-33 as we note that the claim is made by the writer that God had engraved the Law on his heart, 1 QH IV:9-12; V:8-9, 11-12, 24-26.

It was presupposed that only those who were members of the Community possessed knowledge of God. Before a man could "contemplate the light of life" his sin must first be expiated, he must be cleansed from his sins, 1 QS III:6-12. This could only take place through the operation of the Holy Spirit whereby the sin was cleansed through the truth of the Law. Thus it is made clear that an initiatic must first reach a particular standard of proficiency in knowledge of the Law, 1 QS V:20ff.; VI:14, 17-18, before he could be admitted to the Sect. Only after his admission would he be permitted to know the secret knowledge of the Sect, he would be permitted to contemplate the light of life. At the present time men were said to be cleansed by the Law, 1 QS I:12; IV:20; and by the Spirit, 1 QS IV:21. But the cleansing in the present was only partial, and would be so until the time when God did away with Falsehood, and the Spirit of Holiness and the Truth, working unhindered would completely purify man, 1 QS IV:18ff. (Perhaps we should compare John 17:17; 15:3 with the idea of being purified by the truth, which in John is Jesus' word, or the word the Father had given through him.

The nature of the knowledge possessed by the Sect must be defined first of all in terms of the Law. The Manual of Discipline is designed to ensure the correct observance of the Law. The "Maskil" was to be a student and teacher of the Law, and it is made clear that the Law was the most precious possession of the Sect, 1 QH XV:22-24, who described themselves as "sons of truth" the "sons of the Law", 1 QH VI:29, etc.
The "Maskil" also gave special instruction concerning the origin of all things, with special reference to the origin and activity of the two Spirits, 1 QS III:13-15 (See 1 QS III:13-IV:26). The Precept for the age 1 QS IX:13-14, may have been the command to love the children of light and hate the children of darkness, see 1 QS I:3-4, but whatever else was taught the Sect was instructed to abide in the "primitive precepts" which probably refer to the original instruction of the Teacher of Righteousness as to the authentic interpretation of the Law, 1 QS IX:9-11. The sect also possessed knowledge concerning the end time. In 1 QS II:3 there is mention of "eternal knowledge" מְכָל דיִלְּנֵי עַלְמָה which is probably eschatological knowledge referring to the "mystery to come" concerning which the initiate is enlightened, 1 QS XI:3-4, and this eschatological knowledge is no doubt the end of Falsehood which God in the "mystery" of his understanding had ordained, 1 QS IV:18ff. It is possible that the eschatological teaching of the Sect originated with the Teacher of Righteousness, see 1 Q pHab VII:1-5 where it is said that God did not make known to Habakkuk when time would come to an end, but he "made known all the mysteries of the words" of the Prophets to the Teacher of Righteousness.

The Hymns also have a doctrine of creation, 1 QH I:6-20; etc., and we have noted the teaching concerning the division of men into two groups, 1 QH XIV:11-12. The eschatological destruction of evil, 1 QH XV:17,20,25, and the salvation of the just, 1 QH XV:13-17; V:11, is also mentioned, while universal knowledge is promised as in the Old Testament, 1 QH VI:9-12.

This knowledge is always religious and ethical in nature. It includes trusting in all of God's deeds and leaning on his great lovingkindness, 1 QS IV:3-4. Obedience was at the heart of the meaning of knowledge of the Law, 1 QS I:1-3; and obeying God, as in the Old Testament, meant imitating God in loving what he had chosen and hating what he had rejected, 1 QS I:3-4, that is loving the members of the Sect, and hating those outside it. In 1 QM XIII:2-3, the God of Israel is blessed because of his holy purpose and his deeds of truth. God's faithfulness to his purpose is regarded as a fixed reality, but man's conduct is less certain. Thus the blessing continues including only those who serve God in righteousness and know him by faith בְּמִיתָנָה לְיָדִי. This is an important statement.
for Johannine studies, though in the War Scroll the meaning is to know God through faithfulness to the Law, in John the idea is to know God through accepting Jesus as the Way to the Father. As we have pointed out before, in John Jesus has the place of the Law in the Qumran Texts, and this difference transforms the meaning even when there are linguistic similarities. In 1 QH XVI:14-18 knowledge, faith and obedience occur together, and we should note that this language is characteristic of the Old Testament, which is an important source for the Johannine idea of knowledge.

The knowledge possessed by the Sect was esoteric in nature. It was the duty of the "Maskil" to conceal this teaching from the "men of falsehood", that is, those outside the Sect, 1 QS IX:17ff. Members of the Sect were also instructed to conceal the mysteries of God from those outside the Sect, and this concealment was stated as one of the conditions for their own enlightenment, 1 QS IV:6.

Just as knowledge of the Law was a condition of entry to the Sect, 1 QS V:20ff; VI:14,17-18; so it was the basis of advancement within the Sect, 1 QS V:23-24. Those of a lesser rank obeyed those of a greater rank (at least in some matters) 1 QS VI:2; see also 1 QS VI:8-9; 1 QH X:27-29. This grading system may have arisen out of the Sect's understanding of Jer 31:34, "they shall all know me, from the least of them, unto the greatest of them,..."

In 1 QS a:9-11 there is a reference of some interest. "He shall not (approach) a woman to know her by lying with her before he is fully twenty years old, when he shall know (good) and evil." In the Old Testament "knowledge" sometimes describes sexual intercourse, but the linking of this with knowing good and evil is not characteristic of the Old Testament, though Engnell argues that this was the sense in Genesis 2:9,17; 3:15,22; though the 'P' edition has modified the meaning by placing the command to be fruitful and multiply at the beginning in Genesis 1:28, and indicating that it is not until Genesis 4:1 that Adam "knows" Eve. If Engnell is right 1 QS a:9-11 is a clear understanding of that original sense. We should compare with this 1 QS IV:25-26 where it is said that the two Spirits have been given to men that "they may know good (and evil)". In both of these reference
the nature of knowledge as experience is strong, and this is characteristically Hebraic, though it is still a matter of some doubt as to the origin of this idea of knowing good and evil.

The knowledge possessed by the Community was believed to have both immediate and future benefits. The immediate benefits included membership in the Community, and knowledge of the mystery of the end time. Life in the Community was preparation for the coming end, for in the Community, the cleansing could begin though the completion awaited the time when Falsehood would be ended. It is possible that the Community believed that they were preparing the way for the end of Falsehood by the study of the Law, 1 QS VII:14-16. The knowledge given to the Community is said to be "life-giving wisdom", 1 QS II:3. This life is interpreted in the Deuteronomic sense as well being, "healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness", but the present and temporal did not exhaust the meaning for it is also "everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light." 1 QS IV:7-8. The future benefits were experienced in the present by the Community as a foretaste of the fullness yet to be revealed. The unhindered work of the Spirit remains in the future as does the final cleansing of man and the coming of the eschatological Prophet, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. But the Spirit and the Law were already enlightening and cleansing the Community, through their study of the Law and through the instruction given by the Maskil. Thus it can be seen that the dualism of the Qumran Texts, though it is at times developed on a cosmological scale, is fundamentally anthropological. Cosmology is treated only as it throws light on the anthropological situation.

We conclude that the Qumran Texts reveal some developments which are alien to the main stream of ideas in the Old Testament, and in these developments we note what may be described as Gnostic tendencies. Men are divided into two groups, according to their origin, or according to the kind of spirit they possess. The knowledge of the Sect is esoteric, expressly hidden from the uninitiated. At times the language of mystical enlightenment is used, though we cannot be sure that the mystical experience was also being claimed because, in the context of the Sect, the Law and the Sect's own traditional teaching is so central
that all knowledge seems to be defined in these terms. But even if no
mystical experience is claimed, the language reflects the influence of
mystical piety. But what was the nature of the mystical influence which
seems to have affinities with Gnosticism?

A further conclusion that we may draw because of the evidence of
linguistic similarities between the Johannean Literature and the Qumran
Texts is that if the Gospel has a relationship to Gnosticism, it is at a
secondary level whereby the evangelist has felt the influence of
Gnosticism unsconsiously through Judaism. Gnostic influences are
less apparent in the Gospel than they are in the Qumran Texts. When we
turn to I John we note that the situation has changed, and although the
vocabulary of the writer may have already been formed, a confrontation
with pagan Gnosticism has taken place.

II. The Nature of Gnosticism.

Though the Gnosticism of the Second Century A.D. adopted the
vocabulary of Judaism and Christianity to some extent, the Gnostic
teology is alien to the thought of the Old Testament and Christianity.
This is apparent in the contrast between the Gnostic and the Judaic-
Christian ideas of knowledge. In this section an attempt will be made to
indicate the essence of the Gnostic theology through a comparison of the
Gospel of Truth and the Poimandres Tractate, and to relate this to the
Gnostic influence we have indicated in the Qumran Texts.

The Gospel of Truth was discovered, with forty eight other Gnostic
documents, at Chenoboskion in 1945, but was not published until 1956 due
to difficulties involved in the transactions that followed. The Gospel
of Truth appears to be an early Valentinian Gospel, possibly written by
Valentinus himself. The theory of Valentinian authorship arises out of
some statements by Irenaeus and Pseudo-Tertullian. The Gospel itself has
no title or ascription of authorship, but the opening words are "The
Gospel of Truth...", and it was probably known by these first words as
this was customary with ancient books. Irenaeus mentions by name a book
of this title, indicating that it had been published by the Valentinian
Sect not long before the time he wrote this section of his work against
heresies. (17) It is possible that two different works could have the same
name, but as the whole of the Codex Jung appears to be Valentinian in character, and Irenaeus, while refuting the Valentinian system, appears to quote from the Gospel of Truth 31:35ff. The author of "Against all Heresies" says of Valentinus, "He also has his own Gospel beyond these of ours." On such evidence W.C. van Unnik concludes that the author was Valentinus himself. Not all scholars accept this argument as conclusive though there is fairly wide agreement that the Gospel has its origin in the Valentinian Sect, even if it is not the work of the great heresiarch himself. It is probably early Valentinian thought, as the lack of a highly developed mythology would seem to indicate, and as we must conclude if Irenaeus knew of the Gospel, though "recently published". But the Gospel is clearly Gnostic in character none the less. The absence of highly developed mythological features may not be taken as an indication of the lack of Gnostic presuppositions. The whole point of the Gospel is the presentation of a Gnostic understanding of existence.

The Gospel of Truth is not really a Gospel at all in the sense of the Canonical Gospels. It does not deal with the life and work of Jesus in the historical setting of Palestine. In fact reference to Jesus is of secondary importance to the teaching concerning the nature of the created order, the perversion through Error, and the nature of man whose ignorance has separated him from the Father, but who may return to him through "knowledge". The knowledge we refer to here must be understood in a "profoundly religious sense" as "knowledge of God" as it is also in the Hermetica. This is contrary to the opinion of Dodd who holds that the Gnostic idea of knowledge, in contrast to the Hermetica, is not "profoundly religious", but "knowledge about the structure of the higher world and the way to get there". The opening words of the Gospel of Truth make quite clear that the knowledge we are concerned with here is the knowledge of the Father, 16:31-36.

The interpreter of the Gospel of Truth is faced with many difficulties. There are some words used which we cannot give any precise meaning, for instance ΘΗ and ΜΛΗΤ, and other words where it is not clear whether they are being used in a technical sense or not, for example, "pleroma", "the All", " Aeons". But in spite of these difficulties, the main themes are quite clear. The Gospel does deal with cosmology to
some extent, but the main interest is in the nature of man and the true nature of existence. To deal with this subject the Gospel first had to explain how the present order came into being. The Father is the only one who can be described as self-existing, and in this sense it is said that he alone exists, 27:9-10. To the writer's mind the fact that the Father has always existed in himself raises a problem concerning the Father's name. Who could give the Father a name? To solve this problem the Father begets himself a name, and the name of the Father is the Son who bears the Lordly name. The "Father is one-who-never-had-become, it is He alone who begat him for Himself as a Name before he had created the Aeons,...", 38:33-35. (On this point see 38:7-41:3.) The "Aeons" were created after the Father had begotten the Son. But who are these "Aeons"? It could be that they are the powers of the heavenly realm, but in what way are these "Aeons" related to mankind? It would seem that the "Aeons" created by God include that which is in man which is from the divine realm. The "Aeons" are to be understood in the same sense as the "All". Just as the "All" had been searching for the Father of whom it was ignorant, 17:4-13; so the "Aeons" had been ignorant of the Father, and searching for him. The "Living Book" written in letters of Truth was to reveal the secret of the Father to the "Aeons" so that they might find rest, 22:39-23:1; 23:15-18; 24:12-20; 27:5-7. The one reference to an "Aeon" probably has the "word" in mind, who is the way of return to the Father. The fragmentary nature of the text at this point precludes any certainty.

The "Pleroma" apparently refers to "the divine realm of the Aeons", The Word, who is the Thought and Mind of the Father comes from the "Pleroma". He can be described as "the Word of the Pleroma", 35:29. The "Aeons" or the "All" it would seem were originally in the "Pleroma", and with the departure of the "All" through ignorance of the Father, there is a "Lack", but this "Lack" is not in the "Pleroma", but in the "All". The divine realm remains perfect, but that which departed from it has a "Lack" which can only be made up by return to the "Pleroma", 35:29-38. Reunion is due to the perfect Thought, the Word of the Gospel, of the finding of the "Pleroma" by those who are searching, 34:33-35:2.
The Word who came from the "Pleroma" was eventually revealed as a "Pleroma", 35:16. This means that those who belong to the heavenly realm may also be referred to as a "Pleroma", in fact it is said that all those from the Father are "Pleromata", 41:14-16. The return to the Father only takes place through the coming of the Word which is described as the coming of the "Pleroma", 34:36; 35:7. It is also said that the Son came to glorify the place of return and rest, the "Pleroma", 40:30-41:13. Those who return through knowledge are in the "Pleroma", 43:16.

The "All" went forth from the Father because though it was in the Father it did not know him, 17:14-12. The "All" lacks knowledge of the Father, and thus being separated from him was incomplete, 18:29-39; 19:17-17. Into the situation of ignorance comes "Plane", "Error". The "Error" has to do with ΚΑ Ν which is the material upon which she works. Her aim is to deceive those of the "Middle" and to take them captive. The appearance of "Error" was not a divine manifestation, but her appearance and activity is in some sense because of God's activity, 17:14-18:3. "Error" is responsible for the "Lack", and this is matter, the Father is not responsible for this, 35:8-18. "Error" is said to be without root, 17:28-30, as is also her matter, and the deceitful figure which she produces, 17:14-30; 28:28-30:12. These are the men of ΚΑ Ν who have no name, 31:1; 21:30-22:2. Being "rootless" means having no real existence, being merely phantasy, shadows in the night that will perish at the coming of the light of knowledge. Having no real existence they cannot be a divine manifestation, but as the divine manifestation is knowledge, "Error" has her opportunity because the Father has not chosen to reveal himself.

The information we have looked at so far leads to certain conclusions. Firstly, we notice that the aim of the plot of "Error" was to enslave the men of the "Middle". This suggests that there are at least three groups of men, as we might expect in a Gnostic system. There are the men of ΚΑ Ν, these are beyond any hope, they are the invention of "Error" and will perish with her at the coming of knowledge, 21:30-22:2. Secondly, there are the men of the "Middle". It is not as clear just what their position is in the framework of the Gospel. There is a passage which speaks of the sons of the Father as his aroma, and it
appears that some of the aromas became mingled with matter, and because of this the aromas grew cold in separation and "Lack" of knowledge, but the coming of the "Pleroma" was to abolish this "Lack" and bring about reunion, 34:1-33; and this is done through the coming of knowledge whereby the "Lack", and the "Schema", the matter of this world, melt away in the reunion of the "Aeons" with the Father, 24:15-25:24. It seems that the real problem was not caused simply by ignorance of the Father, the Lack was only brought about through "Error" and the separation was caused through those who accepted "Error", 22:23-24. The men of the "Middle" are evidently understood as inferior Christians. They are those for whom Jesus is the Saviour because they do not know the Father, 16:36-17:1; and only through his death was he able to lead them to faith. In his death Jesus makes it possible for those who "Believe" in salvation to be revealed, his death means life for the many, 20:5-14. In the context of the Gospel of Truth this reference to those who "believed" understood as "the many" would seem to indicate inferior Christians.

The true "Gnostics" appear to be those who, though in ignorance of the Father, unaware that the "All" was in him, were in fact searching for him, 17:5-13. It would appear that the "All" includes both those who were of the "Middle" and the true "Gnostic". Some of those who belonged to the "All" were in fact enslaved by "Error", and thus went forth, deceived by "Plane", 20:20-22; 22:21-27. The remainder continue to search for the Father whom they do not know. It is necessary for them to return to him. Their names are pre-inscribed in the Book of the Living, and their return to the Father is assured, 21:3-14. These people are revealed through knowledge. The Gnostic is the one who is from above, and knows from whence he has come and whither he shall return, 22:3-15. Though the Gnostic has not always had knowledge he has always in fact been a child of God because his name has been written in the Living Book. Knowledge awaited the time when it would please the Father to call his name, and at that time he would receive knowledge, 21:25-29; 27:11-33. The proper end of those who went out through ignorance is the return through knowledge of the Father, 37:34-38. These are those whom the Father knows, he has planted them in Paradise, the place of rest
through knowledge of the Father, 36:35-37:3. They have no need to be
 taught because they have something from on high, and stretch out in
 seeking the Father, 42:10-17. The "Gnostic" is described as the "Perfect"
or "Initiate" in 18:11-15; 36:19-20. Initiation evidently took place
through a form of anointing and the hidden mystery of the Father was
revealed to the "Initiate". Apparently "The Lord's Supper" was inter-
preted as a rite of the Mystery Religions through which knowledge is
communicated to the Gnostic, 18:11-38. The Living Book written in
letters of truth for the Aeons, 23:15; which was revealed to the "Aeons",
23:1; was revealed in the hearts of the "little children", that is the
"Gnostics", 19:32-37. Having knowledge of the Father, they do not need
to be taught by any one, because they have knowledge directly from the
Father, 21:3-7. The Gnostic is the person who loves the truth, and
attaches himself to the Father's mouth by the tongue as he receives the
Holy Spirit. Apparently it is in this way that the Gnostic is given
knowledge of the hidden mystery of the Father, 26:31-27:7. The language
here has been shaped by mythology and the precise meaning is not clear,
especially if, as seems probable, a copyist has added glosses to the
text at this point. But it does seem clear that a direct revelation is
made by God to the Gnostic, perhaps by means of the Holy Spirit, and
thus it may be that the Gnostics regarded themselves as the "Pneumatikoi".

The work of Christ needs to be discussed in relation to creation and
redemption. We have already noted that it is said that the Father begat
the Son before he created the "Aeons", 38:33-35. It would appear that
the Gnostics are also described as the Father's words, and they are said
to be in the Logos, the Father's Thought, before they were revealed. The
Logos himself was the first to emerge, evidently when he was begotten by
the Father, 37:4-21. Thus the Logos is also called the "Thought" Εννοία
and "Mind" Υός of the Father, 16:35-36; and it appears that the Gnostics
are "thoughts" within the "Thought". The Word who is in the heart of
those who pronounce it, that is the Gnostics, 26:5-6; became a body,
26:7-8; 23:19-31. The purpose of the bodily coming of the Word was to
make an assault on the work of "Error" who had enslaved those of the
"Middle". She was enraged and in terror at his coming, 18:21-24; 26:18-30.
Because of this she persecuted him, nailing him to the tree, 18:21-25. But it was through this act that "Error" was defeated, because it was through this act that those who were to believe for salvation were revealed, 20:5-9. It is not clear just in what way Jesus' death is related to the knowledge of the true Gnostic. At times it appears as if the true Gnostic has knowledge through the Logos apart from his bodily coming, but it is also said that through his death he becomes the fruit of "Father-Gnosis", 18:25; and it is through this knowledge that the "All" returns to the Father, 19:5-17. But his main work must be understood as saving those of the "Middle". For the Gnostic, Jesus is nothing other than "knowledge of the Father" which is imparted to them directly from the Father, 20:34-21:7.

The coming of the Word who brings knowledge is to make an end of "Error" and her works, the men of matter. "Error" is depicted as being completely without knowledge so that even when her end is near she dithers about not knowing what to do, 26:13-27. The men of matter, who were the creation of "Error" did not recognize the Logos in bodily form nor did they heed his teaching, 19:21-27; 31:1-8. They are simply the moulded figures of "Forgetting" and will perish with her, 21:30-22:3; 25:25-26:27. We note that "Error" and her ways are symbolized by "Forgetfulness", 21:36; as a "figure of falsehood", 17:24; "darkness", 18:18; "drunkenness", 22:17-18; as "Matter", and "death", 25:16-19. To be deceived by "Error" is to be drunken, to be experiencing a nightmare, to be but a mere phantasy, 26:34-30:16. Those who awake and thus come to true knowledge are congratulated by the writer, 30:12ff.

In the Gospel sin is understood as error or forgetting the Father, 32:27; 35:26; but more often forgetting and error are spoken of without relating the subject to sin. Consequently, "repentence", which is related to the idea of sin, is understood simply as the return to the Father through knowledge, 35:22-23; and "forgiveness" is understood as remaining in the place of rest, the Word of the "Pleroma", 35:27-29. In the Gospel the past is of no consequence as long as the man is a Gnostic. The idea of salvation takes the form of mystical absorption. The "All" has its perfection in the return to the Father out of which it came. Knowledge brings return to the situation where the Gnostics are the
thoughts of God without separate existence of their own, 18:34-19:17; 21:8-14; etc. The idea of absorption is also expressed in the parable of the one hundred sheep. By adding the one sheep from the left hand to the ninety nine of the right hand the number signifies the completion, because the number one hundred signifies the Father, 31:35-32:17. The end is the return of all who came forth from the Father, 37:37-38:5. Thus they become identified with the Father, they themselves are the Truth, 42:21-38.

Several important points need to be drawn out of our treatment of the Gospel of Truth. Firstly, "Error" and her task of enslaving the men of the "Middle" should be compared with the role of the Angel of Darkness, whose task is to lead all the children of righteousness astray, until his end, 1 QS III:21-23. There is of course the difference that "Error" is not appointed or created by God because in fact she has no real existence, but is simply the antithesis of God and reality. Therefore, before God wills to bring about the reality which is his plan "Error" has her opportunity, but with the coming of God's reality according to his will, "Error" comes to an end. There is then an important difference in that in the Qumran Texts, falsehood and sin are regarded as real breaches of God's will, and although God as the creator of all things must be responsible ultimately for the existence of falsehood it is made quite clear that he is implacably opposed to it. The only hint that is given concerning the reason for the creation of the Spirit of Falsehood is the indication that it was assigned to men that they might know good and evil, 1 QS IV:25-26. In other words the two Spirits force man to make a choice for or against God. But an act against God is not simply regarded as a nonentity as in the Gospel of Truth.

In the Gospel of Truth 37:21ff. it is said of God "Nothing is wont to happen without him, nor is anything wont to happen without the Father's will." With this we compare 1 QH I:19-20, "All things exist according to Thy will and without Thee nothing is done." (Compare John 1:3.) The emphasis on the will of God is strong in the Qumran Texts as in the Gospel of Truth, but in the latter the stress is on the arbitrary nature of God's will, 37:24ff. This is a stress which runs contrary to the Qumran Texts where it is clear that the will of God is expressed in the
We notice that both the Qumran Texts, and the Gospel of Truth, have a Gnostic doctrine of the Nature of man. But the Gospel of Truth is more clearly Gnostic than the Qumran Texts. The man who knows God knows him because his true nature comes from the heavenly realm and that knowledge is in reality recollection, and in recollection man is absorbed into the divine reality.

We will turn our attention briefly to the Poimandres Tractate of the Hermetica. But before looking into the idea of knowledge in that work we will draw attention to certain details where the ideas are akin to the Gospel of Truth. Firstly, God is described as the Father of the "All", 21, 27, 31. In both documents the "All" appears to refer to the original creation including Man. Secondly, we note that the original Man becomes mingled with material nature which is the creation of the Demiurge, 14–15. The state of those without knowledge is described as drunkenness, and irrational sleep, 27. They have journeyed into error and ignorance, 28. (See also Tractate VII, on "Ignorance of God"). The Hermetica also develops ideas concerning the rites of the Mystery religions such as we have noted in the Gospel of Truth.

In the process of creation by the will of God through his Logos, God, who is Mind, begat another Mind, the Demiurge. In the process, the Logos became united with the Demiurge, but left the lower elements of nature without "Logos", "reason", so that they were nothing more than mere matter, 9–10. The Mind of the Father gave birth to Man who was like himself, 12. But Man in his desire to be creative became mingled with the reasonless matter, and as a consequence from this union Man became a dual natured being, immortal because of his true origin, but mortal, a slave to his framework and subject to destiny because of matter, 14–15. The whole problem with Man is his body which is bound up with the deceit of love, and because it belongs to the material world of darkness it produces death, 19–20. These are the men who are born of earth, who are drunken, who are in an irrational sleep of ignorance of God, 27.

The remedy of Man’s predicament is his rediscovery of his true nature and origin. It is this that takes place in this Tractate through
the revealing work of Poimandres. Poimandres is identified as the Mind of the Absolute Sovereignty, 2, your God, 6. The Logos which comes from the Mind of the Father, and is not separated from it is that which sees, and hears in Man, 6. In other words, the Mind of God is not separated from the Mind of Man, so that the Mind of God can also be described as Man's Mind, 6,7,30. The knowledge that we are dealing with here is regarded as being communicated directly from the Father to Man through the Logos or by virtue of the uniting of the Mind, 3,30. The knowledge is basically self-knowledge. It is recognizing one's divine origin. "Let the Man who has Mind recognize himself." 21. The indication of this statement is that there are men who do not possess Mind. In fact Mind declares "I myself, Mind, dwell with the holy and good,... and at once they know all things and they worship the Father in love." 22. Here we should notice that the Tractate appears to be dependent on Wisdom 7:24-28, where a similar statement is made of Wisdom. But Wisdom is a Divine attribute, not an essential aspect of the nature of man. We have here an instance of a Hebrew Old Testament saying being used in a way foreign to the meaning which it has in its Old Testament context.

The Gospel of Truth and the Poimandres Tractate both understand the true nature of man in terms of the Thought and Mind of the Father. Because they are thoughts from the Father's Mind, or Minds from his Mind, authentic knowledge is to be aware of this relationship. A marked difference between the two is the real existence, through the work of the Demiurge, of the world of sheer matter in the Tractate in contrast to being a mere illusion according to the Gospel. In this regard, and in the development of the theme of the arbitrary will of God, the Gospel of Truth is more philosophical in its approach than the Tractate.

In neither of these documents is the revealer figure of any real significance. Poimandres, the Mind of God who reveals secrets to Hermes turns out to be Hermes' own Mind as well. In the Gospel of Truth, the main emphasis is on the direct communication of knowledge by God to the mind or heart of the Gnostic. It is possible that this knowledge was thought to be in some way consequent on the coming of Jesus. But the idea of the Logos taking a body, 26:8; 23:31; is to be understood in a Docetic sense, 34:4-8. The purpose of the body was to confuse the "Hyle"
in the work of bringing the plot of "Error" to an end, for it was through
death that the possibility of faith was opened up for those of the
"Middle". But for the real Gnostic the Word who is in the heart of those
who speak it overshadows the significance of Jesus. It is not knowledge
or faith in Jesus that the Gospel declares, but knowledge of the place
of origin, knowledge that man is in the Father, that he belongs to the
divine realm, and that matter is the work of "Error", nothing but an
illusion, it is this knowledge which reunites man with God.

The question concerning the relationship of the Johannine writings
to Gnosticism is most difficult because while there are some points of
agreement, the differences are striking, and nowhere more striking than
when we come to the subject of Christology. Whereas it is essential to
Gnosticism that the soul or mind of man be regarded as a heavenly entity
that had become entangled in the world of matter, and in the Gnostic
systems the material world is regarded as "an illusion", or "evil", for
the evangelist, standing as he did in the Old Testament tradition the
material world had its existence through the Word of God. Man was
created as a creature of the material world, and there is no suggestion
that man by nature shared in the divine nature. Only Jesus is from above,
and his descent is not caused by ignorance, but arises out of the Father's
love for the world, his creation. The coming of Jesus is the coming of
the creator to the creature, and he meets man, not as one who with them
shares in the divine nature, but as the Lord whom they are called to
obey. Gnostic revelers are nothing more than personifications of
knowledge which is communicated directly from the Mind of God to the
Mind of the Gnostic through the affinity of being, that is their common
sharing in the divine nature. Thus whereas the revelation in Jesus takes
place in the context of personal relationship, the Gnostic receives
revelation through communion with Mind, his own Mind, his God.

Eschatology, for the Gnostic, does away with his individuality which is
something which he has from the world of matter. It is swallowed up in
reunion, absorption into the divine. In these systems, where the figure
of Jesus is used as a revealer, the incarnation cannot be taken seriously.
The body that Jesus takes is merely a disguise which is cast away when it
has served its deceitful purpose of hiding him from the men of "Matter".
This differs greatly from the Fourth Gospel where the incarnation of Jesus is stated in terms which the Gnostic could never have accepted. "The Word BECAME flesh". This statement, consistent as it is with the thought of the evangelist, is an indication of the great gulf that separates the Johannine writings from Gnosticism.

The problem with man is not that he has a body of matter, nor that he has forgotten that he has come from God, but that as God's creature he has not kept God's Law, and in this sense has not known God. Consequently it is difficult to see how the evangelist could have borrowed directly from a myth which assumed the divinity of man, and the artificial union of the essential man with matter in the form of a body, in developing his Christology. It is true that in the myth indicates that the essential Man comes down from above, as the evangelist says of Jesus. But the fact that Christian Gnostics, such as the author of the Gospel of Truth, could not accept the reality of the incarnation seems to indicate that the myth failed badly at the essential point that the evangelist was trying to make. Further, the myth assumes an affinity between the revealer and man. They are essentially of the same nature. But in the Fourth Gospel man never ceases to be the creature brought into being through the Word. It seems far more likely that the evangelist was drawing on the Hebrew tradition about Wisdom, Torah, coming to dwell with man. In this tradition the distinction between God and man is recognized, and there is no tendency to regard the material existence of man as something with which God may not come into real contact. That the thought of the evangelist is in a way connected to Gnosticism at this point ought to be recognized, in that we have noted that in the Poimandres Tractate 22 interprets the coming of Wisdom to some men in Wisdom 7:24-28, as the dwelling of Mind in some men. At this point it is clear that the Poimandres Tractate has been influenced by the Old Testament. The influence of the Genesis creation narrative is apparent throughout this Tractate as Professor Dodd has shown. (25) But the relationship of the Wisdom teaching in Israel to Gnosticism is complex, and no clear statement can be given. For our purposes this is not important because it seems clear that the evangelist was drawing on Israel's Wisdom tradition.
There are certain emphases in the Fourth Gospel which are akin to Gnosticism though nothing like identical meaning could be suggested. The fact that the evangelist uses a vocabulary which is related to Gnostic usage without, it would seem, feeling that he need deny the Gnostic sense of the words, suggests that the evangelist is not being directly influenced by Gnosticism, but at the most is feeling the impact of Gnosticism at second hand, probably through Judaism, where Gnostic thought seems to have been known and modified by Hebrew thought in such writings as the Qumran Texts. In the Qumran Texts, Gnostic influence is more apparent than in the Fourth Gospel, though in essentials the Old Testament doctrine of creation prevents anything like a fully Gnostic development because man remains flesh over against God the creator. The fact that the Qumran Texts show no polemical tendencies concerning Gnostic thought is easily explained by the fact that the Community was not in direct contact with Pagan Gnosticism, nor were the Sect's writings intended to be read by "outsiders". Within the Sect it was not likely that the meaning would be misunderstood. In the same way the evangelist shows no sign that he is aware that there are those who use the same language that he uses in a manner that would contradict the meaning he intended. When we turn to the First Epistle of John we find that the writer is fully aware that there are those who use the language that he uses in a most unworthy manner, and his depreciation of this unworthy use is made absolutely clear. It is this difference that distinguishes the Gospel from the Epistle most clearly.

The differences that we have recognized between the Qumran Texts, the Gospel of Truth, and the Hermetica indicate that it is necessary to make certain distinctions within the compass of what we classify as Gnostic. Firstly, we should recognize Pagan Gnosticism which is certainly pre-Christian in origin. In Greek philosophy we come into contact with many Gnostic ideas, the dualism of form and matter, for instance, and Gilbert Murray draws attention to the important development which he describes as "The Failure of Nerve" which is expressed in the marked pessimism resulting from the failure of Greek Philosophy and Culture to bring in Utopia through the reign of the Philosopher King. The result was a deep distrust of anything that life in this world could offer,
and a longing for escape. In Gnosticism this escape was offered through knowledge. Such a system of thought is enshrined in the Hermetica, though we must recognize the influence of the Mystery religions and also the Old Testament, particularly the Genesis account of creation. But although the influence of the Old Testament, and perhaps also Christian influence can be detected in the Hermetica, the real point of the Poimandres Tractate seems to be foreign to the thought of the Old Testament and Christianity. It is possible that the Genesis creation myth was borrowed from a source which was Gnostic in character, and which perhaps also contributed to later Gnosticism. The creation narrative is used in the Poimandres Tractate as the presupposition for the revelation of knowledge through the common sharing of Mind in Hermes with the divine Mind. Plato's doctrine of the pre-temporal fall of souls would have served just as well as the creation narrative; in fact it would have fitted more naturally in the context of Gnosticism where knowledge is remembering as it is in Plato's epistemology. It is as well that we notice that this Gnosticism had found a kinship of thought in some Jewish mythology, which, as we have said, may in its origin have been more Gnostic in character.

Secondly, we are aware of a pre-Christian Jewish Gnosticism which can be detected in the Qumran Texts. The exact relationship of this thought to paganism is not clear, though we venture to suggest, the fact that it is essentially alien to the teaching of the Old Testament concerning the nature of God, man, and the world, would seem to suggest that the development within Judaism must in some way be dependent on the development of these ideas outside Judaism. Those who have argued that Gnosticism originated in Judaism overlook the fact that the essential nature of Gnosticism is foreign to the thought of the Old Testament, while having much in common with some aspects of Greek thought for instance. Further, the development of Gnostic thought within Judaism is related to the use of mythology, which, to say the least, did not originate within Judaism. The creation myth is not unique to the Old Testament, and when it is said that Man was made in the "image" of God we are in the area of what could be understood as Gnostic terminology, though it is not the Gnostic meaning that is understood in Genesis. Further, the
fall of Man, his condemnation, took place through eating of the tree of
the knowledge of good and evil which is interpreted in 1 QSa 1:10-11 in
a sexual sense. It may be that this was the sense in the original myth,
or that because of some foreign influence the idea of knowing good and
evil was later understood in this sense. It is interesting to note that
the fall of Man in the Poimandres Tractate, 14-15, is said to have taken
place through his having been united in love with Nature. It is not
surprising that in the Jewish development of Gnosticism Adam is a key
figure. Adam is not far distant from the thought of the full Gnostic
figure who fell from the realm of light. He becomes the first of a
succession of people who pass on true knowledge which had been "conveyed
direct from God to the soul." In the Qumran Texts we have noted what
appears to be the idea of man's (some men) origin in the world of light,
and the idea of the direct communication of knowledge from God to a
succession of men who acted as the teachers of the Community. The
emphasis on secret knowledge, and the idea that men differed according
to the kind of spirit they possessed are akin to Gnosticism, but the
clear distinction between the man who has knowledge and God, the belief
that the flesh could be purified, and the emphasis on knowledge as
obedience to the Law make clear that the Sect has not departed from the
foundation of the Old Testament in the fundamental issues.

Thirdly, there are post-Christian Gnostic systems. These are some-
times closer to Jewish Gnosticism, and at other times closer to Pagan
Gnosticism. The great difference in these systems is the introduction
of the personal redeemer, who is known first of all in Christian writings,
and only subsequently in Gnostic writings, where he appears, but only in
a qualified manner which indicates the incapability of Gnosticism to deal
with the thought of the incarnation. In the Christian Gnostic Sects
Christian ideas and vocabulary were used in varying ways. In some
writings which show awareness of Christianity, words like ὄρθρος and
Χριστός are used purely as the framework of the Gnostic mythology.
The later Valentinian system criticised by Irenaeus seems to be a good
illustration of Pagan Gnosticism which has adopted a little of the
Christian vocabulary to fill out the Gnostic mythology. There were also
Christians who felt the impact of Gnostic thought, such as Marcion, who
took the Christian message seriously, but because of unanswered problems were drawn at certain points to the Gnostic solution. But even in Marcion's system, no real place could be made for a real incarnation of the Logos in Jesus.

The conclusions which we draw from this study may now be briefly stated. Firstly, the Gnostic idea of knowledge plainly differs from the idea in the Old Testament and the Johannine writings. Secondly, Gnosticism in the Second Century A.D. appears to be a syncretistic development, but the tendencies can be noted, with some differences from the Second Century A.D., in the pre-Christian era.
Chapter Ten

The Theme of Revelation in the Fourth Gospel

I. Introduction

The emphasis on revelation in the Fourth Gospel must be understood in the setting of the evangelists' presentation of Jesus as the fulfilment and abolition of Judaism. With the incarnation of the Λόγος the Law of Moses had been superseded (John 1:14-18). The religion of the Jews was to give way to that which showed it to be superior in the coming of Jesus (John 2:1-11). The validity of the old Temple was abrogated and in its place a new Temple for the meeting of God and man was the resurrected Jesus (John 2:13-22). The idea that the Kingdom of God could be identified with Judaism is denied (John 3:1-15), and it is made clear that it is faith in Jesus and possession of the Spirit that is required of those who worship God truly (John 4:23-24). (1)

The situation presumed by this treatment would seem to be one where Christians were seeking to remain within the fold of Judaism. The Gospel indicates the intolerable compromise of such an intent. In the Gospel we meet from time to time, those who believed in Jesus, but who sought to keep their faith secret, for fear of the Jews (see John 3:1ff; 7:50; 12:42-43; 19:38f.). It is made clear that Christians must be prepared to face excommunication from the Synagogue because of their faith. The promulgation of the "Test Benediction" ( 모르되 못되) about 85-90 A.D. seems to be relevant to this situation. The lack of any formal test may perhaps indicate that the situation reflected by the Gospel is a little earlier (see John 9:22; 12:42; 16:2). It is part of the evangelists' aim to show that the Church must stand against Judaism. Thus the Jews appear "in a bad light", not because the author was not a Jew, but precisely because he was a Jewish Christian who had experienced the stifling effect of attempts to compromise with Judaism. (2) The Gospel narrates how certain individuals, Nicodemus, and the man cured of blindness for example, overcome their fear of the Jews and confess faith in Jesus.

The theme of revelation is set in the context of the question of the relationship of Judaism and Christianity. The Gospel does not greatly use the technical terminology of revelation but deals with the theme in a different manner. What we mean by revelation in the Gospel, has several
different, though related layers of meaning. We must at this point make clear what is meant when we talk of revelation. What has been revealed, and what is the manner in which the revelation has taken place? God is revealed in Jesus, and through this the world is shown up in its true light.

In speaking of creation by the Logos the evangelist seems to have in mind some idea of general revelation. It is true that he also asserts that the world did not respond properly to that revelation. In what sense can we speak of revelation when what we speak of was not received by those for whom it was intended? By way of answer it may be said that this revelation makes man's failure to respond properly to God blame-worthy. Further, it should be pointed out that it is not asserted that this revelation had no effect at all, but that man has not responded appropriately to the revelation.

More prominently the Gospel deals with the revelation to and through Moses and the Prophets. It is clear that Jesus is the subject of the revelation. Abraham rejoiced to see his day (John 8:56). Moses wrote of him (John 5:46) and Isaiah saw his glory (John 12:41). These were recipients of the revelation, and their witness was the medium through which the revelation continued. But it is indicated that the Jews did not respond to that witness (John 5:39-47). The coming of Jesus (John 1:14) is described as the coming of the revelation. In him God has been revealed. But only through Jesus' glorification are men enabled to receive the revelation and to respond to it authentically.

We will deal in detail with the complex working out of this theme in the Gospel, and it will become clear that although God was revealed in the historical Jesus, only after Jesus' exaltation and the coming of the Spirit did his disciples truly receive (in authentic faith) the revelation which had come through him. But the full revelation remains in the future until the believer goes to be with Jesus (John 14:2ff) and will then see his eternal glory (John 17:24). Until then the revelation is not face-to-face but is indirect and mediated to faith. The revelation is communicated to the believers through Jesus' word and the Spirit, which are at work in the community. The face-to-face relationship is promised for the future (this aspect is clearer in I John 3:2; compare I Cor. 13:12).
From what has been said it may at first appear that the purpose of
Jesus' coming could be described exclusively in the categories of
revelation. The emphasis on the eclipse of Judaism by the coming of
Christ does bring to the fore the superiority of the revelation which has
taken place in him. Jesus came into the world to bear witness to the
truth (John 18:37), a purpose which he fulfilled throughout his ministry
(John 3:11, 32; 7:17; 8:14). For Jesus, witness to the truth was witness to
himself (John 14:6) in his saving activity (John 8:31-36). Jesus'
revealing activity was at the heart of his mission (John 11:14, 18; 3:34;
17:4, 6, 26 etc.) because his saving activity was effective only for those
who believed in him, for those who knew him (John 8:31ff).

Jesus' coming into the world is also said to be for the purpose of
κρίμα (John 9:39ff.). This statement appears to be in contradiction to
John 3:17. But in John 3:17 κρίμα means "to condemn" as the contrast
with ἔλεημον indicates, whereas the "judgement" of John 9:39 includes both
salvation and condemnation. In John 9:39ff blindness is a symbol for
death and sight a symbol for life. Those who think that they can see
(think that they have life) are condemned to blindness (death), while
those who acknowledge their blindness (their need of life) are given
sight (life). The purpose of Jesus coming was to give life to the
world, but it was inevitable that those who rejected that gift should
be condemned. The purpose of his mission is said to be to "save" the
world, John 3:17; 12:47. He came that "his sheep" may have life,
John 10:10. The purpose which Jesus came to fulfill can also be described
in terms of "the Father's will", John 6:38-40. Jesus came to do the
Father's will, that is to give life to those the Father had given him.
But in John 10:16 it becomes clear that the Father's will for Jesus also
includes the giving of his life and the taking of it again. Because he
lives through death they also will live, John 14:19. It would seem that
it is being asserted that Jesus in his death and resurrection conquered
death. It is certainly taught that through this, his hour of
glorification (John 12:27), or exaltation (John 12:32f), the judgement
of the world has taken place and the prince of this world has been cast
out (John 12:31), and men of all classes are drawn to Jesus. Thus it is
asserted that Jesus has conquered the world (John 16:33), and that the
Prince of this world has been judged (John 16:11). The evangelist does not clearly indicate just how this cosmic judgement is carried out. All we can say is that through Jesus' glorification Satan's grip on the world was broken, opening up the possibility of freedom for men.

The purpose of saving the world or giving life to the world involves the giving of Jesus' life, John 6:33,51; 10:11,15; 11:50-52; (compare John 12:32; 18:14) 15:13 (compare 13:37ff; 17:19). Jesus is said to give his life for "his people", "the people", "the nation". The purpose of saving the world or giving life to the world involves the giving of Jesus' life, John 6:33,51; 10:11,15; 11:50-52; (compare John 12:32; 18:14) 15:13 (compare 13:37ff; 17:19). Jesus is said to give his life for "his people", "the people", "the nation". The use of ὑπέρ followed by the genitive case indicates some idea of substitution. Whereas the nation would have perished, Jesus as an individual dies instead. The statement on the lips of Caiaphas is said to have been true at a deeper level than he knew. These sayings indicate the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death. Jesus is referred to as "the lamb of God who bears away the sin of the world", John 1:29. C. H. Dodd's suggestion that the ἀρνίος τοῦ Θεοῦ of John 1:29 is to be understood as the kingly "ram" (ἄρπνίον) of the Apocalypse is unconvincing. The use of different words and the different contexts make this suggestion unlikely. We cannot even be sure that the evangelist was aware of the imagery used in the Apocalypse. It is more likely that the evangelist thought of Jesus in terms of the Passover lamb. He indicates that the death of Jesus took place at the time of the slaying of the Passover lamb, see John 13:1; 18:28,39; 19:14,31,42. Emphasis on the Passover is stronger in John than in the Synoptic Gospels (John 2:13,23; 6:14; 11:55 twice; 12:1; 13:1; 18:28,39; 19:14), and references to it are spread through the Gospel whereas there are fewer references in the Synoptic Gospels and they are concentrated in the Passion narrative. Thus, the evangelist seems to have gone out of his way to portray Jesus as the Passover lamb. But the Passover sacrifice does not appear to have been an expiatory offering which John 1:29 seems to presuppose. Jesus' death was, and through identification with the Passover lamb, Christ, the Christian Passover lamb, is understood to have taken away the sin of the world. It may be that the lamb of Isaiah 53:7ff is in mind also (see Acts 8:32; I Peter 1:19). The idea appears to be that of the removal of guilt through sacrifice (see Exodus 28:38; 34:37; Numbers 14:18; I Sam. 15:25; Ps. 32:5; 85:3; Mic. 7:8). Jesus fulfilled
The sacrificial system of Judaism by providing in himself a sacrifice to remove the sin of the whole world. (5)

The idea of sacrifice is connected to the idea of cleansing. Jesus, through his death, has cleansed his disciples. This seems to be the meaning of "the foot-washing" in John 13 which brings out the meaning of the passion as does the narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper in the Synoptic Gospels. The foot-washing indicates that Jesus actually performed some act of service which cleansed the disciples. But this cleansing is not automatic, it depends on the giving and receiving of God's word in Jesus, John 17:14, 17. In other words, what Jesus achieves is inseparable from what he reveals.

The glorification of Jesus is the death sentence on religious nationalism. The Son of Man is lifted up so that whoever believes in him may have eternal life, John 3:14ff. In his exaltation he draws all men to himself, John 12:32. (See also John 4:23 for another example of this kind of universalism.) It is possible that the coming of the Greeks in John 12:20ff. represents a temptation to Jesus to avoid the cross and to draw all men by other means, John 12:27. But in John 12:31ff. the way of the passion is affirmed.

Revelation is at the heart of the Gospel. But Jesus is not simply "the Revealer". He draws attention to himself as the one in whom the Father is known, and through whom the world is judged, and the one through whom the world may be saved. The Gospel places its emphasis on the proclamation of Jesus as the Saviour of the world rather than explaining how it is that Jesus has saved the world. What Jesus has done is complete, but the world as yet has not believed in him. Thus the evangelist places the emphasis on the revelation of Jesus as the one who does these things, and sets him forth for a believing response, John 20:31.

II. Jesus as the Λόγος.

W.F. Albright (6) has argued that the Johannine use of Λόγος has an Oriental origin. "The idea goes back to a dynamistic conception of the third millennium B.C. which makes the voice of god act as a distinct entity with power of its own". He draws attention to Isaiah 40:8; Wisdom of Solomon 18:15; Deut.3:22; Exodus 3:12; Gen.21:20; Deut.4:24; 9:3. In Judaism the idea of "Wisdom" overshadowed that of "Word", and
as we shall see this point is important for the development of the Johannine usage where the evangelist, for his own reasons, reasserts the tradition of the "Word" while drawing on material used concerning "Wisdom". This was possible because there was a tradition in Judaism which equated "Wisdom", "Torah", and "Word". First of all attention must be drawn to the similarities between the teaching about the Λόγος in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel and the teaching about Wisdom in Israel's Wisdom Tradition. We have already drawn attention to the teaching in the Qumran Texts concerning the role of God's Wisdom and Knowledge in creation, and have suggested that it is of significance only when it is set in the context of Israel's Wisdom Tradition. (7)

Rendel Harris (8) argues that the Prologue was originally a hymn in praise of Wisdom. (9) This theory goes beyond the evidence, but it serves as an indication of the apparent influence of the Wisdom Tradition. Some of the obvious similarities between the Prologue and the Wisdom Literature are set out by Professor Dodd (10) Not only are there verbal parallels to the Prologue in the Wisdom literature, the general poetic form of certain passages which personify Wisdom is akin to the form of the Λόγος hymn in John. See Proverbs 1:20-33; 8:9; Sirach 24; Wisdom 7:22ff.; Baruch 3:9ff. Parallels are not restricted to the Prologue. In particular it should be noted that John 3:13 resembles Baruch 3:29 and Wisdom 9:16-17, and the rejection of Wisdom, and return to heaven, which is noted with regard to John 1:11, (Enoch 42:2) is suggestive with regard to Jesus' return to the Father.

Jesus' role is akin to that of Wisdom as the teacher of men (Job 9:6-7; Wisdom 9:16-18) who speaks truth (Proverbs 8:7; Wisdom 6:22), reveals God's will (Wisdom 8:4; 9:9-10), leads men to life (Proverbs 6:13; 8:32-35; Sirach 4:12; Baruch 4:1), (and immortality, Wisdom 6:18-19?), who addresses her hearers in the first person in long discourses (See Proverbs 8:3-36; Sirach 24), offering herself as food and drink (See Proverbs 9:2-5; Sirach 24:19-21; cf. Isaiah 55:1-3). Wisdom is not content to let men find her, she seeks them out (Proverbs 1:20-21; 8:1-4; Wisdom 6:16; Compare John 1:36-38, 43; 5:14; 7:28, 37; 9:35; 12:44), and teaches her disciples (Wisdom 6:17-19), who are her children (Proverbs 8:32-33; Sirach 4:11; 6:18; See John 13:33), and tests them and forms them
(Sirach 6:20-26) until they love her (Proverbs 8:17; Sirach 4:12; Wisdom 6:17-18) and they become friends of God (Wisdom 7:14,27) (See John 15:3; 17:17; 6:67; 15:15; 16:27). But some men reject Wisdom (Proverbs 1:24-25; Baruch 3:12; Enoch 42:2. See John 8:46; 10:25). Thus Wisdom provokes a division: some seek and find (Proverbs 8:17; Sirach 6:27; Wisdom 6:12); others will not change their minds until it is too late (Proverbs 1:28) (Compare John 7:34; 8:21, 13:33). See also pp. 166 ff.

Thus it is clear that the Wisdom parallels continue throughout the Gospel with regard to the ministry of Jesus as the Revealer. Bultmann (Comm. p.8.) has drawn attention to the likeness in form between the Wisdom poems and the source which he describes as the Offenbarungsreden, (Revelation discourses) which of course includes the Prologue. We have suggested that the existence of this form in the Wisdom literature points away from a direct Gnostic influence in the Fourth Gospel to a treatment of the theme of the Law in the light of the Christian revelation. Jesus had fulfilled all that the Law stood for, and this meant that the past validity of the Law had now come to an end. The only remaining purpose of the Law was the witness which it bore to Christ. In expressing this theme the evangelist has appropriated ideas concerning Wisdom which, because he believed that they were fulfilled in Christ, are applicable to him. Not only did he use the same words to express this, but also, to some extent at least, the forms in which these words were cast. Two questions yet remain to be answered. Why did the tradition about Wisdom suggest itself to the evangelist when he was seeking to describe Jesus as the Λόγος? Secondly, if the Wisdom tradition was so suggestive for the Christology of the Prologue, why is Jesus referred to as the Λόγος and not σοφία?

Wisdom had become an alternative description for the Torah. In the passage in Sirach 24 "Wisdom shall praise herself..." the writer goes on to indicate that he is referring to the Law, Sirach 24:23. Rendel Harris (11) indicates that in such passages as Sirach 2:16; 32:15 we must take the Law as an equivalent of Wisdom, just as Proverbs 8:22 was applied to the Torah by the Jewish Fathers. The interpretation of Wisdom as Torah had important consequences in the Fourth Gospel as we can see from John 1:17 etc. What the Jews thought to be true in the Law was really
true in Jesus Christ. The Torah background of the Johannine use of Λόγος is by means of the Wisdom tradition. But how are Wisdom and Λόγος connected? Word and Wisdom are used interchangeably on occasions, "Who madest all things by thy word; and by thy wisdom thou formedst man," Wisdom 9:1-2. There are three passages where first Wisdom, then the Word, and finally Wisdom again, are spoken of in royal terms and in such a way that would suggest that Wisdom and Word were synonymous. 1. "Send her (Wisdom) forth out of the holy heavens, and from the throne of Thy glory bid her come,..." Wisdom 9:10. Here the request is made to God to send forth Wisdom from his throne. 2. "Thine all-powerful word leaped from heaven out of the royal throne," Wisdom 18:15. 3. "I (Wisdom) came forth from the mouth of the Most High, and covered the earth as a mist. I dwelt in high places, and my throne is in the pillar of the cloud." Sirach 24:3-4. The pillar of the cloud seems to refer to the Exodus pillar of cloud (See Exod. 12:21/22). Thus Λόγος as a Synonym for Wisdom is related to the Law. But this is not the only connection of Λόγος with the Law. Λόγος is used to mean commandment, see Psalm 118(119):89. The predominant ideas behind the Λόγος are those concerning the Law as the expression of God's will for man. But why does the evangelist use Λόγος and not νομος or δοξια?

Firstly, the evangelist wished to recall the phrases of Genesis 1, (compare John 1:1, and Genesis 1:1.) and as C.H. Dodd has noted; "We may therefore assume that for the author of the Prologue too the statement of Genesis that God spoke carried with it more meaning than a similar statement would naturally convey to us." He understood that the Λόγος "existed substantively, and mediated creative power." "For creation by the word we have ample scriptural authority, e.g. Psalm 32(33):6: τῷ Λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου ὁ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν." The evangelist's choice of Λόγος to describe the cosmic functions of Christ arose out of an established tradition in Judaism. This tradition runs parallel at many points to the Wisdom tradition. The choice of Λόγος rather than δοξια is an indication of the author's desire to relate what was said of Jesus to the tradition concerning the creative word of God, and in particular to the opening words of Genesis.

Secondly, the use of Λόγος draws attention to the connection
between the Prophetic Word and Jesus. Abraham saw his day, John 8:56,58; Moses wrote of him, John 5:39,46; and the prophet Isaiah wrote of him, John 12:41. The Creative Word and the Prophetic Word are one in Jesus, and the themes of creation and revelation are prominent in the Prologue.

Thirdly, the evangelist wanted to draw attention to the revelation of the Church's proclamation. For Paul the proclamation concerned "the word of the cross", ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ, that is, the crucified Messiah, Χριστὸν ἐστιν ὁ Σαρκικὸς, God's mighty power, Θεὸς Σωτήρ, God's Wisdom, Θεὸς σοφία. I Cor. 1:19/31. The Gospel proclaimed by the Church has the same dynamic power as the Word of the Lord in the Old Testament. (See also Romans 1:16-17) The evangelist wanted to draw attention to the fact that the λόγος proclaimed by the Church was Jesus.

Fourthly, the evangelist draws attention to the connection between the words which Jesus spoke, which were God's words (John 17:8,14), and Jesus himself who is the Word of God, John 1:1ff. (See also I John 1:1; and Revelation 19:13). Jesus communicates himself in his words. Whoever receives the words of Jesus receives him, and wherever the words of Jesus abide, there he also abides, see John 6:35ff; 15:1ff; 17:1ff.

These positive reasons account for the evangelist's choice of λόγος rather than σοφία as a title for Jesus. There are also two reasons which account for his rejection of σοφία. σοφία is unsuitable because it is a feminine noun. Further, it seems that there was a Wisdom Tradition which was likely to confuse rather than elucidate what the evangelist had to say. In the Pauline Corpus (including Ephesians and Colossians) σοφία is used more frequently than in the rest of the New Testament. (Twenty eight times in Paul and twenty three times in the rest of the New Testament.) All but two of the references in the Pauline Epistles are from I Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians. It is in these three books that Gnostic influence has been widely recognized. There is one reference to σοφία in Romans 11:33, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ. σοφία is referred to in the immediate context of some characteristically Gnostic words. In 2 Corinthians 1:12, δικαίως ἐν σοφίᾳ δικαιομένη, wisdom is viewed critically as it is in I Corinthians.

In the first three chapters of I Corinthians σοφία is used sixteen
times, and ὑπόταξις is used ten times. ὑπόταξις is used also in I Corinthians 12:8, and ὑπόταξις is used once in Chapter 6. In I Corinthians 3:10, Paul refers to himself as "a wise master-craftsman", ὑπόταξις ἁρματήκτων which recalls Wisdom's description of herself in Proverbs 8:30. (See the Wisdom of Solomon 7:22; 8:6, and Bereshith Rabba 111 which identifies Wisdom with Torah, the "architect of creation.") Paul's thought, like that concerning Wisdom in Proverbs 8, is about building. (Note the use of ἀρχιτέκτων in Proverbs 8:29; and ἀρχιτέκτων in Proverbs 9:1.) In I Corinthians 3:10 Paul says that he has laid a foundation (ὑπόταξις) and others build upon this (ὑπόταξις). The foundation Paul has laid is "Jesus Christ", I Corinthians 3:11, who is "God's Wisdom", I Cor. 1:24,30; 2:17. Evidently there were those at Corinth who were seeking to lay another foundation, an alternative to Jesus Christ, and this is described by Paul as "the Wisdom of the world" I Cor. 1:20; 3:19, "the Wisdom of men", I Cor. 2:5,13, "fleshly wisdom", 2 Cor. 1:12, and the "wisdom of this age and the rulers of this age", I Cor. 2:6. This wisdom concerned words, I Cor. 2:1,4,13. These words were an alternative to God's Wisdom, I Cor. 1:17, that is, "the Wisdom who has come from God", I Cor. 1:30, the power of God in action in the crucified Christ, I Cor. 1:24; 2:2,4. Thus in the Corinthian correspondence Paul is largely concerned with an attack on wisdom "falsely so called", but he does assert positively that Christ is the true Wisdom from God.

In Ephesians and Colossians it is the positive development of the Wisdom theme which concerns the writer. In Colossians chapters one and two the writer develops his Christological thought by drawing on the Wisdom Literature. Here Paul's attack on false wisdom is made by asserting that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in Christ, Colossians 2:3. He makes this point "so that no one may deceive you by persuasive (but false) words", Colossians 2:4. Thus the false wisdom concerns words and the true wisdom is to be found in Christ alone, as Paul argued in I Cor.

In John the ἀργος is the dynamic, active Word of God. Paul develops a similar Christology, but connects his teaching more closely to Wisdom. He applies the title ὑπόταξις to Christ, and makes use of the Wisdom tradition in expressing his cosmic Christology. Though the
Paul had spoken of Christ as the Wisdom of God, and in particular he had described "The Word of the Cross", "Christ crucified", as God's Wisdom. If this Word of the Cross is God's Wisdom, and Christ is God's Wisdom, then it is but a step to recognize that Christ is the Word, but a step of profound significance, and a step that was crucial for the Theology of the Fourth Gospel.

The evangelist's development of the Λόγος Christology effectively indicates that God's will is revealed truly, not in the demands of Law, but only in Jesus who reveals God's will to save the world because of his love for it, see John 3:16. The response to the personal revelation of God's will in Jesus can only be described adequately in personal terms. The use of Λόγος indicates the essential nature of self-communication of God to man in the revealing activity of Jesus. Thus we note at this point that the personal nature of the revelation determines the nature of knowledge which must also be described in personal terms.

A. An Introduction in the Prologue.

That God is "the God who reveals himself" is made plain in the opening verses of the Prologue. The association of "Word" with "Wisdom" and "Torah" in Judaism meant that "Wisdom" and "Word" would be understood as the "Law". The Law which had been revealed to Israel was considered her possession, and thus the determining relationship was to a legal code, to commandments and dogma. The evangelist regarded this to be a perversion of the worst order which obscured the true meaning of the Law. He uses Λόγος to express the nature of revelation as self-communication. God himself is the subject of the revelation, and his will to reveal himself, which arises from his character, is his will for fellowship (See I John 1:3), which we may describe in terms of the Kingdom of God. The opening of the Gospel indicates that the whole of existence is the result of God's will for fellowship. God has never been without his Λόγος, he has ever been the God who reveals himself. The incarnation of the Λόγος (John 1:14) is the revelation of God as the God who comes to man. The purpose of that coming was that men may know God and enter into relationship with him, that they may become children of God, John 1:11-14.
B. The Father is the ground and origin of the revelation.

That the Father always has his Word is an indication of the nature of God. Word in the sense presupposed by the evangelist indicates disclosure. Words are basic means of communication, and in the sense understood by the evangelist, the Word is not withheld in silence, but uttered. That God has always had his Word indicates that by nature he wills communication. Before going any further we need to ask what it is about God that brings him to will to reveal himself.

a. Revelation becomes event because of God's love for the world, John 3:16. The nature of this love is shown in the giving of his only begotten Son, that those who believe in him may have eternal life. In the Prologue the incarnation of the Logos is described in terms of grace and truth. That is, the mission of Jesus both arises out of God's love for the world, and reveals his love to the world (See also I John 4:9-10). Though the world was created by the Logos, "all is not right with the world", John 1:10. Ἀναφορά is used 78 times in John, and mainly in an important and theological sense. (13)

b. The coming of the revelation is described in terms of the Son's mission from the Father, and in this way the origin of the revelation is indicated. The most characteristic form is ὁ ἀληθῆς μικρὸν (λόγον), though the same point is made by the use of ἀναφορά and ἐκθέω.

In the Synoptic Gospels ἀναφορά is used to indicate the authority involved in a special mission, see Mk. 9:37 = Matt. 10:40 = Luke 9:48; and Mk. 12:16 = Matt. 21:37 = Luke 20:13, though in Luke 20:13 we should note that the verb used is ἐπιστέπειν. We note also Matt. 15:24; Luke 4:18,43; 10:16. These references suggest the idea of a prophetic mission. But these expressions are not important for the Synoptic Gospels to the extent that is apparent from their use in the Fourth Gospel. Of the twenty eight uses of ἀναφορά in John seventeen refer to the sending of Jesus by the Father. (See John 3:17,34; 5:36,38; 6:29,57; 7:29; 8:42; 10:36; 11:42; 17:3,8,18,21,23,25; 20:21.) The same verb is used of John the Baptist stating that he had been sent by God (John 1:16; 3:28); and it is also used to describe the sending of the disciples by Jesus (John 4:38; 17:18). In John 17:18 the sending of the disciples by Jesus stands in a relationship of comparison to the sending
of Jesus by the Father. From the examples given it could be suggested that ἀκοστέλλω has a technical sense in John, but the rest of the evidence indicates that this is not the case. The same verb is used of the Jews sending, messengers, a delegation, servants, and Jesus as a prisoner (John 1:19; 2:24; 5:33; 7:32; 18:24). It is also used of the messengers sent by Mary and Martha to Jesus concerning Lazarus (John 11:3); and to interpret the meaning of the name Siloam (John 9:7). In spite of the fact that we may not give ἀκοστέλλω a special technical meaning, it is clear that the importance of this word in the evangelist’s interpretation of Jesus is greater than in the Synoptic Gospels although, as we have noted, this interpretation is in fact partly suggested by the Synoptic usage. The fact that in the Fourth Gospel both the Baptist and Jesus are said to be sent by God, as were the prophets of the Old Testament, suggests that at one level at least Jesus is to be understood as belonging to the prophetic tradition.

In Luke 20:13 Κύψω is used where ἀκοστελλω is used by Matthew and Mark. There can be no difference of meaning intended by Luke, and as we shall see, in the Fourth Gospel both ἀκοστέλλω and Κύψω indicate the same kind of mission. It would seem that the evangelist if anything favours Κύψω. Jesus refers to ὅ ἄνευς με (ἀνέκτησι), John 4:34; 5:23, 24, 30, 37; 6:38, 39, 44; 7:16, 28, 33; 8:16, 18, 26, 29; 9:4; 12:44, 45, 49; 13:20, 14:24; 15:21, 16:5. (John 5:23, though a slightly different form, is rightly dealt with at this point). Κύψω is not used of Jesus being sent by the Father apart from this formula which accounts for twenty three of the thirty two uses in the Gospel. This formula is used as a title for God only by Jesus except on one occasion where the Baptist refers to ὅ ἄνευς με βοηθήσω ... John 1:33. In John 7:18 and 13:16 the formula is used in a statement where a generalization is made. In 7:18 the generalization should be understood in terms of Jesus’ relationship to the Father, τοῦ κύψαντος αὐτῶν but in 13:16 we should understand τοῦ κύψαντος αὐτῶν of the disciples’ relationship to Jesus. In John 1:22, the messengers who were sent by the Jews (ἀκοστελλω, John 1:19) referred to those who sent them as τοῖς κύψασιν έμας. Though the formula is plural in this case it is right to deal with it at this point. (14)
There are five other references where ἀκοστέλλω is used: twice of Jesus sending his disciples, John 13:20; 20:21; twice of Jesus sending the Spirit, John 15:26; 16:7; and once of the Father sending the Spirit, John 14:26.

We need to ask whether ἀκοστέλλω and κέμψω have the same meaning. The differences in usage may be stated as follows:

1. ἀκοστέλλω never occurs in a form parallel to ὁ κέμψω με (κατ’ ὑμῖν).
2. Only κέμψω is used of the sending of the Spirit. But the evidence as a whole suggests that both words may be used to indicate the same kind of mission. Both verbs are used of the sending of Jesus by the Father, and the sending of the disciples by Jesus, and there are three passages in particular where the two verbs appear in a synonymous sense which is clear in the parallelism. Compare John 13:20 and 17:13, where the Father who sent Jesus (ἀκοστέλλω) is described as τὸν κέμψαντα με, and Jesus sending of the disciples is described by both κέμψαω and ἀκοστέλλω. In the third passage, John 20:21, the emphasis is on the synonymous nature of the sending as is made clear by the use of καθός and κατ’ ὑμῖν. We may add to this evidence the fact that the Baptist, who is said to have been sent by God, (ἀκοστέλλων ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, John 1:6) refers to the sender as ὁ κέμψω με βαπτίζων, John 1:33; and those sent (ἀκοστέλων, John 1:19) to question the Baptist refer to those who sent them as τοὺς κέμψαντας ἡμᾶς, John 1:22, and in 13:16 the sender of the ἀκόστολος is described as τὸν κέμψαντος ἑαυτὸν. Although the words in themselves have no different meaning, as we have seen, it would appear that the form ὁ κέμψω με (κατ’ ὑμῖν) draws attention to the sender while the ἀκοστέλλω used in a statement tends to focus attention on the one sent. But even this distinction is not clear cut as can be seen in John 17:18 where attention is focussed on the senders. Any such distinction does not arise out of a difference of meaning between ἀκοστέλλω and κέμψω, but from the nature of the formula into which κέμψω is cast. (15) The suggestion that κέμψω used "of the sending of the Spirit by Jesus" (John 15:26; 16:17) is significant for Christology does not take account of the use of κέμψω to describe the sending of the Spirit by the
Father, John 14:26. The importance of these references is that they
ground Jesus' authority in the Father and claim the Father's
participation in his activity, see John 5:36; 6:57.

We note also the use of ἡμῶν in Mark 2:17 = Matt.9:13 = Lk.5:32;
and Matt.5:17; 10:34–35; 11:3 = Lk.7:19–20 and compare John 1:9; 6:14;
11:27 where Jesus is described as ὁ ἐρωμένος; Lk.9:56; 12:49. In
the Fourth Gospel the idea of Jesus' coming takes on a much more
significant role in the context of the idea of his mission from the
Father. The important uses may be noted in John 1:11; 3:2,19; 5:43;
We note also John 1:19; 6:14; 7:27,31,41–42; 11:27.

In the Synoptic Gospels the use of ἀναστασίαν and ἡμῶν imply a
prophetic mission, but the writers do not greatly make use of these terms.
They do record that Jesus was regarded as a prophet, at least by some of
his disciples (Mk.6:15; 9:28; and Matt.21:10–11), and some of the people,
Lk.7:16; Matt.21:46. There are perhaps three reasons why the Synoptic
Gospels do not make use of "the Prophet" tradition in developing their
Christology. Firstly, John the Baptist appears as the Prophet in the
Synoptic Tradition, see Mk.9:11–13; Matt.11:9; Mk.11:32. Secondly, there
appears to have been the belief in a prophet redivivus, which could only
be misleading if applies to Jesus, see Mk.6:14–16; 8:28.(16) Perhaps we
should recognize here the belief concerning a succession of men into whom
δοξία had entered (Wisdom 7:27–28). This belief can perhaps be traced
in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (17) as "Mind" in the Polymandres
Tractate.(18) In the Synoptic Gospels John the Baptist is presented as
in some sense Elijah redivivus, Mk.9:11–13; Matt.11:14. He is regarded
as the eschatological prophet who ushers in the coming age, the Kingdom
of God, see Mal.3:1; Mk.1:2ff. Thus the Synoptic Gospels, in rejecting
the prophet redivivus tradition in regard to Jesus, rejected the idea of
identifying Jesus with the "Prophetic pattern". Thirdly, the
eschatological prophet is understood in terms of the Malachi prophecy
(Mal.3:1 and 4:5–6) as Elijah. His role is that of a preacher of
repentance, and as such could not express adequately Jesus' relationship
to the Kingdom of God. This role they rightly attributed to John the
Baptist.
But the Malachi tradition concerning the coming Prophet was not the only tradition. In 1 QS XI:11 there is mention of the hope concerning the coming of the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (Prophet, Priest and King). We note also the Messianic Anthology (4 Q xist) which includes five quotations arranged in four groups, the first group referring to the Prophet like Moses, (see Deut. 18:18-19) the second about the Royal Messiah, and the third, the blessing of the Priest-Messiah. What is of interest to us at this point is the hope concerning the coming of the Prophet like Moses arising out of Deut. 18:15, 18-19. In the Acts of the Apostles Jesus is thought of as the Prophet like Moses, Acts 3:22-23; 7:37. The Fourth Gospel makes use of the hope for the coming of this Prophet in the development of Christology.

Jesus and Moses are compared and contrasted from time to time throughout the Gospel beginning at John 1:17 where it is made clear that Jesus is greater than Moses. "The Law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." Thus, while Jesus is placed alongside Moses at this point, the evangelist indicates that Jesus is greater than Moses. But the very placing of Jesus beside Moses draws attention to the hope for the coming of the Prophet like Moses, who would at the same time be greater than Moses because the people would obey him. Moses as the prophet of the Law, whose work failed to bring about obedience in Israel, is contrasted to Jesus the new Prophet who effectively brought obedience. In John 1:45 we should possibly recognize an appeal to Deuteronomy 18:15, 18-19 in the words "of whom Moses wrote in the Law..."

In John 2:13-22 we should possibly connect the idea of the coming Prophet with the inauguration of the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31ff.), and a new Temple, see John 1:14, 51; 2:21; compare Malachi 3:1ff. which speaks of the coming of the Lord to his Temple. Further, in spite of the fact that the evangelist does not quote Jeremiah 7:11, as the Synoptic Gospels do, the passage is in mind as is indicated by the development of the theme of the destruction of the Temple which is to be found in Jeremiah 7:14. What is more, although the Synoptic Gospels do not develop the theme of the destruction of the Temple in the context of the incident of "The Cleansing", they do report that false witnesses claimed that they had heard Jesus say that he was able to destroy the Temple of
God and rebuild it in three days, Matt. 26:61; that he will destroy this
hand made Temple, and build another, not made with hands, in three days.

It seems likely that there was an element of truth in these charges. The
coming of the new Covenant brought to an end the validity of the old
Temple. Jesus' words in John 2:13-22 are probably to be understood as a
new Temple Court Sermon such as is known to us in Jeremiah 7. It is of
some importance to notice that the raising of the new Temple is spoken
of using ἐγερθεὶς, which is used of Jesus resurrection, John 2:22;
Acts 3:15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:40; 13:30, 37; Rom. 4:24; etc.; not οἰκοδομέαρι
as in the Synoptic Gospels. Thus in this incident Jesus stands in the
prophetic tradition pronouncing doom on the old Temple, but in drawing
attention to his own significance through the resurrection, as the new
Temple, he indicates the limitations of the prophetic pattern when applied
to him.

The evangelist understood one aspect of Jesus' ministry in terms of
the performance of "signs" (σημεῖα). This is the word that is used in
the LXX to translate ΝΙΚΩ. The ΝΙΚΩ was a "special part of the
prophetic activity", see Isaiah 8:18; Ezekiel 4:3; John 2:11, 23; 3:2;
4:54; 6:12, 14; 11:47; 12:18, 37; 20:30. See also 5:36; 10:25, 38. Each of
the signs in the Gospel makes its own point, but the signs as a whole
indicate that Jesus has come from God (John 3:2; see also 5:36; 10:25, 38),
at least in the sense of a prophet like John the Baptist who is said to
have come from God, John 1:6.

The meeting of Jesus with the Samaritan woman leads to her recognition
of him as a prophet, John 4:19. Jesus accepted that recognition, but as
with the recognition of Nicodemus, John 3:2, he went on to challenge her
to see him in terms of a significance which could be contained by the
Prophetic model. Nicodemus was challenged to be born anew, and the woman
was informed that the eschatological hour had come making obsolete the old
ways of worship. Worship was now to be offered God in the Spirit who was
given to those who believed in Jesus, see John 4:23ff; 7:39; 14:6. Thus
it is clear that Jesus focussed attention upon himself in such a manner
that would have been unjustifiable for a prophet, John 4:41-42.

In Chapter 5 the evangelist records a sign which Jesus performed on
the Sabbath, consequently incurring the wrath of the Jews, because he
broke the Sabbath. But Jesus' defense entailed an appeal to Moses' testimony to him, John 5:36 (Deut.18:15,18-19); and an appeal to the activity of the Father (John 5:17-23) who sent him. In this way Jesus appealed to the origin of his activity in the Father, and the Father's participation in his activity, just as the prophets did. But unlike them, he claimed that men's attitude to him determined their eternal destiny, John 5:24ff.

Chapter 6 opens with another prophetic sign which leads to the confession that Jesus is ὁ λαός τοῦ προφήτου, ὁ ἑρμηνευόμενος εἰς τὸν Κόσμον. The expression concerning "the one who comes into the world" is characteristically Johannine, but the recognition of Jesus as the Prophet seems to be rooted in the tradition. The Prophet is further defined in the discourse which follows, and what is meant by coming into the world is further clarified. In the discourse Jesus, who had fed the multitude, is compared with Moses who is said to have given the people of old bread from heaven. This comparison and contrast draws attention to the promised Prophet like Moses in Deut.18:15,18-19. The idea of Moses giving the people bread from heaven takes up Nehemiah 9:15 and Psalm 28:24f. But Jesus interjects that it was not Moses, but God, the Father, who gave the true bread from heaven, John 6:32. It could be that Jesus here sides with Psalm 28:24f against Nehemiah 9:15. But this does not seem likely as the evangelist is able to affirm that the Law was given by Moses, John 1:17. As it seems likely that the symbolism of bread was intended to draw attention to the Law as bread,19 that is, that which gives life, it is unlikely that this is what was meant. Rather we must understand this as a denial that Moses gave the τὸν ἀρτὸν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινὸν. In other words, the bread which Moses gave was not the true and life giving bread which the Father gives, John 6:32-33, and which Jesus, not Moses, is able to give John 6:34. But there is a greater distinction between Jesus and Moses. The true bread which comes from the Father, and which Jesus is able to give, is Jesus himself, and life is given through coming to him and believing in him, John 6:35,48,50-51. The discourse leads on from the recognition of Jesus as the Prophet to the recognition that the language concerning coming into the world relates to Jesus origin. But because the Jew
knew his mother and father they could not accept this claim, John 6:41-42.

In Chapter 7 we find that Jesus' claim to have come from God was understood in Jerusalem to mean that he was the Messiah or the Prophet (perhaps the Messianic Prophet), John 7:26,40f. There are three arguments raised against this point of view. Firstly, it is claimed that Jesus was not the Messiah because his origin was known whereas the Messiah was to have a mysterious origin, John 7:27. The irony of this argument is the evangelist's understanding of the incarnation of the Λόγος of which the Jews were unaware. Secondly, it is argued that the Messiah was to come from Bethlehem, not Galilee, John 7:41-42; see Micah 5:2. It is also argued that no prophet (or according to P66 "the Prophet") comes from Galilee, John 7:52. The irony of this argument also is clear if the evangelist was aware of the Bethlehem birth stories. Thirdly, it is claimed that none of the rulers or Pharisees have believed in Jesus, but only those who were ignorant of the Law. This argument assumes that the "educated class" must be right, an argument that the history of Israel would not entirely support. Further, the argument was not valid as the interjection of Nicodemus indicates. (see also John 12:42f.) But the leaders themselves show that they do not obey the Law because they do not wish to hear what Jesus had to say for himself (John 7:48-52) in spite of the evidence of Jesus' powerful words (John 7:46) and his astonishing signs (John 7:31). They were not willing to admit that Jesus' claim to have come from God could be true because they were well satisfied with their own system of religion and were unwilling to have it changed. They were not seeking God's will and consequently they rejected Jesus, John 7:17. Though they knew the Law in theory (John 7:52), they did not obey it, (John 7:19,51. See Romans 2:17ff.)

In John 8 Jesus discussed the question of origins with the Jews. He claimed that God was his father (8:25ff) and that the Jews showed that the devil was their father by their antagonism to him (8:44). The Jews claimed that Jesus was of an illegitimate origin (8:41) and was consequently to be regarded as a demon possessed Samaritan, 8:48. It would appear that we are here in touch with the tradition of the virgin birth, at least, as it was interpreted by the Jews. The Jews allowed their understanding of Jesus' physical origin to blind them to the truth.
of God in him, and consequently, they regarded what, at the lowest level, should have been understood as prophetic inspiration, as demon possession.

In John 5:37-47 Jesus claimed that those who believed Moses would believe him, but in 9:29 the claim that God spoke by Moses was made the basis of the argument that Jesus was a sinner because he healed the blind man on the Sabbath day, 9:16-24. The Pharisees were sure, on these grounds, that Jesus was not from God as Moses was, though they were not prepared to say from whence he had come, 9:29. Unknown origin here does not refer to Jesus' place of birth, though it may be that the evangelist intends us to understand the Jews as contradicting themselves, see John 7:27. The real point was their refusal to acknowledge that Jesus' authority was grounded in God. But there were those who drew attention to the signs as evidence that Jesus had come from God, 9:16. The man who had been healed also drew this conclusion, 9:30-33, and acknowledged Jesus as a prophet, 9:17. This conclusion did not go far enough, and we follow the incident until Jesus reveals himself to the man as the Son of Man (or Son of God), John 9:35, and is worshipped by him, John 9:38. The Jews conclude that the man has made his profession of faith in Jesus because, having been born blind, he had been born in sin, 9:34.

The evangelist's use of the prophetic mould to portray the authority and mission of Jesus is partly prepared for by the early denial of the Baptist concerning the suggestion that he may be the Messiah or Elijah or the Prophet, John 1:19-21. This makes the way clear for understanding Jesus as the promised Prophet.

The Synoptic Gospels portray Jesus as a Spirit endowed man, see Mt.1:10=Mc.3:16=Lk.3:22; Mt.1:12=Mt.4:1=Lk.4:1; Lk.4:14,18; Mt.12:28=Lk.11:20. The Fourth Gospel also draws attention to the descent of the Spirit on Jesus, John 1:32. John adds the details which indicate the permanent nature of the abiding, see also 3:34. Further the evangelist indicates that Jesus himself bestows the Spirit, John 1:33; (see Mc.1:7=3:Lk.3:16=Mt.3:11.) 7:32-39; 15:26;16:17. While Jesus is like the prophets as one who is inspired by the Spirit, the fact that the Spirit abides permanently on him, and that he was able to bestow the Spirit separated him from them. In this Jesus is marked out as one greater than Moses, for he fulfilled Moses' desire that all the Lord's
peoples should be prophets and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them. Numbers 11:29. Thus Jesus promised the Spirit to all believers, John 7:38-39.

The prophets of the Old Testament stood in the counsel of the Lord and he revealed his word to them (see Jer. 23:16-22); and Jesus claimed to have been sent by the Father, having seen what the Father did and having heard what the Father had said, see John 1:18; 5:19-20 etc. But in spite of the use that the evangelist made of the hope for the coming Prophet, and the prophetic model, it is not correct to speak of a Prophetic Christology in the Fourth Gospel. Rather he highlights the recognition of Jesus as the hoped for Prophet (or as a prophet), and makes use of the vocabulary associated with the prophetic office to bring out the nature of the revelation that had taken place in Jesus. With the designation of Jesus as the Λόγος through whom the created order had come into being, in whom God was present, there was a danger that the result would be the belief in two Gods. But by using the terminology related to the prophetic mission it was made clear that Jesus was totally dependent on the Father and that the Father was active in him. Of course the fact that Jesus himself was the central fact of the revelation marks him off from the prophets. It is a Λόγος Christology which, through the use of the prophetic categories, makes clear that we must understand it as the Λόγος of the Father.

C. The revelation in the Λόγος.

The theme of revelation in the Prologue raises the question about the nature of revelation prior to the incarnation. Had God revealed himself prior to this event, and if so what was the nature of that revelation, and what was the relationship of it to the revelation in Jesus?

I. Creation by the Λόγος, as stated in the Prologue, indicates that in this activity God reveals himself. The nature of this revelation is not clear, though the world's failure to know him is blameworthy as a result. Bultmann has suggested that the creation is a revelation in the sense man should have knowledge of his creatureliness, which is the possibility of understanding himself as God's creature. (20) At some time every man is, or once was, faced with the decision for or against this
possibility. The knowledge of creatureliness is not grounded in any emotion or feeling, but in existential self-knowledge. The world is originally intelligible as creation and so too is God's claim on his creature, the claim being that man should honour God; see Romans 1:18-21; Wisdom 13:1ff. In creation the Λόγος was life-giving power which would have been light for men had they understood themselves as creatures. The light is authentic self-understanding which is true life as is indicated from the beginning in that the Revealer is depicted as the light and the life. But this interpretation of the light does not do justice to the theme of the judgment by the light so prominent throughout the Gospel, unless in some way the possibility stands in judgment over the world because the possibility remains unfulfilled. The line of interpretation given here by Bultmann can be followed up to a point. It is true that Τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων means the light for men (objective genitive), just as Τὸ φῶς τῶν κόσμων means the light for the world. The life of the Λόγος is revelation for men, for the world, and because the context in which this revelation takes place is the Darkness, it means that it is the judgment of the world. The light is the light of life (subjective genitive), the life manifests itself as light. (24)

It is possible that in the Prologue we have some material incorporated from a source hymn such as has been postulated behind Colossians ch.1, and where the meaning was somewhat different from what we now find after the editing by the evangelist. It is possible that in the source the light of men indicated that men (or at least some men) share in the light. But this is not the evangelist's meaning, and if such a source did exist he has transformed the meaning by indicating that 'his own' (who in the Hellenistic myth are said to share in the light) reject the Λόγος. But it must be said that the existence of the source is doubtful, and even if a source is thought to have been used it is quite another matter to establish that the source differed from the present text precisely at this or that point. It seems best to draw only two conclusions at this stage. 1. The whole world was made by the Λόγος and all men should have known him, but, 2. The world, including 'his own' did not know him and consequently stand under the judgement of the light.
The precise thought of the evangelist on this point is not clear, but what is plain is that the world stands condemned because of its rejection of the knowledge of God. Whether this general revelation is to be understood in terms of natural law (See Romans 2:14-15; 5:12-14), or in some sense like that of Romans 1:18ff., the evangelist is not concerned to inform us. His real emphasis is not at this point, for this is merely the background for his main theme. In a sense it is only a secondary background for the real emphasis on revelation before the incarnation of the Αὐγήσ does not come at this point.

II. The revelation of the Αὐγήσ in the Law and the Prophets is an important theme in the Gospel. It is introduced as early as verse six in the Prologue. John represents the messengers of the Old Covenant and is described in terms applicable to a prophet. This description is in marked contrast to the terms used to describe the Αὐγήσ. It is also of some significance to note the difference of the role assigned to the Baptist when compared to his function in the Synoptic accounts. John appears there as the beginning of the Gospel (Μ.11ff.) and has some significance apart from Jesus in the coming of the Kingdom of God. But in the Fourth Gospel John’s baptism, as well as his witness, is just to mark Jesus out. He has no significance apart from his witness to Jesus, 1:7-8; 1:15,19ff.; 3:22ff. etc. The evangelist indicates that this is also the function of the Old Testament; 5:39,45-47; to bear witness to Christ. Abraham rejoiced to see his day 8:56, and Isaiah prophesied as the result of seeing Christ’s glory 12:41. The witness of the Old Testament to Christ should have led the Jews to believe in him, and their failure is the more reprehensible because of their rejection of this witness. The Jews are to be regarded as having an advantage in this regard as is indicated by the references to the witness of the Scriptures, and also in the discussion with the woman of Samaria 4:22-24. It is true that the coming of the revelation in Jesus is the judgement of all religious quests, 4:21,23; but at the same time it is made clear that the Jews worshipped according to knowledge whereas the Samaritans worshipped in ignorance, 4:22. It would seem to be a fair conclusion to draw that the knowledge of the Jews here presupposes the revelation of the Old Testament. It is true
also that the saving act of God in Christ comes from the Jews and not the Samaritans, and the remaining validity of the Old Testament, the Jewish Scriptures, is that they bear witness to him. The witness arises out of the revelation of the glory of the eternal LOGOS. See 12:41. The revelation and witness involved in the Old Testament concern the eternal Λόγος, and this theme of revelation and witness is taken up into the evangelist’s presentation of the Λόγος made flesh. Once the incarnation of the Λόγος has taken place, it is seen to be the fulfilment of the witness of the Old Testament. It is the abrogation of the Old Testament as a closed system for which any independent significance may be claimed.

The Old Testament as the witness arising out of the revelation to certain individuals in the past, is the witness to Jesus and is in a secondary sense also revelation, 5:35. Just as John was sent (1:6) to bear witness to Jesus, so the prophets were also sent. The sending and obedience is involved in the revelation event, and though the evangelist does not indicate that inspiration by the Spirit is also involved in the witness of the Old Testament, this was common knowledge, and is presupposed in his development of the theme of revelation and witness, 15:26-27.

By drawing attention to the witness of the Old Testament to Jesus the evangelist shows that the Jews should have believed in Jesus, and that they are condemned for their unbelief by the Scriptures in which they put their trust, 5:45.

III. The Λόγος made flesh is the τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. John 1:4, 9; 8:12, 9:5 (see 3:19-21 and 12:46). The meaning is ‘the light for the world’ as we have seen. Bultmann’s objection that the parallels in the Old Testament and Rabbinic literature concerning Wisdom and the Law are invalid because they are symbolic does not seem to be valid. The Gnostic usage (to which Bultmann appeals) itself is symbolic. Bultmann elsewhere recognizes the symbolic use of the terms ‘bread’, ‘bread of life’ and as these as well as ‘light’ are supposedly borrowed from the Gnostic source, and both are said to refer to the revelation, it is hard to see how it can be objected that the evangelist does not use ‘light’ symbolically. We conclude that the evangelist is using the
words 'light', 'bread', 'vine', etc. in a symbolic way. For this background see Str. B. 1, pp. 237f.; 2, pp. 357, 521f., 552f.; Psalm 27(26):1; 56(55):13; 119(118):105, 130; Job 33:30; Baruch 5:9. For the dualism of light and darkness which is prominent in the Gospel (see pp. 73f. above) note IQS 2:13; 3:7, 20-21. Note 'light of life' in IQS 3:17 which was a special interpretation of the Law. See Psalm 36(35):10 and compare ICD VII4 where it is noted that 'the well is the Law'. Torah is said to be light, see Siphre Numbers 6:25+41; Proverbs 6:23; Deut. R. 7:13; Mekh. Ex. 14:13; Test. of Levi 14:14; Ex. R. 36:13; Wisdom 18:3-4. Wisdom is also thought of as light, Wisdom 7:26; Prov. 8:22 with Gen. 1:3.

There is also the Christian precedent for using the symbol of light to refer to the revelation in Jesus though this is also dependent on the Old Testament. See Matt. 4:16 (cites Isaiah 9:1); Lk. 2:33 (see Isaiah 49:6); and in Matt. 5:14 the disciples are described as 'the light of the world' as Jesus is in Jn. 8:12 etc. It is to be noted that the evangelist is at pains to make clear that the witness of the Church is grounded in the work of Jesus, and by going a stage behind the Synoptic saying he is able to do this. See also Acts 1:47; Phil. 2:15; Col. 1:12; Eph. 5:8; 1 Peter 2:9.

The revelation event is expressed in terms of the coming of the light, the 'true light' to which testimony is borne by the Baptist, 1:8; and the Scriptures, 5:39. They are lights, 5:35, but not the true light. True is not here opposed to false, but makes clear the secondary nature of the witness of John and the Old Testament, and the primary significance of Jesus. There were witnesses to the Light before the coming of Jesus into the world, but at that coming they were rendered obsolete 1:9; 3:19 (8:12; 9:5) 12:46.

a. The revelation as the φῶς; the Κρύπτω of the world. The original possibility of knowing God which was given in creation through the activity of the Logos was unfulfilled, or rather, rejected. The nature of this possibility depends to some extent on the meaning of 1:4, 9. Bultmann punctuates 1:4 as follows: ὁ γενόμενον, ἐν κύριῳ. Ἰωάννου, καὶ ἡ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. This is taken to mean that the life given in creation is also the light. It contains the possibility of revelation, and the content of the revelation is
correct self-knowledge, to know oneself as a creature, and to honour the creator accordingly. The life as such is authentic life.\(^{(26)}\) The life given in the saving revelation brought by Jesus is the same as the lost possibility given in creation.

But this is not the only way of taking this verse, and though this punctuation has the support of the earliest fathers and heretics, and the added argument that it maintains the parallel structure of the clauses, it is to be rejected. The importance of the structure is doubtful as it can only be maintained by the exclusion of certain verses. The alternative punctuation is as follows: \(\chiρις αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ εὗ ὁ γέγονεν. \)

\(\epsilonὐ καὶ τὸν \ Ζυγοὺ \) (or ἔστιν, ὁ δ. etc). (The ἔστιν is an error as is shown by the continuation with \(\eta \) in verse four.) In favour of this reading (1) John frequently uses \(\epsilonὑ \) at the beginning of a sentence. (2) Repetition is characteristic. (3) Such passages as 5:26, 39; 6:53; give a similar sense. (4) The fact that 'in the Word was life' makes better sense and a more naturally Johannine sense than 'the created universe was life in him, and this life was the light of men', or any of its alternatives.\(^{(27)}\)

The 'light of men' in verse 4 is to be read with verse 9 in mind, for it is the light \(\delta \ ϕωτις \ τοις \ αὐτοῖς \ \chiρισμὸν. \) The sense of this is not that all men are enlightened with the divine reason, as verse 10 makes clear, but that all men come under the \(\chiρις \) of the light, see 3:19. The function of the light is judgement. All men of all time have always come under the judgement of the light, that is the life in the \(\Lambdaογος \), whether they have known it or not. The existence of the darkness does not overcome the light. The fact of rejection does not deny the judgement by the light, but is in fact a manifestation of that judgement. The testimony of John (1:16-7) signifying as it does the witness of the law to the light, indicates that already the light has had its function as \(\chiρις \) in dividing men according to their response to the revelation as the light. The Scriptures are the testimony of those who have seen the light, who have come to the light, and borne witness to the light. (5:39, 45-47; 8:56).

In verse 9 the light which has always shone in judgement on every man is said to be coming into the world. Grammatically, \(\εὑρέσε \)
could be taken with ἀνέβρασαν or φῶς. The fact that ἀνέβρασαν ἐξ τοῦ κόσμου is a common Rabbinic expression for 'every man' (cf. Lev. R. 31:6.) ἀνέβρασαν ἐξ τοῦ κόσμου is outweighed by: 1. In verse 10 the light is said to be in the world, and therefore the coming is logical here. 2. Elsewhere in the Gospel men are not said to have 'come into the world' but Jesus has come into the world 6:14; 9:39; 11:27; 16:28; and the light has come into the world 3:19; 12:46. This point makes it hard to accept any other interpretation of verse 9. 3. Further, the periphrastic imperfect is in accordance with John's style. 1:28; 2:16; 3:13; 10:40; 11:1; 13:23; 18:18,25. Here in verse 9 we have a reference to the incarnation, the coming of the light, the coming of the revelation as judgement.

There are three things that emerge about the revelation as the light, as the judgement of the world. 1. The revelation causes division. 2. The revelation is the condemnation of the false life of the world. 3. The revelation is also the opportunity to come to real life. (N.B. These 3 points are made strongly in Chs.8–9 which reveal Jesus as ἔλαθες τοῦ κόσμου.) But before we look at these points we must consider the world into which the light has come.

The world was created by the Λόγος with the original possibility of revelation and thus of knowing God. This was the possibility of authentic life. The world's failure to know God is regarded as blame-worthy, 1:10. The world is in darkness, 1:15. In fact darkness is of the essence of the world as it now is, see 8:12; 12:35,46. There is no explanation of how this situation came into being. The world is the world of men who love darkness rather than the light (3:19), who are blind but claim to have sight (9:39–41), who are in bondage to sin but claim to be free (8:34,35), and as a consequence are under the sway of death (8:21,24). The world which claims to have knowledge (sight) freedom, and life, has in fact only a lie, and this lie is the darkness. It is this world that God loved (3:16), and to it the revelation has come. In John 1:10–11 we are told of the world's rejection of the light. The reference to "his own" denotes the Jewish people who in their rejection of Jesus represent the world. It is this rejection of the light which makes the world what it is. Of course this rejection does not nullify
the witness of Moses and the prophets (5:39, 45-47; 8:56; 12:41), nor can the important place of the Jews in "salvation history" be overlooked, John 4:22. When Bultmann says "It is clear; before the light's coming all were blind," he fails to do justice to the thought of the evangelist. In the Johannine sense the coming of the light refers to the incarnation of the Λόγος. But if Abraham saw Christ's day, if Moses wrote of him, and if Isaiah saw his glory, how can it be said that they were blind? Bultmann fails to do justice to the evangelist's understanding of the witness of the Old Testament to Jesus at this point. But this criticism must be modified in view of the fact that Bultmann does recognize, to some extent, the validity of the witness of the Old Testament. His statement is confusing because it would appear that his understanding of the coming of the light is existential rather than historical as it is for the evangelist. (29)

1. The coming of the light was for the purpose of judgement (κρίσις) which causes division, John 3:19; 12:31. This purpose is not to be understood in terms of condemnation (κρίνειν), John 3:17; 12:47. But the purpose was with a view to bringing about κρίμα, John 9:39. There appears to be a contradiction at this point. But it is only apparent because by worldly standards, the judgement by the light was no judgement at all. The judgement of the revelation was to be seen in the division caused by it. It is noteworthy that all of the references to the light come in the first twelve chapters which deal with the revelation to the world, the challenge of the light to the darkness, 3:19-21. A recurring theme throughout this section is that of the division (διάκόπτω) which Jesus created, John 7:43; 9:16; 10:19, as men leave the darkness for the light. See John 9:5, 25, 39-41.

2. The judgement is the condemnation of the world. (a) It is the condemnation of the world's quest for life. The life revealed in Jesus condemns what the world falsely calls life, John 1:4. In John 9:39-41, the Jews who claimed to have sight were in fact claiming to have life. Because of this they rejected the possibility of life which had come in Jesus. Rejection does not leave men as they were before the coming of the revelation, but definitively and irrevocably in the darkness because they have rejected the only possible cure for their blindness. The Jews
claimed to have life in the scriptures (John 5:39), but it was this claim which prevented them from coming to Jesus (John 5:40) who was the "true light". The world is right in seeking for life, but wrong in thinking that it knows how to have life, in fact, that it has life. The error lies in the idea of life itself. It was thought that bread and water would give life and thus these things are sought, John 4:15; 6:26. Jesus made clear that these things could not give life, though his use of this symbolism suggests that there is a connection between the life that is revealed in him, and the life for which the world longs, distorted though that longing may be, John 4:14; 6:27,32-36, 48-51; 7:37-39. The world longs for life, but when the life was revealed it condemned what the world called life just as light condemns the darkness. This condemnation reveals the world's need of life, and the possibility to have this life in Jesus, John 3:16,36; 5:24; 6:35, 47,51; 7:37; 8:12,51; 9:39-41; 10:9; 11:25f; 12:44ff.

b. The revelation is the condemnation of the world's quest for religion. This theme is brought out in 2:13-22; 4:1-42; 5:1-47; and chapters 7-9 revolve around this theme. It is closely related to the theme of the condemnation of the world's quest for life because religion has to do with God, and the revelation of the true life was the life of God. The world's rejection of life is not properly understood until it is seen to be at the same time the rejection of God. In chapters 5 to 9 the Jews use their religion to guard themselves from the revelation, 5:18; 6:42; 7:22-24,27,40-52; 9:16,24. This religion which makes men secure against the revelation is condemned by the revelation in Jesus. The life which is revealed in him is also the truth (John 14:6), not truth in general, but the truth which God is, which is his Word (John 17:17). The truth is the revelation of God in Jesus, who speaks the truth, does the truth, and is the truth, who in his whole being, words and works, is the revelation of God.

The Jews thought that in their possession of the Scriptures (the Law in particular) they had life (5:39), and as a consequence failed to come to the one who could give them life, to whom the Scriptures bore witness (5:40). (30) The coming of the revelation in Jesus was the fulfilment of the hope to which the Old Testament bore witness, but it
condemned the religious quest of Judaism along with that of all other religions (4:22-24). In this new situation the witness of the Old Testament leads naturally to faith in Jesus, but the failure to receive that witness brought the Jews' religion with the religions of the world, of which it had made itself one, under the condemnation of the revelation. The coming of the light brings about a new possibility for the world. For those who will admit that they are blind, and in darkness, the coming of the light is the opportunity to see, to be in the light, to become children of the light, 3:19-21; 8:12; 12:35-36, 46. (31)

The primary meaning of the light is to indicate the judgement that takes place in the coming of the revelation in Jesus. This view is supported by the recognition that all of the references to the light occur in the Book of Signs (Chapters 1-12). It is in this section that the judging work of Jesus is portrayed. In chapters 13-17 Jesus is present with those who have believed in him. The division has already taken place, and although Judas has yet to divide himself from the community of believers, this is not described in the terms of light; but it is said, and probably with some significance, as Judas withdraws, 'and it was night'. Judas withdraws into the darkness and his condemnation is sealed. It is during chapters 1-12 that Jesus as the light shines in the darkness and the Jews deny Jesus' claims 10:1-41; deny the meaning of his miracles 11:1-54; deny the witness of those who believe 11:55-12:9; and thus they retreat irrevocably into the darkness. The darkness is falsehood and death. It is not God's creation even though it is named 'night' by him and is thus under his control. In this way the Jews are sons of darkness, not light, they embrace a lie, for the darkness has no created reality, they are themselves sons of falsehood 8:32-34, whose existence is unauthentic, on the boundary of God's possibility.

The light is that which shines on men, and not that which illuminates God. It is the life of the eternal Word. Predominantly in John it is the life of the incarnate Word which is the light of the world, the light for men. The revelation of the life in Jesus must be considered to make clear further aspects of the judgement by the light. (32)
CHAPTER ELEVEN

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life".

I. The relation as the ὑπάρξεις. The word ὑπάρξεις is used only in John 14:4,5,6. The reference in 1:23 is a quotation of Isaiah 40:3 by John the Baptist. The wording of the quotation agrees with the LXX and Mark 1:3 except that ἐνυψώσετε is used in the place of ἔτοιμοντε. John may have translated from the Hebrew 119, or he may have been influenced by the use of ὑποθέλειν, which follows in the LXX, and chosen to use ἐνυψώσειν because of the association of this verb with ὑπόθεσις in Sirach 2:6; 37:15; 49:9. It is certainly to the background of the Wisdom Literature that which we must turn with regard to John 14:6. In the Wisdom Literature it is the Law that is the Way the truth and the life. (1) The evangelist does not use ὑπάρξεις in a non theological sense simply to describe a path as the Synoptic Gospels do, e.g. Mk.2:23; 4:14; 15 etc. The Baptist prepares "the way of the Lord" by his witness to Jesus. He prepares Jesus' Way. The way Jesus was to take was the way of his uplifting to the Father via the Cross.

In John 14:4-5 the question concerning where Jesus was about to go raised the question of the way he was to take. Jesus had announced his departure to Father (14:2-4), asserting that the disciples knew the way he was going. But Thomas replied that they did not know where he was going, and could not know the way he was to take, 14:5. Jesus' words presuppose some passion prediction such as John 12:31ff; 13:31-33. (See Mk.8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34) But the disciples had failed to understand Jesus' true significance, and hence they could not understand the way he was to take, a way which was unique, and which no one else could take for him or with him, see John 13:36-38. But after his departure the disciples would come to the Father through him. Thus in John 14:6 we note that the subject has changed from the way Jesus must take to the Father, to the way to the Father for the disciples. There is a sense in which the disciples of Jesus follow him in the way that he took to the Father, but in John 14:6 we are dealing at a more fundamental level of how the Father is known. No one has seen the Father, but Jesus has made him known, John 1:18. This is indicated in such passages as 5:19 where we are told that the Son does only what he sees the Father doing, and (8:26) that the words that he speaks are what he has heard from the
father. His whole life is the fulfilment of the Father's will (5:30, 4:34) with the result that to receive Jesus is to receive the Father. (2)

Jesus, as the only way to the Father, is not like other ways which may be dispensed with once the goal is reached. Jesus is also the truth, and this truth is not something which can be possessed, thus dispensing with the way. The truth can only be known by coming again and again by the way, and this indicates the continuing necessity of faith, which is coming to Jesus, John 6:35, 37, etc. Faith cannot be dispensed with until this earthly life is concluded. Those who believe in Jesus are challenged to abide in his words, to continue in faith, and to them Jesus promised the knowledge of the truth, John 8:31-32.

By designating Jesus as the way it is made clear that all the generations of Christians stand in the same relationship to the revelation. None can dispense with the way, not even the Apostles, for there is no outgrowing the revelation event. The goal is only possessed by continuing along the way, and because of this it is not properly described as a possession but as a gift.

II. The revelation as the Ἐνακτημον.

Truth is given its definitive meaning in the Farewell Discourses when Jesus says "I am the Truth", 14:16. (On the background of the Johannine usage in the Qumran Texts see pp. 74-76 above. See also Psalm 119(119): 28-30, 89-90, 151, 160 where, as in the Qumran Texts, the Truth and the Word are equated with Torah. Psalm 119 is something of a Torah liturgy. See also Genesis 24:48; Psalm 25(24):10; 86(85):11; 119(118):29-48; Tobit 1:3; 3:2; Midr. 5:6; Sirach 37:15. See also TDNT 1.245 note 34 and 1 QH IV:40 הוהי יהוה יִמְרָה, "For Thou Thyself art truth..."; Exodus R. on 29:1 "As Thou art truth, so is also thy Word truth"). Jesus has replaced the Law and rendered it obsolete.

Where Judaism asserted that the Law was truth (see Mal.2:16; 2 Esdr.19:13= Neh.9:13; Psalm 119(118):142), the evangelist indicated that truth as revealed in Jesus was personal. The glory revealed in him, the incarnate Word, is said to be "full of grace and truth" (John 1:14,17.) Χριστός ἐκληριγενής καὶ ἐκληριγειν. (On the use of Χριστός see Isaiah 1:21 LXX.) The grace and truth which came in Jesus are contrasted with the Law given by Moses, and recall the association of דְּתָה דָּוִי in the Old Testament.
Professor Dodd has indicated (3) that in the later stages of the LXX, and in Hellenistic Judaism after the Septuagintal period, Χαρίς came to be preferred to ἔλεος as a rendering of ὅπις, and the combination of Χαρίς and ἀληθεία is so unusual in Greek that we must suppose that the expression was derived from a Hebrew source. (See Exodus 34:6; Psalm 57(56):14, 11, 12; 61(60):7; 85(84):11; 86(85):15; Prov. 20:28; Wisdom 3:9; etc.) The phrase ὁ Σήμεον τὴν ἀληθείαν (John 3:21; 1 John 1:5) should be considered alongside ἐκ ἀείσεις ἐξ ὑμῶν κοινωνίαν τὸν ἁγιόμουν, John 7:19. The Jews' antagonistic attitude to Jesus revealed their failure to obey the Law which would have led them to believe in him, John 5:39-47. (For the idea of doing the truth see Neh 9:33; Isaiah 62:10; Tobit 4:6; 13:16; Sirach 27:19; 1 QS 1:9; V:3; VIII:9; etc.) Closely associated with "doing the truth" is the idea of "walking in truth" Κρίτησιν τοῦ ἁγιομουν. (See Tobit 3:9; Psalm 26(25):3; 1 QS VIII:4.) and also "to stand in the truth", The devil ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἴσων ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, John 8:44. (See 1 John IV:14, ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἴσων ἴσων) He has nothing in common with the truth.

Bearing witness to the truth (John 5:33; 18:37; 3 John 1:4; 12) is a suggestively ambiguous idea. (See 1 QS VIII:6) The Baptist who is said to bear witness to the truth (5:33) in fact bore witness to Jesus, John 1:15ff., 15, 29ff., etc. At the shallowest level bearing witness to the truth means telling the truth, but the fact that Jesus is the truth gives these statements a more profound meaning. In witnessing to the truth Jesus was to bear witness to himself, John 18:37 and see John 8:13f. In this category we should also consider Jesus' statements about speaking the truth (John 8:40, 44, 46; 16:17; See Psalm 20(30):10), which indicate that Jesus is telling the truth, but which may also carry an overtone of the self-revelation which he is making.

In John 8:31f. Jesus promised those who had believed in him that if they remained in his words they would know the truth (γνῶτι τὴν ἀληθείαν). See also 1 John 2:21; 2 John 1:1. (For the background see Proverbs 22:17-21; and Wisdom 3:9 where trust or faith leads to understanding the truth; and Daniel 9:1316. For the idea of "knowing the truth" in the Quaran Texts see 1 QS VI:12; IX:35ff.; XI:20, 29, etc.) 1 QS VI:12, 14: ἡ ἐπίστασις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ ἐπίστασις ὑπερήφανος, should be especially
noted.) The meaning of truth is defined to some extent by the fact that it is expressed as the antithesis of falsehood, see John 8:44. It has been suggested that the antithesis of truth and falsehood indicates that the evangelist is developing an idea of truth which is not Hebraic in origin. But James Barr has argued that both ἀλήθεια and ἀλήθεια are semantic markers which may be used to denote the contrast between the true and the false. There are many instances in the LXX where ἀλήθεια translates רות and must draw attention to the antithesis of truth and falsehood. In Psalm 119(118)29-30 the way of falsehood (πραγματεία) is the antithesis of the way of truth (','=',$). The LXX translates θεότης as ἀλήθεια. The context suggests the antithesis of truth and falsehood, and a comparison of verses 86 and 151 suggests that ἀλήθεια is being used in the same sense as רות in this context, and thus it would seem that the LXX is correct in its translation as ἀλήθεια in verse 30.

It is in the context of the antithesis of truth and falsehood that the promise is made καὶ γενόσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἔλευθερώσετε ὑμᾶς. John 8:32. In Psalm 119(118)42-45 the Psalmist declares that through trusting in God's word of truth, and continually walking in his commandments, he would walk at liberty. Liberty is to be understood in the Deuteronomistic sense of inhabiting a spacious land (παρθένῳ in the LXX in καθίσματι; see Deuteronomy 34:5-20). This is a description of salvation in the terms of the Old Covenant, and it is offered to those who keep the Law. The freedom mentioned in John 8:32 is the salvation of the New Covenant which is given to those who know the Son (8:36), who is the truth of the New Covenant.

The two statements in John 8:44 καὶ εὔ τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ οὐκ εὕρηκεν (see 1 QH IV:14), and ὅπερ οὔκ εὕρεν ἀλήθεια ἐν κορί, are complimentary. The latter has an interesting parallel in 1 QH V:9, "you have confirmed the counsel of truth in my heart." The acceptance of truth results in behaviour which may be described as standing in the truth, walking in the truth, or doing the truth. But the devil has nothing in common with the truth. His ways are the ways of falsehood. It is possible that εὕρηκεν should have a rough breathing, and thus be regarded as the perfect tense of εὑρίσκω, but it fits the sense
better to read the smooth breathing and to take it as the imperfect of
the verb στηκασ (compare John 1:26). In the beginning the devil was
not standing in the truth but was a liar and a murderer. His behaviour
was contrary to the truth because the truth is not in him. Those in
whom the truth is, walk in the truth. See also 1 John 1:8; 2:4; 2 John 1:
2. For the Old Testament background see Psalm 5:19; 1 Esdras 4:37ff.;
1 Macc. 7:18.

An alternative description of those in whom the truth is, is ὁ Ἰησοῦς
καταφέρειται... John 18:37; 1 John 2:1; 3:19. Compare the
reference to "the sons of truth" in 1 QH VII:29; VII:29-30; (IX:35?);
X:27. Those who walk in the truth do so because the truth is in them,
because they are sons of truth. But we should notice that there is no
idea of a fixed division of men into two groups because the possibility
of becoming sons of truth is held out to all who will believe in Jesus,
John 1:12. At Qumran the sons of truth were sons of the Law, but in the
Fourth Gospel, because Jesus is the truth, men became sons of truth
through faith in him. Pilate's question: ἔστιν Ἰησοῦς καταφέρειται; (18:38)
indicates that although he is sympathetic to Jesus, he is not of the
truth. He has not come to accept Jesus as the truth, and consequently
his search continues.

In our discussion of Jesus as the λόγος we noted a connection
between the Word as Jesus, the word which he spoke, and the word in
which the Church proclaimed him. We notice a similar connection between
Jesus as the truth and the word which he has spoken from God which is
also the truth (John 17:17) ὁ λόγος ὁ σωτήρ τῆς ἔκθεσιν. Compare
Psalm 119(118):43, 86, 142, 151, 160; Mal. 2:16; but especially Psalm 119(118):
142, ὁ νόμος λόγος, δὲ σωτήρ τῆς ἔκθεσιν. See also 1 QH XI:7. What
was said of the law in the Psalm is said of Jesus in the Gospel. Jesus
is himself God's Word, and he speaks God's words. Both are referred to
as the truth, and through this truth the believers are sanctified and
kept from the power of evil. We note the definite article, "the truth",
in John 8:32; and 17:17 denoting the saving truth in Jesus. (7) In the
word which he speaks Jesus is present, separating believers from the
world, not in the sense of taking them out of the world, but breaking the
power of evil over them. This separation is not only negative, for it is
this saving truth which separates the Apostles for their mission.

The coming of the truth in Jesus brought about a new situation (John 4:23-24). Until this time the genuine worshippers had been the Jews (not the Samaritans). But the coming of Jesus marked the time of the giving of the Spirit. Genuine worshippers were now those who through faith in Jesus, the truth, received the Spirit, those who worshipped ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀλήθεια. (8) The Spirit, whom Jesus sends to those who believe in him is called "the Spirit of Truth" John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13. (9) Jesus is the truth, and by calling the Spirit "the Spirit of Truth" attention is drawn to the fact that the Spirit is sent by Jesus, John 15:26. He is sent to take over the functions of the departed Jesus, and is called the ἀληθὸς Καρακήντον (John 14:16), Jesus having been the first.

The name Spirit of Truth also draws attention to the function of the Spirit as the one who bears witness to the truth, making the revelation in Jesus effective in the world, John 15:26; 16:8-11. He does this by leading the disciples into all truth (ἀληθεύοντας εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντας). (10) The truth into which the Spirit leads men is Christological, and thus through his witness to Jesus the Apostles also bear witness to him, John 15:26-27. In this way we note that Jesus as the truth can be regarded from the standpoint of his own words as truth, and in the words of those who bear witness to him the world is confronted with the truth, because the Spirit is active in this witness. In 1 John 5:6 the connection between Jesus and the witness of the Spirit through believers is taken a step further in the declaration ἔστω ὁ λαμβάνων ἀληθεον. (11)

The background of this theological development is to be seen in a series of statements about the knowledge of the truth in 1 Tim. 2:4; 4:3; 2 Tim. 2:25; 3:7; Tit. 1:1; Hebrews 10:26. The evangelist does not use the compound verb or the noun for knowledge, but these passages indicate that the background of the evangelist's development is to be seen in the missionary preaching of the Gospel, the truth, through which men are saved, 1 Tim. 2:4. The evangelist works out theologically Jesus' relationship to the Gospel. He does this in his theology of the Word. To know the truth, is to believe the word, the Gospel, to believe
in Jesus, because Jesus is the Gospel. In 3 John 8 ἀληθεῖα is a
synonym for Gospel, or perhaps even "the Gospel Mission". The readers
are urged to welcome missionaries that the readers συνέργοι γενομένοι ἐν
ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. "Fellow workers with the truth" will not do because the
relationship is to the missionaries with whom, through assistance given,
they became fellow workers. Perhaps the dative may be translated "in",
thus "fellow workers in the truth", that is the Gospel.

In the Johannine Epistles the expression "to love in truth" occurs
several times, 1 John 3:18; 2 John 1; 3 John 1. The meaning is simply
"to love truly", and in 1 John 3:18 it is made clear that true love
involves deeds and not only words. The closest formal parallel in
the Gospel is 4:23-24, but worship in truth cannot in that context mean
to worship truly as it would be a senseless tautology to say that the
true worshippers worship truly. In 2 John 3 the meaning seems to be
that "grace, mercy, and peace will be truly with us in love".

The adverb ἀληθῶς is used seven times in the Gospel to assert
the veracity of the statement made, and occurs only in conversational
passages. The Samaritans affirm that Jesus is in fact the Saviour of
the world, 4:42. The crowd affirms that Jesus is in fact the Prophet,
John 6:14; 7:40. The crowd asks incredulously if in fact the rulers know that
Jesus is the Christ, 7:26. Nathaniel is declared by Jesus to a guileless
Israelite, 1:47. There is perhaps another level of meaning. Not only
is Nathaniel really a guileless Israelite in contrast to Jacob, he is a
true Israelite in the sense of Romans 2:8-29. In John 3:31f Jesus speaks
of those who are in fact his disciples, and in 17:8 he affirms that the
disciples' knowledge of his mission from the Father is now a fact. In 1 John 2:5 it is said of the person who keeps Jesus' word, that the
love of God is in fact perfected in him. Thus we see that the adverb
is used to indicate the true state of affairs, in contrast to what is
falsely supposed.

ἀληθῶς is applied only to statements and those who make them and
means simply "veracious", John 1:33; 4:13; 5:31, 32; 7:18; 8:13, 14, 17, 26;
10:41; 19:35; 21:24. See also 1 John 2:20. An exception is the use
in John 6:55 where ἀληθῶς is read by άλθής, a context CK LT f but
ἀληθῶς is the reading in νuber. If ἀληθῶς is the true reading
the sense would be akin to John 1:47; 8:31. The actual is brought into contrast with that which is falsely supposed to be food and drink. But the closest parallels to John 6:55 occur in passages using ἀληθινός, e.g. John 6:32. The meaning is that when men long for food they are really seeking the means whereby they may have life. Jesus is the authentic heavenly food in the sense that it is through him that men may have eternal life.

ἀληθινός like ἀληθής may be used to indicate that a statement is veracious, John 4:37; 19:35. (Compare John 4:37 with 2 Kings 7:28; 3 Kings 10:6; 17:24; 2 Chron 9:5 in the LXX where ἀληθινός translates σιμάριον.

In John 8:16 Jesus claims "my judgement is ἀληθινή." (13) In 5:30 he says "my judgement is σικάωα. The contexts suggest that both statements have the same meaning. Right and true judgement are one and the same. See also 7:24. In John 17:25 Jesus addressed God as "Righteous Father". The Hebrew יהוה seems to underlie these passages using סיקיווס as well as John 8:16. (14) It seems that the passages using סיקיווס are more closely related to John's "vocabulary of truth" than is at first apparent. In John 16:8,10 it is said that the Paraclete, when he is come, will convict the world of sin, סיקיווס and judgement. In exposing the unbelief of the world as the epitome of sin, the darkness of falsehood into which the world has retreated, Jesus is vindicated as the one who has come from and returned to the Father. It would seem that סיקיווס here bears the meaning of Jesus' vindication arising out of God's faithfulness. This vindication includes the manifestation of the truth of Jesus' claim to have come from God, and this truth is brought home to the world through the Spirit, whom the ascended Jesus sends to believers, that through them the judgement of the world may continue. The crucial act of judgement had taken place in the lifting up of Jesus, but the evangelist recognized both a continuing aspect and a final act of judgement.

The remaining uses of ἀληθινός are most important. Jesus is the "true light", John 1:9 and see 1 John 2:8. The Baptist is called a light (5:33) in the sense that he bore witness to Jesus. By calling Jesus "the true light" it is made clear that other lights have their
validity in relation to him, and any who claim independence from him make their claim falsely, and in fact are not lights at all. True worshippers (4:23) are in contrast to idolaters, and the true bread from heaven is contrasted with the manna Moses gave (6:32), which could not give the life which men sought from it. The true vine stands over against other vines (See Jeremiah 2:21 in the LXX). Jesus refers to the Father as "the only true God" (17:3) and he appeals that the one who sent him is "true" 7:28. See also 1 John 5:21 where the meaning is that men may have life by knowing "the true God" who is known only through his Son Jesus Christ. The true God is contrasted with idols, 1 John 5:21. The Jews who claimed to have life and to know God, but rejected Jesus, could not know the true God, for he is known only through his Son. They were enslaved to idols.

In developing the theme of truth the evangelist has drawn on statements concerning the Law and also the vocabulary of the Christian Mission where the Gospel message was described as the truth, 1 Tim.2:4. Jesus, not the Law, was the true light, though the Law like John the Baptist may be regarded as a light bearing witness to Jesus. But if men made the Old Testament independent of Jesus, as if the Scriptures could give them life, then in this context the evangelist affirms that Jesus is true and they are false. Such absolute claims could be made of Jesus because the eternal Θεός was incarnate in him, and the Father was revealed in his words and works. The truth revealed in him was the truth about God over against the false ideas of God held by the Jews and the world. The truth about God is revealed in his faithfulness and love for the world manifest in Jesus' mission into the world. The truth is that he is a saving God, "the Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth;..." Exodus 34:6. But in Jesus this faithfulness is seen to break the bounds of nationalism, and is expressed in terms of God's universal love which opens up the way of salvation. The truth about God is that he is life-giving, and this point is made in terms of his love.

The truth concerns man also, because in Jesus the true life of man is revealed. This is the significance of the sayings about the true
bread and the true drink. The true life of man comes from the knowledge of the truth, the one who is true, who reveals the life of God, and gives this life to man. The revelation of this life in Jesus is the judgement of the world. Men's efforts to have life are revealed as falsehood by the revelation of the true life in Jesus. Thus the truth is (1) saving truth 8:32; (2) Jesus is the truth 14:6; (3) The truth is communicated by the Spirit of Truth 16:13; (4) The truth (Jesus) is received by those who do the truth 3:21.

III. The revelation as the ἀλήθεια, John 14:6.

The vocabulary concerning "eternal life" in John betrays its Jewish origin as is clear from the fact that ἀνάμνησις is not found in pagan religious and philosophical writers until long after our period. The compound form ἀνάμνησις, and the simple form ἀπαντά, have ample Jewish precedent, though only in Dan 12:2 and the LXX is ἀνάμνησις used to translate ἀναμνήσθη ἡ, and it is this book which clearly teaches the doctrine of the future life. In connection to Daniel's doctrine of the future life we note John 5:29. In Jewish usage the meaning of life is elucidated by means of two contrasts between (a) life and death, and (b) the life of this age (ζωή), and the life of the age to come (ζωή). The question concerning "eternal life" is also raised in the Synoptic Gospels, see Mark 10:17=Lk.10:25=Matt.19:16. But this terminology is not as important for the Synoptic Gospels as it is for John. More important for them is the terminology concerning "the Kingdom of God." John can also deal with the theme of "eternal life" in terms of "the Kingdom of God" (3:3,5; and also 18:36), but it is more characteristic for him to speak of "eternal life".

There are several reasons why the evangelist chose to use the description "eternal life" in preference to "the Kingdom of God." Firstly, it was necessary to break with Jewish Nationalism which associated the Kingdom of God with its own cause. Secondly, it is said that Wisdom gives life to those who find her (Proverbs 8:35; note also Dodd: Interp. pp.82f.,146f., for references that indicate that Torah gives life). One of the themes that we have noted in the Gospel is that Jesus not Wisdom (Torah) fulfils the hopes of Judaism for knowledge of God and life. Thirdly, the evangelist's emphasis on the personal experience of salvation
could not be properly expressed in terms of "the Kingdom of God" which is essentially a corporate concept, and one which emphasizes the unfulfilled situation. "The Kingdom of God" is a powerful concept only as long as the king is present, or as long as his return is imminently expected. The evangelist wrote aware of the need to state the meaning of the Gospel in the time of the king's absence. Though absent he reigns through the witness of the Spirit in the Church. His reign is manifest in that life-giving and judging witness. Thus the evangelist develops the idea of "eternal life", which he found in the Gospel tradition, in a manner similar to St. Paul in Romans 6:23, to indicate the salvation given to those who believe in Jesus, see John 3:15,16,36; 10:28; 17:2; 20:30.

Before going any further it is necessary for us to show that the two forms "life" and "eternal life" may be used interchangeably, though it should not be concluded that the simple and compound forms are synonymous. It is never said of the Father or Jesus that they have "eternal life", but it is said that they have life in themselves, John 5:26; 1:4. It goes without saying that God is not a transitory being, and the qualification of ζωή is not required to make this clear. Further, it is clear that the references to the Father and Son having life in themselves involves more than their own personal possession of life. The one who has life in himself gives "life" (6:33) or "eternal life" (10:28). In these contexts "life" indicates the life-giving power of the Father and the Son, and for this purpose ζωή was more appropriate than ζωή ζωής. But we may not assume that ζωή always indicates life-giving power as the statement in 6:33 indicates. There the meaning of ζωή is synonymous with ζωή ζωής. The life which is given is eternal life not just physical life. Thus it is said of those who believe that they have "life", 5:24; 20:31; but more frequently, "eternal life", 3:15,16,36; 5:24; 6:47. In 3:36; 5:24 in particular it is clear that the "life" given to believers is "eternal life". The same point is made when it is said that Jesus has come that "his own" may have "life", 10:10; and that he gives them "eternal life", 10:28; 17:2. Jesus, "the bread of life" (6:35,48,51) gives "life" to the world (6:33,57), and those who eat this bread have "eternal life".
In 3:36 and 5:24, the opposites of not having "life" and having "eternal life" show that the meaning here is the same. Jesus dispenses the "living-water" (life-giving), 4:10, 11; 7:38, and those who drink this water have "eternal life".

The conclusions we may draw are fairly clear. In speaking of the Father and Jesus there was no need to indicate that their life had the character described by 

\[ \delta \nu \lambda \iota \iota \nu \iota \iota \delta \], and the main aspect in view here is the life-giving power which is better described by 

\[ \gamma \omega \eta \] alone. But in the case of those to whom the Father and Son gave life it was necessary to indicate that the gift was not simply the resurrection of physical life, nor simply an extension of that life, but the gift of a life which comes from another order of existence. This life comes from God himself. There is at times in the Gospel an oscillation of meaning with regard to 

\[ \gamma \omega \eta \] which can be understood to mean sheer physical life (compare Romans 7:1-2) or salvation (compare Romans 1:17; 8:13; 5:18). In the Gospel this oscillation is consciously developed to show that what the world seeks as "life" is no life in the light of the revelation of "life" in Jesus.

There is need to distinguish 

\[ \gamma \omega \eta \] and 

\[ \gamma \omega \eta \] from 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] which has a distinct meaning. 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] like the Hebrew \[ \nu \delta \delta \] has a wide range of meaning, and may be used simply as "I" or as a psychological term. The usage of 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] in the Fourth Gospel indicates that the evangelist is developing ideas which can be seen in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus gives his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] for others, John 10:11, 15; 15:13, see Mark 10:45. Jesus is troubled in his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \], John 12:27, see Mark 14:34. He says that the person who loves his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] shall lose it, and the person who hates his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] in this world shall guard it for 

\[ \gamma \omega \eta \] in 

\[ \nu \delta \delta \] John 12:25, see Mark 8:35. Peter's offer to give his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] for Jesus is shown to be out of the question, John 13:37-38; compare Matt. 26:35 though the wording is different. The evangelist, by using the word 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] shows the anomaly of Peter's suggestion that he should give his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] for Jesus, when in reality it was to be Jesus who gave his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] for Peter. Peter may in time give his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \], but not for Jesus, nor in the same sense that Jesus gives his 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \]. (It is to make this point that the evangelist chooses to use 

\[ \psi \nu \chi \gamma \] here instead of having Peter simply say that he would die for Jesus as is recorded in Matt. 26:35.)
The sense in which Peter may give his life must be understood in terms of the mutual service of believers to one another as John 13:14-15 shows, not in the exclusive sense in which Jesus gives himself for the disciples, see 13:16-10. In John 10:17-18 Jesus explains that the act of laying down his ψυχή and taking it again is dependent on the Father’s authority and rooted in his love. The saying is akin to that of Mk.10:45, but the special Johannine theme of Jesus’ freedom and authority in dependence on the Father is emphasized. In John 10:24 the Jews ask Jesus how long he is going to vex their ψυχή about the Messiahship question. The use of ψυχή in this passage is similar to John 12:27; Mark 14:34.

Thus it would seem that ψυχή refers to the life of a creature which is interrupted by death. It is true that ἀιωνιός is used at times when it may be understood to indicate the renovation of creaturely life which would terminate in the foreseeable future, but such a renovation is to be understood as a sign of the "eternal life" given through Jesus. Jesus gives his ψυχή up to death (John 10:11,15,17), but his ἀιωνιός is not interrupted by death. Note the tense in John 14:19, ὁ εἴδω ἀιωνίω...

We proceed now to a more systematic analysis of the theme. The Father is described as ὁ ἀιωνιός θεός (6:57) who has ἀιωνιός in himself (5:26). As we have noted, the life-giving activity of the Father is in focus in these statements. Jesus lives (ὁ) because of the Father, and as a consequence is able to give "eternal life" (6:57-58). In John 5:26 the fact that the Father has ἀιωνιός in himself and has given the Son (authority) to have ἀιωνιός in himself is made the justification for the claim that those who hear the voice of the Son of God will live (ζησοῦν), 5:25. From these statements it is clear that the Father is the source of ἀιωνιός.

Jesus’ ἀιωνιός comes from, and is dependent on the Father who is the source of ἀιωνιός (5:25-26; 6:57-58). Just as the ἀιωνιός of the Father initiates ἀιωνιός for the Son, so the ἀιωνιός of the Son initiates ἀιωνιός for the world. As far as the world is concerned Jesus is the ἀιωνιός (11:25; 14:6), ἀιωνιός is in him (1:4), and this ἀιωνιός is the light for men (1:4) the light for the world (8:12). The life of God revealed in Jesus is the judgement of what the world calls life and men are divided by their
response to this revelation. The judgement is the condemnation of those who reject it and the gift of \(\text{ζωή} \) to those who receive it (8:12).

All that Jesus does is at the commandment of the Father whose will he fulfils in bringing eternal life (12:50). The Father's will to send Jesus, to give eternal life, arises out of his love for the world (3:16). Thus the Father is the source of "eternal life" in the sense of being the ultimate cause of the giving of all \(\text{ζωή} \).

Jesus described himself as \(\text{ὁ ἡμών θύσιν \ ζωής} \) (6:35, 48) and \(\text{ὁ ἡμών \ ζωή } \) (6:51) to indicate that "life" comes from him to man, not from any other source, nor merely from his words, or acts, but from him, his words and deeds included. He is the food upon which men feed by faith and thus have "eternal life", 6:33, 35, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58. But Jesus is not \(\text{ζωή} \) for the world apart from what he does. His coming was to give \(\text{ζωή} \) to the world (6:33); that his own may have \(\text{ζωή} \) (10:10). He gives his own "eternal life" 10:28; 17:2. He gives life-giving water (4:10, 11; 7:38), that is, the Spirit who makes alive 6:63. This water springs up to "eternal life", 4:14. But Jesus is only able
to give the Spirit through his departure by giving up his \(\phiυχή \) to death, 16:17.

Jesus' words are life-giving (4:50, 51, 53) and this is not only physical life, for he has the words of "eternal life" 6:68. His words are related to the Spirit in life-giving activity, 6:63. Further, Jesus' words concern his own activity for he indicates that he gives his flesh for the \(\text{ζωή} \) of the world, 6:51. The giving of Jesus' \(\σάρξ \) like the giving of his \(\φυχή \) denotes the giving of himself over to death that the world may have \(\text{ζωή} \). Because he is the efficient cause of "life" for the world he is described as the one who gives the abiding bread which gives eternal life, 6:27, but the ultimate origin in the Father is constantly in view 6:32.

If Jesus brings life to the world in what he does, this is true because he performs the action. Thus Peter may not lay down his \(\φυχή \) for Jesus, but on the contrary, Jesus lays down his \(\φυχή \) for Peter, indeed for the world. Because in the \(\λόγος \) incarnate there was \(\text{ζωή} \), he is able to give up his \(\φυχή \) to death without the \(\text{ζωή} \) being interrupted, and because of his continuing life (3:14; 14:19) death is
conquered and made available for the world 14:19. It is because he is the incarnate that he conquers death, and reveals himself to be the resurrection and the 11:25.

The "life" which is "eternal life" Jesus gives to those who believe in him 3:15, 16, 36; 6:47, 11:25; 20:31, who come to him 5:40; 6:35 (which means to believe as the parallelism of 6:35 indicates), who eat his flesh and drink his blood 6:53-54 (which means to come to Jesus, to believe in him 6:35), who hear his words 5:24-25 (the parallelism indicates that this hearing is the hearing of faith; see also 6:29), who see and believe in the Son 6:40 (Seeing is not placed as a necessary qualification but on the contrary seeing without faith is shown to be of no avail), who believe in Jesus and the Father who sent him 5:24; 17:3. This life is given as a gift to those who believe 6:33; 10:28; 17:2.

Believers have already passed from death to "life" 5:24. The nature of the "life" given is revealed in Jesus. He gave his through the gift of the Spirit 1:12f.; 3:5f.; 6:63, who inspires the proclamation of the Apostolic testimony to Jesus (15:26-27) through which the harvest for eternal life is gathered (4:36), because it is through this proclamation that the world is provoked to faith. The love of the disciples in the willingness of the one to lay down his for the other proclaims Jesus in another way (13:34), and in this love they have "eternal life" 12:25. In the light of the revelation of this "life", the Jews, and the world are shown to be in error when they claim to have life already 5:39.

We have yet to consider the references to "eternal life" which demand a future eschatological interpretation. (17) The idea of "eternal life" as a present reality indicates the new quality of life, but the problem of physical death is not answered. This problem is answered only by recourse to the treatment of the resurrection. The believer who now experiences "eternal life" (5:24) must, in spite of this,
experience physical death. Jesus himself, who is the life, underwent physical death, conquering it by his resurrection. One possible way of taking 14:19 is that the resurrection of the disciples is a consequence of Jesus' 
\[\text{ζωή} \] which conquers death. But there are clearer references to the resurrection at the last day than this one.

John 5:29 speaks of the resurrections to life and to judgement in terms reminiscent of Daniel 12:2. In the preceding verses (5:25) Jesus has spoken of the life which he gives to the dead who hear his voice, that is, the present experience of eternal life which he gives to those who believe. But in 5:28 he speaks of the future (note the absence of \[\text{καί \ ζωή \ εστίν} \] which is used in 5:25) when those in the tombs will hear his voice. Here the reference to physical death is clear and in 5:29 the general resurrection of both the good and the bad is spoken of in terms reminiscent of Dan.12:2. By dealing with both of these aspects of "eternal life" the connection between the present personal experience and the future general resurrection is indicated. The same duality is to be found in 6:39-40 where it is said that it is the Father's will that those who believe in the Son may have "eternal life", and that Jesus should raise them up on the last day (see also 6:44,54; 12:48).

In John 11:23-26, 43-44 there is an important treatment of the theme of eschatology and the resurrection. Having been informed of the death of Lazarus Jesus affirmed that he would rise again, and Martha understood this to be an assertion about the last day. Jesus did not deny that Lazarus would rise from the dead on the last day, but drew attention to the question of his own present significance, 11:25. Firstly, he affirmed that the believer who dies, "yet shall he live", that is he will be raised to life. This point is illustrated by the Lazarus incident which is to be understood as a \[\text{σήμερον} \] with two levels of meaning. Firstly, in the sense of 6:40, the resurrection at the last day, for Lazarus, though raised only to die in the future (and many believers must have died in the evangelist's life time), demonstrates Jesus' authority to raise men up on the last day.

Secondly, it is stated that the person who lives \[\text{ζωή}, \] who is a believer, shall never die, 11:26. He has already passed from death to
life 5:24. But this does not mean that the believer will not experience physical death. Just as Jesus who is Ἰησοῦς could give his υἱὸν unto death, so the believer also must face physical death, but the eternal life which he has experienced in the present cannot be terminated. He will live for ever 6:51, 58; 8:51-52; 10:28; 11:26. The raising of Lazarus, as well as indicating Jesus' authority to raise the physically dead, points to Jesus' power to give eternal life in the present, and this gift in the present will be revealed fully at the resurrection on the last day.

IV. Jesus' self-revelation.

Twenty six of the thirty uses of Ἰησοῦς in the Fourth Gospel come from the lips of Jesus. In the four other instances the Baptist confesses "I am not the Christ" 1:20; 3:15; the man Jesus had cured asserts "I am (the man born blind)" 9:19; and Pilate asks "Am I a Jew" 18:35. There is nothing strange in this use, and there is certainly no mystical sense attached to it. We may not assume that these words on Jesus' lips have any special sense apart from what is supplied by the context. Ten of the "I am" statements made by Jesus seem to fit into this straightforward category. Firstly we will mention the straightforward statements where the predicate is supplied; 8:18, "I am the one who bears witness..."; 8:23, "I am from above!"; 8:23, "I am not of this world"; 14:3, "that where I am, there you may be also". Secondly we note the statements where the predicate is implied by the context; 4:26, "I am (the Messiah)"; 6:20, "I am" meaning "It is I"; 8:28, "You will know that I am" (perhaps, "you will know that I am the Son of Man"). (The context does not properly supply a predicate here and we will discuss this verse later); 18:5, 6, 8, "I am (Jesus of Nazareth)." But the fear of the soldiers may suggest a secondary theme.

We turn now to the statements where Jesus reveals himself as the "I am". "Unless you believe that I am, you will die in your sins." 8:24. There is no predicate implied or stated, and the Jews' question "Who are you?" indicates that none was understood. Jesus' response may not be taken as a question as what follows indicates. He is from the beginning what he tells the Jews. If the intended meaning had been "I am what I have been telling you from the beginning" we would expect
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not the present tense λαλῶ but the imperfect. Rather Jesus is from
the beginning (τὴν ἀρχήν, see John 1:1ff.) the εἶχεν εἰμί.

"When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that
I am," 8:28. The sense could be completed "You will know that I am the
Son of Man". But this does not really complete the passage, and with
8:24 still in mind, it is necessary to understand this as an assertion
that they will know that Jesus, the Son of Man, is the "I am", the one
from the beginning, the eternal one who has come from above. Thus it
is likely that in 8:24,28 the evangelist is drawing together what he
has said about the Λόγος and the Son of Man through the use of the
absolute εἶχεν εἰμί.

"Before Abraham was born I am" 8:58. The evangelist is consciously
working out what he has said of the Λόγος in the Prologue in terms of
the historical Jesus. It is fundamental for him to assert that the
eternal Word became flesh, and that in Jesus we encounter the eternal
"I am".

"But now I tell you before it comes to pass, that, when it comes
to pass, you may believe that I am". 13:19. The event about which Jesus
spoke was his betrayal by Judas. Because of his forewarning this,
seeming catastrophe, was to result in the belief in Jesus as "I am". There
is no predicate supplied here and this saying is to be classed
with 8:24,28,58. It should also be compared with 14:29 where Jesus
forewarns the disciples of his imminent departure to the Father so that
when this event should take place they may believe (see also 16:1,4,33).
The absolute use of ΠΙΣΤΕ⇌ΞΕ → here is the equivalent of ΠΙΣΤΕ⇌ΞΕ →
followed by διήρπε εἰμί in 13:19.

This absolute use of εἶχεν εἰμί is unintelligible Greek, but in
the LXX it is often used as a translation of μω "which normally
is used by God, but on occasions is used by the arrogant sinner who
puts himself in the place of God, Isaiah 47:13; Zeph.2:15. With
John 8:24; and 13:19 particularly in mind we turn to the question of
the background of this usage of the absolute "I am". In Isaiah 41:4
the absolute εἶχεν εἰμί is given in answer to the question "Who has
done these things". The answer "I am" needs to complete the sense,
"the one who has done these things". But although this is to be seen
as an instance where the predicate is implied, the context elucidates to some extent the reason for placing the answer in an absolute form. The one who does these things is ἐγώ θεὸς κρατῶς, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐγώ εἶμι. The question had already been answered by ἐγώ θεὸς, and the remainder of the sentence is to be understood as an indication of who God is. He is the eternal one. Thus in Isaiah 43:10 we note that the reason for the Lord's choice of Israel is said to be "that you may know and believe and understand that ἐγώ εἶμι; before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me". In 46:9-10 we find the assertion ἐγώ εἶμι ὁ Θεὸς, the one who declares the end from the beginning. While it may be true that the complete form is ἐγώ εἶμι ὁ Θεὸς we have noted the possibility of using ἐγώ εἶμι alone in contexts which make clear the eternal being implied in this use of ἐγώ εἶμι. (See also Isaiah 43:13; 46:4; 48:12; 52:6; Deuteronomy 32:39). In this usage the eternal God who controls history stands over against the powerless pretensions of deity worshipped by the heathen. But it is the context that makes this sense clear, not the use of ἐγώ εἶμι in itself.

In the Fourth Gospel the absolute use of ἐγώ εἶμι stands in contexts which make clear that Jesus is asserting his eternal being over against all false claims of divinity. One further point needs to be mentioned, and that is the suggested play on the divine name (see Exodus 3:14-16) in the use of ἐγώ εἶμι which, if such was the case, would add significance to what the evangelist has to say about believing on the name of Jesus, e.g. 1:12. But Bultmann has forcefully criticised this idea by showing that if reference is being made to Exodus 3:14-16, the ἐγώ εἶμι needs to be repeated, otherwise the one use must be both subject and predicate. (17) Such a play on the divine name, even if it did exist, would add nothing to our interpretation.

We turn now to the thirteen statements where "I am" is followed by a predicate of symbolic character. These Bultmann classifies as "the Recognition formula". (18) In this form the "I" is said to be the predicate. The speaker announces himself to be that which is expected. This is made clear in John by the contrast of the false expectation with the new interpretation given by the "I am" statement. Thus Jesus reveals
himself as the one for whom people are searching, 6:35, 41, 48, 51; 8:12; 10:7, 9, 11, 14; 15:1, 5. It is suggested that these statements may have been Presentation formulae (which answers the question "Who are you?" by "I am so and so."), or Qualificatory formulae, which often follow the Presentation formulae, enumerating the deeds of the Godhead in the first person. In John the strong contrast between Jesus and the false expectation marks the usage as Recognition formulae. Examples of this form in the Old Testament are Isaiah 41:4; 43:10f.; 52:6; Deut. 32:39. (19)

In John 8:24, 28; 13:19, Bultmann considers the absolute use of "I am" to be a variation of the Recognition formula, and he describes this as the true Revelation formula. Jesus is not said to be the fulfilment of anything specific because this usage is intended to indicate that what men long for and seek is to be found in Jesus. He is all that he has shown himself to be, and of course this has particular reference to the Recognition formulae. The absolute "I am" means "I am the Revealer". (20)

It is necessary to object to Bultmann's interpretation at two points. Firstly, the absolute use in John is not used simply to bring together all aspects of the Recognition formulae. Rather this usage occurs in contexts where the eternal being of the one speaking is asserted, and in this matter the usage in John is related to the Old Testament and especially Second Isaiah. Not only is the eternity of the revelation asserted, but also the eternity of the Revealer. Secondly, the various symbols used in the Recognition formulae are all said to mean the same thing and refer to the true life revealed in Jesus, and consequently only find their true meaning when they are seen to be true in the Revealer. (21) Thus the symbol "bread of life" is said to have the same meaning as "living water". (22) But against Bultmann we must point out that while Jesus does say "I am the bread of life" it is only said that he gives the "living water" (4:10) and in 7:38-39 the water that he gives is interpreted in terms of the Spirit whom he sends as a consequence of his glorification. It is true that Jesus and the Spirit are closely related in the revelation event (4:23-24), but it seems to be a mistake to make both synonymous. Further we note that when dealing with the theme of "the light of the world" judgement is in mind in a way that it
is not when using the symbols of "bread of life" and "water of life".

Jesus is "the bread of life" John 6:35,48. Bread was one of the symbols used by the Jews for the Torah which they considered could give life. The point of the "I am" statement is to show that Jesus, and not Moses gives life, Jesus, not the Law. In asserting this, functions proper only to God are applied to Jesus, see Deut.32:39. It is also said that the Father gives the true bread from heaven (6:32), and this is identified with Jesus (6:35,41). This is the bread for which the Jews were longing 6:32-34. Thus Jesus is the bread which the Father gives that the world may live, but he also gives the bread himself (6:51), and this is no contradiction because the Son does what he sees the Father doing (5:19), he does the Father's will. By putting the matter in terms of being and giving, the place of Jesus in the Gospel is clarified. The act only has its significance because he, the one who is "the bread of life", did that act. By putting the matter in terms of being "the bread of life" the act of giving his flesh for the life of the world is shown to arise out of the nature of his being.

The life which is given is eternal life because the bread is that which has come down from heaven through the incarnation of the Word. The giving of this bread was only a reality when Jesus gave his flesh over to death ἐκ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς which probably means ἔκ δύναμις 37.

Jesus is "the light of the world" 8:12; 9:5. We have noted that the theme of light is used in the Gospel to indicate the judgement of the world (see 3:19-21; 9:39-41). By expressing the idea of light in an "I am" statement it is shown that the judgement of the world arises out of the nature of his being. Because he is "the light of the world" he came into the world for the purpose of judgement 9:39ff., and because he is "the light of the world" the world was judged by his coming, 15:22-24.

The statement "I am the door" (10:7,9) is in part equivalent to "I am the Way", 14:6. The "door" is being used in a different sense in 10:1-6 from the idea in 10:7ff. In 10:1-6 the door is the means by which the shepherd enters, but neither the door nor the porter are
significant. In this passage Jesus is the shepherd whose voice is known to the sheep. But in 10:7ff. Jesus is the door through which the sheep proceed to find life. The thieves and robbers, "all those who came before" Jesus, are those who have claimed to be the door, the way to life, and hence there is no criticism of Moses and the Prophets. Jesus alone is "the door" to life because he is "the way" to the Father.\(^{(24)}\)

The references to Jesus as "the door" and "the Way" serve to emphasize the exclusive nature of his activity which arises from the uniqueness of his being.\(^{(25)}\)

Following the discussion of the sheepfold is the assertion "I am the Good Shepherd", 10:11,14. "The Good Shepherd" is contrasted with thieves and robbers first of all 10:10, and then with the hireling 10:12. The thieves and robbers, as we have said, are not to be understood as Moses and the Prophets. They are discussed in the section which deals with Jesus as "the door" 10:7-10. They are the Messianic pretenders, the false saviours. These the sheep refused to hear, and their behaviour marks them off from the Shepherd. They seek only to gain for themselves, but the Shepherd seeks to give the sheep life 10:10. This leads on to the assertion \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \varepsilon\iota\mu\varsigma\ \delta\ \kappa\omicron\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\acute{n} \ \delta\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma\)\(^{(26)}\).

Part of the point of this statement is that by definition Jesus alone can be the shepherd, the sheep are his, see 10:12,14,27. Not even Peter may be regarded as a Shepherd, see 21:15-17. He is rather a "hireling" \(\mu\omicron\sigma\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) who does not own the sheep, 10:12, and he comes to the flock through the door, that is Jesus. By describing himself as the Shepherd Jesus asserted his rightful ownership of the sheep. In the total theology of the Gospel this may be said to rest on the fact that the world was made by him. Thus the sheep belong to Jesus because of who he is, the Shepherd.

The Shepherd imagery is further defined as \(\delta\ \kappa\omicron\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\acute{n} \ \delta\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma\).

In the Synoptic Gospels \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma\) is used frequently and is applied to fruit, works, trees, ground, seed, pearls, fish, certain circumstances, salt, and measure. In John it is used only of wine (21:10), the Shepherd (10:11,14), and works (10:32-33). The meaning of \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma\) is to be understood in terms of the proper fulfilment of the function of what is being considered. Jesus, because of who he is, is the shepherd
to whom the sheep belong by right, and as such he is a proper shepherd.

The functions expected of a shepherd can in part be known from the activities carried out by shepherd in the New Testament period. But our main evidence comes from the text itself where the action of "the Good Shepherd" is portrayed, thus defining for us what it means to be ὁ Κοιμητὴς τῶν Λατρευόντων. His concern is for the life of the sheep, and in this concern he lays down his life for them. The wording of 10:11 is akin to that of 6:51. Because of his death the sheep have life. That Jesus is "the Good Shepherd" arises out of his relationship with the Father and is necessarily expressed in relation to his sheep (10:14-15). In this relationship he does what he must do because he is "the Good Shepherd". The giving of his life was no accident, no arbitrary act performed in a moment of enthusiasm, but the necessary outworking of his being.(27)

We have already dealt with Jesus' assertion "I am the resurrection and the life" (11:25; 14:6). His power to raise the dead was demonstrated in the raising of Lazarus and in his own resurrection (10:18). The "I am" statement draws attention to the fact that this authority belongs to him because of who he is. This point is made in 5:19-30 where it is said that he has been given (authority) to have life in himself, and authority to perform judgement because he is the Son of Man, and in 8:24,28, the evangelist brings together the "I am" and the Son of Man, identifying Jesus with both titles.

"I am the truth" (14:6) has already been discussed to some extent. In this statement it is asserted that the ultimate reality of God is personal, and he is to be encountered in the historical person of Jesus of Nazareth. This reality cannot be understood merely in terms of the transitory experience of a man who has discovered what self-fulfilment means for him, but rather that the eternal reality is revealed in his person, that in fact he is the revelation of the eternal God, who is no strange God, but the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who revealed himself to Moses, the faithful compassionate God who does not forsake his people. The truth is the revelation that God is for us in Jesus Christ.

"I am the true vine" (15:1; see 15:5) has a close verbal parallel in the LXX of Jeremiah 2:21. (ἵνα ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα). (28) It is possible that
the evangelist considered that Jesus (and the branches abiding in him) was God's Vine, and not Israel. The theme of Israel's Apostacy suggested by this imagery in the Old Testament is taken up in the idea of the branches which do not abide in the vine, which probably suggest that the apostacy of Judas is in view. But against this interpretation is the fact that the evangelist normally uses his imagery for a Christological purpose, and the Vine is a symbol separate, to some extent, from the branches, just as the Good Shepherd is separate from his sheep. Bultmann, recognizing this point, interprets "the true vine" in terms of "the tree of life". His precedent for this interpretation is to be found in the Mandean literature. But the conclusion of Behm is that "All these seem to be either paraphrases or applications of John 15:2, 4ff.".

In later Judaism the vine was used as a symbol for the Messiah (2 Baruch 39:7, Note in Psalm 80:14ff LXX the vine is in parallelism with the Son of Man-king), and in Sirach 24:17, Wisdom is portrayed as a vine. With the identification of Wisdom and Torah in mind (Sirach 24:23f.) we draw attention to a basic theme of the Gospel, that Jesus (not the Law) gives life 5:39f.; etc. John 15 deals with the question of abiding in the vine (15:4f.), in Jesus (15:6) in Jesus' love which involves abiding in his commandments (15:9-10) and having his word abide in us (15:6). Thus Jesus stands in place of a legal code. "The true vine" replaces Wisdom who claimed to be the vine (Sirach 24:17-22). But whereas Wisdom said that those who eat of her will yet be hungry and those that drink of her will yet be thirsty, Sirach 24:21; Jesus said "he who comes to me shall never hunger, and he who believes on me shall never thirst", John 6:35. Thus it would appear that in the "I am" statements the evangelist not only has in mind such an address as is found in Isaiah 43:10 etc., but also the egoistic discourses in which Wisdom called men to herself, and offered herself to men as the way to life. There is a close relationship between Jesus' discourses in John and Wisdom's kerygma, see Proverbs 1:21; 8:1ff.; Sirach 24. We have already noted the cosmological function attributed to Wisdom (Prov.3:22-31; Job 28:20-27;). Sirach 24 and Wisdom 7 take up this theme identifying Wisdom with the Law which took up residence in Israel.
The divine origin of Wisdom heightens her kerygmatic stature. Who can afford not to listen? (31)

The egoistic form of address used by Wisdom finds an interesting parallel in the Johannine discourses. Wisdom offers herself to men in terms of symbols which are also found in the Johannine discourses, as food and drink (Sirach 24:21; Proverbs 9:5; Compare John 6:35,51,53 etc). She calls men to listen and claims to dispense life (Proverbs 3:18; 8:35; Sirach 24:19; Prov.8:1ff.). Wisdom proposes "noble things", the "truth" (Proverbs 3:14-15; 16:16; etc.), but the main theme is "life" (Proverbs 8:35), "the path of life" (Proverbs 2:19; 5:6; 10:17; 15:24), "the fountain of life" (Prov.10:11; 13:14; 14:27; 16:22), "the tree of life" (Prov.11:30; 13:12; 15:4), which is identified with Wisdom in Prov.3:18.

The theme of life is prominent in the kerygmatic appeal which follows the exposition of the divine origin of Wisdom in Prov.8:22,30. The appeal (Prov.8:31-36) contrasts the life which comes from finding Wisdom and the death which comes from rejecting Wisdom. John also is aware that "life" is a grace dependent on a relationship with the living God. But in Proverbs and Sirach "life" refers to the good things of life, sheer length of days (Prov.3:16; 23:16), a good name (Prov.10:7; 22:1), riches, honour, life (Prov.22:24), and implicit in these possessions is the idea of being possessed by the Lord (see Psalm 73:23-28), for possessions are a blessing from him (Prov.10:22; Deut.4:40; 8:1). On the other hand, death is a calamity for the unwise and wicked which comes suddenly and takes them unawares as a result of their wickedness. As life goes beyond mere length of days, so death is more than just existence in Sheol (shared also by the wise), it involves corruption. (32)

In Wisdom the theme of "life" is developed under Hellenistic influence and is spoken of in terms of "immortality" as the lot of the wise and the righteous, Wisdom 1:15; 15:3. But even in Proverbs "life" points beyond this earthly existence (Prov.11:6,21; 13:6), and in the statement "whoever finds me finds life" (Prov.8:35), the equation that Wisdom="life" is made (see also Sirach 4:12). Wisdom is the form in which Yahweh's will and salvation approach man. Wisdom does not come as an "it", but in the shape of a person, a summoning "I", as the form in which Yahweh makes himself present, and in which he wishes to be sought.
by men. "Whoever finds me finds life". Only Yahweh can speak in this way. (33) In the Fourth Gospel the summoning "I" of Wisdom is replaced by the summoning "I" of Jesus who claims that those who find him find life, John 11:25; 14:6; 17:3; etc. (Wisdom also promises to pour out her Spirit upon all who will listen, Proverbs 1:23; etc., see John 7:33f., etc. Matthew 11:25-30, a passage dealing with Jesus' relationship to the Father followed by a kerygmatic appeal, should be compared with Proverbs 8:22-36; and the kerygmatic appeal of John 7:37f. should be compared with those mentioned above.) See also pp. 118-119 above.
CHAPTER TWELVE

The revelation of the glory.

Kittel is of the opinion that the evangelist's use of δόξα and δοξάζω "stands closest to the Palestinian mode of speech which is carried over into the Greek linguistic form". (1) The evangelist uses the word "glory" in two different ways. It is used of the visible manifestation of God's presence wholly in the Old Testament sense of θεόπνευμα in John 12:41. (2) "Glory" is also used in the sense of "honour", given sometimes by man, sometimes by God, John 5:41,44; 7:18; 8:50,54, and compare 1 Sam.2:30. (3) The reference in 1 Sam.2:30 should be compared with John 17:1 in particular. In John 9:24 the man who had been born blind was told to "give glory to God" and we compare Joshua 7:19; 1 Sam.6:5; 1 Chron.6:26f.; 2 Chron.30:8; Psalm 29(28)1ff.; 66(65)5; 68(67):34; Isaiah 42:12; Jer.13:16. This meaning is also common in the Greek use of δόξα. (4)

In John there is a close relationship between the use of δοξάζω and εὐδοκεῖ, compare John 12:23,31, with 3:14; 8:28; 12:34, and for precedent of this connection in the Old Testament see Exodus 15:2; Isaiah 33:10; 52:13; Daniel 4:32 LXX; Jer.17:2; etc. Attention also needs to be drawn to the teaching in the Gospels that God casts down the proud but exalts the humble, Matt.11:23; 23:12; Luke 1:52; 10:15; 14:11; 18:14, and see also James 4:10; 1 Peter 5:6; (2 Cor.11:7). For the Old Testament background to this theme of humility and glory see Proverbs 15:33; 18:12; 22:4; 29:23; Sirach 4:21; 20:11. Apart from the Johannine use we have only to account for three uses in Acts to complete a survey of the New Testament usage. Two of these refer to the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God (Acts 2:33; 5:31), and the other reference is to the exaltation of the people of Israel in Egypt (Acts 13:17). It is in connection with the exaltation of Jesus that the evangelist worked out his idea of glory in terms of Jesus' death (12:32-34).

We shall deal briefly with the usage where "glory" means "honour" or "praise", John 5:41,44; 7:18; 8:50,54; 9:24; 12:43. It is said of the Jews that they prefer the glory of men to the glory of God, 5:44; 12:43; compare Matt.6:1; 23; where it is said that such Jewish piety aimed at securing glory from men. This piety is contrasted with those who fix
their attention and God, and our attention is drawn to the different sources of "glory" or "praise". This usage accounts for ten of the nineteen uses of δόξα, and δοξάζειν is also capable of expressing this meaning, but the verb is always suggestive of a deeper meaning. Perhaps this arises from the fact that Jesus' glory is not from man, but from the Father, and consequently it is no vain word but corresponds to reality. Hence praise passes into revelation.

In John 21:19 Jesus signified (δοξάζειν) by what sort of death Peter would glorify (δοξάζειν) God. This passage, coming as it does in Chapter 21, is probably not to be regarded as the work of the evangelist. It is modelled on what the evangelist records in 12:33; 18:32, where Jesus signified (δοξάζειν) by what kind of death he was about to die. (Note also in the three passages κληρονομεῖν θανάτον). The association of δοξάζειν with Jesus' death is not made in 12:33; 18:32, but is clear in the Gospel. Apart from 21:19 only the Father, Son or Spirit are the subject of the verb in the active voice, and when the Father and the Son are said to be glorified (passive voice) it is generally clear that the one is glorified through the other. Thus this use of δοξάζειν stands out from the rest of the Gospel, and fits more easily in the Johannine use of δόξα in the sense of "honour" or "praise", and thus has the meaning of τιμᾶν in Matt.5:18 (which is a quotation of Isaiah 29:13 where the Hebrew is 'יִתָּה). In John 4:44 it is said that "a prophet has no τιμᾶν in his own country", δόξα could have been used in the same sense. The verb τιμᾶν is used in the sense of "honouring" in 5:23; 8:49; 12:26. Thus in John δόξα, τιμᾶ and τιμᾶν are used in the same sense as in the Synoptic Gospels where the usage is clearly dependent on Old Testament; see Matt.15:4,5,8; 19:9; (27:9); Mark 7:6,10; 10:19; and Luke 18:20 where τιμᾶν translates the Hebrew root יָדַע. Excluding John 21:19 we note that δοξάζειν is not used in this sense but has been replaced by τιμᾶν, leaving δοξάζειν free for a more significant purpose.

"Glory" is spoken of as the object of sight in 1:14; 11:40; 12:41; 17:24. Parallels to these verbs of seeing the glory of the Lord may be noted, in John 1:14 Λαλῶ, see Tobit 3:14 (Tobit 3:16 LXX Texts B.A.); John 11:40 οὐκ ἔδωκα, see Exodus 16:17; Isaiah 33:17; 66:18; John 12:41;
The evangelist commences with the Old Testament idea of "glory" as the manifestation of the divine presence, and this "glory" is communicable as Exodus 34:29ff. indicates. In the Old Testament the situation is that of looking back to certain partial manifestations of "glory" and looking forward to the complete manifestation in the future, see Isaiah 40:5; Sirach 45:3. This future hope became important in later Judaism. In the New Testament the Old Testament idea of "glory" is given a Christological interpretation. In Mark the Old Testament idea of "glory" was adopted with little modification. The "glory" was reserved to the period of the exaltation, and this glory was to be revealed in the future at the coming of the Son of Man; Mark 8:38; 10:37; 13:26. But we need to modify this point by recognizing the partial manifestation of "glory", wholly in the Old Testament sense in the account of the transfiguration, Mark 9:1ff. metamorphoo is used by Mark and not Sophia as in Exodus 34:29ff., but the general description makes the connection clear. The Fourth Gospel has no account of the transfiguration, and the focal point concerning the revelation of "glory" does not lie in the future, but in the past, John 1:14. What is more, this "glory" is not described in terms of the manifestation of brilliance and light. The "glory" was revealed in the historical life of Jesus of Nazareth, and in particular at certain times during that life. One critical moment stands out as that which makes clear the nature of the "glory" revealed in him. The uplifting of the Son of Man is the moment in which he was "glorified". This idea is partly anticipated by the teaching about humility and "glory" which we have noted in the Synoptic Gospels and the Old Testament, linked with an understanding of the exaltation of Christ (Acts 2:33; 5:31). But it was the evangelist's purpose to show that the "glory" of the Son of Man did not follow his humiliation, but is to be seen in his humiliation. The real glory is to be seen in the event of the Cross itself. It is this that stamps the distinctive meaning on the Johannine presentation of "glory".

I. The Vision of Glory in the reflection of Faith.

We turn now to a more detailed discussion of the material in the Gospel. John 1:14 raises some problems which relate to the nature of
the "glory" spoken about here. (1) "We beheld..." The Apostolic testimony is grounded in sight of the glory of Christ (see 15:27). The "glory" was revealed in the life of the historical Jesus, but the nature of the revelation was such that it could only be seen by those who believed. Thus the concept of "glory" is modified as it cannot be regarded as a phenomenon which forces itself upon those within physical proximity. (9) The sight of the "glory" is recognized in the reflection of full faith, and this is the force of ἐθέμασεν in this verse.

(2) "...the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,..." The glory revealed is that of the unique Son, who, because of his intimate relationship with the Father, is able to reveal the Father, and to see his glory is to see the glory of the Father, John 1:18. By referring to Jesus as μονογενός, the evangelist makes clear that the Father is the origin of the "glory". The Father has given this glory to the Son, 17:22. Because the Son's glory comes from the Father, the Father's glory is revealed in him, and it was for this purpose that the Son came into the world. (3) "...full of grace and truth", (10) For the use of Ἰησοῦς, Ἰησοῦς and ἰδρύμενον see Psalm 84(83)11; (113:9 LXX) 115(114)1; Sirach 4:21. ἰδρύμενον is used with Ἰησοῦς in Isaiah 61:3; Ezek 43:5; 44:14; Sirach 42:16, 25. and also see Hab.2:14. But none of these references gives us a real parallel. The problem with this phrase is that ἰδρύμενον could refer to Ἰησοῦς, μονογενός, κόσμος, or even Ἑλέος. If ἰδρύμενον is declinable it must refer to Ἑλέος, (11) and we have a parenthesis from καὶ ἐθέμασεν ἰδρύμενον...καρπὸς. But beholding the glory of the incarnate Word is not to be disposed of as parenthesis. ἰδρύμενον may be indeclinable. (12) Irenaeus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and later Greek Fathers connect ἰδρύμενον with Ἰησοῦς. (13) Further, D reads ἰδρύμενον which is evidently meant to be taken with Ἰησοῦς. The evangelist first states that the "glory" was seen, he then indicates the origin of the "glory", and finally expounds the nature of this "glory". The evangelist had in mind a different kind of "glory" from that which his readers would have expected and he makes clear the true nature of "glory" at the outset. The "glory" is the love, the self-giving love of Jesus who gives himself up for the world, and this is to be understood as the self-giving of God (3:16). His love goes to the extremity in
order that he may truly give himself to man in the personal relationship which was purposed in the act of creation. The "glory" of God revealed in Jesus is full of grace and truth, and in it is revealed the God whose glory is his humiliation and suffering, and unswerving faithfulness to the world which refused to know him.

II. Signs, Glory and Faith.

If true faith in reflection recognized the "glory" of the unique Son from the Father, the "glory" manifest to those who did not believe was quite different. This "glory" is more like the Old Testament idea of the visible demonstration of the divine presence. In John 2:11 we are told of Jesus' first σήμειον in which Jesus "εφανέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ and his disciples believed in him". ἐφανέρωσεν is used nine times in John, and three of these uses concern Jesus' resurrection appearances in Chapter 21. Elsewhere the verb is used of Jesus (1:31; 7:14), the origin of the works of those who come to the light (3:21), and God's works (9:3). In each case we are dealing with phenomena which can be seen or conclusions drawn from such. Only in John 2:11 is "glory" the object of ἐφανέρωσεν. The σήμεια performed by Jesus were visible to sight, and the "glory" was visible in the "signs". But they were not intended just to be seen, they were to lead men to believe, 20:31. The "glory" revealed in the "signs" is the authority and power of Jesus. The evangelist describes the miracles as "signs" because they are not simply displays of power, but a demonstration of Jesus' relationship to the Father, whose works they were, 5:36; 9:4; 10:32; 37-38; 14:10. Thus the "signs" were intended to lead men to believe in Jesus in the context of his relationship to the Father, but there was always the danger of a faulty faith which regarded him only as a miracle worker. The disciples are said to have believed in Jesus because of this "sign", but the Gospel makes clear that this faith was not authentic faith at this point.

Seeing the "glory" in the sense of John 2:11 depends on historical circumstances. Only those present could see this "glory", and consequently "second-hand hearers" could not see this "glory". But, they are not inferior because of this as the evangelist makes clear in 2:23-25, by showing that the faith aroused by "signs" was suspect, and that the recognition of the glory in the "signs" need not be that which
is expressed in the reflection of 11:14. Further, he draws attention to the fact that authentic faith was possible for those who had never seen Jesus at all, 20:29.

This theme is developed further in 11:4,40. The sickness of Lazarus is not to end in death but in a revelation of God's "glory"; in the manifestation of his power over death. In this situation Jesus is "glorified" because the Father has given him authority to give life (5:21,26), and this authority was revealed in the raising of Lazarus. This "glorification" of Jesus, which is a revelation of his relationship to Father, leads men to believe in him, 11:45. But "glory" and "glorification" probably have second meanings in this context. The sickness of Lazarus is not to end in death, but with men praising God, and from this event Jesus will be "glorified", that is lifted up, for John makes the point, "from that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death", 11:53.

In John 11:40 we have a statement which could be taken to mean that Jesus performed this sign in response to faith (see Mark 2:5ff.; 5:34f.). But the meaning is also more profound. While the sign revealed the power of God and led many to believe in Jesus in a superficial sense (11:45 and compare 2:23-25), those who already believed in Jesus would see in this miracle the glory of God's life-giving love.

III. The Glorification of the Son of Man.

"The kingdom of God" is used only twice in the Fourth Gospel (3:3,5) but the concept lies behind much important Christological material. In Chapters 1-12 Jesus is referred to as "king" in 1:50; 12:13,15; and in 5:15 it is said that the crowd was about to take him by force and make him king. In Chapters 18-19 βασιλεύς is used twelve times with reference to Jesus. "Son of Man" is used twelve times, and only in Chapters 1-13. Thus in the passion narrative we note a change in emphasis from Son of Man to king. In 18:36 Jesus (three times) refers to "my kingdom". Thus it is clear that the evangelist does understand Jesus to be a king, but his kingdom is not the political this-worldly kind, because he is not that kind of king. The evangelist shows what kind of king Jesus is through the Son of Man theme.

Though the "Son of Man" figure is sometimes said to be dependent on
a Gnostic Anthropos myth, it seems more likely that it is a development from the creation myth known to Israel. (15) Whether or not there was a New Year Festival in Israel, it is certain that the kings were prominent figures, not only as military leaders, but also in the religious life of the nation. Elaborate parallels between the Psalms and the Babylonian New Year Festival are at least an indication that the king in Israel was approaching the significance of the Babylonian monarch. The king is the Son of God, Psalm 2:7; Lord, Psalm 110:1; and as Lord the connection is made between the king and Adam in 4 Ezra 6:54-59. Both the "P" and "J" creation stories make clear that the first man is given dominion over the created order, that in fact (though the word king is not used) he is king of paradise. It is at this point that the Son of Man and the Anthropos myth begin with a common origin. Israel's creation myth has much in common with the Babylonian myth. But if the Israelite myth has been borrowed from the Babylonian myth, it has been radically transformed by the theological treatment it received.

Bentzen draws attention to the idea of the first man as king of paradise in Psalm 8; Ezekiel 28:1-19; Job 15:7ff. The kings of Israel were successors of the primal king, and in Genesis 3:15 it is promised that through the king, Paradise would be regained. This idea is taken up in terms of the Davidic kingship so that the Messianic hope is understood in terms of "the Son of David". But although the first man is replaced by David, the Davidic Messiah retains some features of the first king. He is to be king of the restored Paradise and the fact that he is the "seed" of the woman is emphasized, see Isaiah 7:14; 9:6ff.; 11:1-16. (16) There was also a tendency to think that the Messianic king was pre-existent (see Micah 5:1ff.), though this probably only asserts the certainty of the coming of the Messiah. But it is significant that this is done in terms of pre-existence.

During the Babylonian exile and in the time of the Maccabees Israel had no king, and the hopes were now pushed into the future, and the myth which had been developed in an eschatological direction was taken up into the Apocalyptic literature. "Son of Man" had long been a description of the king (see Psalm 8:4-5; 2:4-7). In Daniel 7 the "Son of Man" is the figure of Israel's king, now a future and supernatural deliverer who will
restore the dominion to the rightful people. The dominion reasserted by
the Son of Man (king) is also thought of as the reassertion of Israel's
dominion because the king is to be regarded as a representative person.
The "Son of Man" represents the people of the Saints of the Most High.
Thus we notice the change from Man's dominion in the original myth to
Israel's dominion. But in so far as the other kingdoms are represented
by animals the original mythology of man's dominion over the beasts
is used to assert Israel's future dominion over the bestial kingdoms.
Further, they arise from the sea, and this reminds us of Yahweh's battle
with the deep in the creation myth, see Psalm 93 and also 4 Ezra 11ffff.

In Daniel, the functions of the Son of Man are spoken of in terms
of judgement and supernatural kingship. But in 1 Enoch and 4 Ezra the
Son of Man is a pre-existent being who is also the revealer of heavenly
secrets. Thus the idea of the Apocalyptic Son of Man merges to some
extent with the ideas of the Hellenistic religions of salvation by
knowledge. The impact of this search for supernatural knowledge is to
be seen also in Daniel, to whom God reveals secrets (Daniel 2:18ff.,
28-30). The book is full of revelations by dreams, or messengers.
Though the Son of Man does not convey esoteric knowledge, the potentiality
for this purpose is clear, and as we have said, this aspect is developed
in 1 Enoch.

The Son of Man sayings in the Synoptic Gospels have been divided
into three groups by some scholars: (1) concerning the earthly ministry;
(2) passion predictions; (3) predictions of future glory. Only in the
third group are there quotations from Daniel 7. For the other two usages
the Synoptic Gospels give no precedent, and apart from the explanation
that the title Son of Man as used by Jesus was understood as "I", there
is little to suggest except that, had not the tradition used the title,
the Synoptic Gospels would not have, because they were not able to make
anything of it. The text of John 9:35 would seem to suggest that soon
after the New Testament period the title Son of Man was regarded to be
an inadequate expression of Jesus' significance and was changed to Son
of God. The Synoptic Gospels would seem to share this view, but for the
fourth evangelist the Son of Man is the supernatural heavenly king, who
is also the revealer of heavenly mysteries.
We turn now to the theme of the exaltation, or glorification of the Son of Man. John 1:51 is of some importance, though the interpretation of this verse is a controversial point. Nathaniel’s confession, “Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are the king of Israel” was evoked by Jesus’ supernatural knowledge of him, and is thus a confession of faith based on a miracle. Jesus’ response makes clear the inadequacy of this confession. The confession names Jesus as “Rabbi”, “Son of God”, and “King of Israel”, the latter two titles being synonyms for “the Messiah”. “Rabbi” makes clear that Nathaniel regards Jesus from an earthly point of view as a human Messiah. In typical Johannine irony the statements also indicate that in a man, a “Rabbi” we meet the eternal Son of God because the Λόγος ἐδρεῖς Εὐεργετή. But Nathaniel’s confession required a new dimension if it was to cope with the true significance of Jesus. Thus Jesus turned Nathaniel’s attention to the heavenly sphere. He would see greater things; “heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man”.

There are three possible interpretations of 1:51. Firstly, noting the reference to Genesis 28:12 where Jacob saw a vision of a ladder set up from the earth to the heavens with “the angels of God ascending and descending upon ("it" or "him" according to the Hebrew "it" in the LXX)". Taking Son of Man as the ladder we understand the saying in 1:51 as meaning that Jesus is the way from earth to heaven and heaven to earth, see John 14:6. Secondly, understanding "him" in Genesis 28:12 and with reference to the Genesis Rabba on this passage which gives the view that Rabbi Yannai taught the traffic of the angels between earth, where Jacob slept, and heaven, where his image remained, the meaning would be that the Son of Man was in touch with the heavenly realm (3:11-13). But against the first view it must be said that although Jesus is said to be the "way" to the Father by which men come, elsewhere he is not said to be the "way" by which heavenly traffic is carried on between earth and heaven. Against the second view we note that Jesus’ contact with the heavenly realm is not said to be dependent on angelic messengers, but on the fact that he himself has come from heaven, see 3:11-13. Against both views it has been suggested that the sequence of events indicates that the scene is set in heaven as in Rev. 4:1. The
evangelist has, distinct from the Genesis account "you will see the heavens opened" (ἴδε οὐρανῶν). In Genesis a ladder is set up from the earth reaching into the heavens. Admittedly it could be argued that the heavens were opened to let the angels through, but the order is ascent, and descent, and although this interpretation is possible the change from setting up a ladder from the earth, to the heavens opening, has the effect of changing the focus from earth to heaven. The heavens are opened and the Son of Man is revealed as the central figure with the angels converging on him, see Acts 7:56. Attention should be drawn to the theme of the eschatological coming of the Son of Man at the right hand of God, on the clouds of heaven and with angels in attendance, see Mark 13:26; 14:62. The use of ὀφείλετο draws attention to the Synoptic baptismal stories (see Mark 1:10; Matt.3:16; Luke 3:21; and note John 6:27; 12:34). The placing of John 1:51 suggests that the Synoptic baptismal stories may be in mind, but the event spoken of here is to be seen in the future. The Fourth evangelist portrays no "Transfiguration" or "baptism" but refers both of these events to the "lifting up" of the Son of Man, his "glorification", through which he is enthroned as the heavenly king (see John 17:5), receiving the worship, not only of men, but also of the angels (see Hebrews 1:6). His kingship does not await the future coming of the Son of Man in glory as in the Synoptic Gospels, but is revealed in his being lifted up to heaven through the cross.

In John 3:13ff, most of the points concerning the Son of Man are raised. Verse 13 deals with his "ascent" and "descent". The perfect tense ἀνεβαίνειν indicates that this verse must be understood from the standpoint of the exaltation. The possibility that the text includes "who is in heaven" or, "who was in heaven", or "who is of heaven" must be left open but adds nothing to the meaning if this verse is understood as post-exaltation in reference. Thus it is asserted that only the one who first came down from heaven has subsequently ascended into heaven. This appears to be a polemic against the belief in the ascent of some person into heaven, who consequently returns as a revealer of heavenly secrets (see 1 Enoch 70:2; 71; and also Prov.30:3-4; Wisdom 9:16-18; Baruch 3:29; Deut.30:12.) Only Jesus has ascended and he first of all descended. He is of heavenly origin, see John 1:1ff.
**Kataβαίνειν** is used concerning the incarnation in John 6:33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58. Thus in his objection the evangelist reverses the order of the claim that a man may ascend into heaven and come down with knowledge of the heavenly mysteries. The only one who has come down from heaven is the Son of Man and he has returned to heaven. We note the use of ἀναβαίνειν followed by Kataβαίνειν in John 1:15; 3:13; Rom. 10:6-7; Eph. 4:8-10. Ephesians 4:8-10 is important for John 3:13 because it makes clear that although the ascent is mentioned first, the descent took place first, and we have noted John's use of Kataβαίνειν to indicate the incarnation and conclude that this is the sense in John 3:13, see also "where he was before" in 6:62. In John 3:14-16 the identification of Son of Man with ὁ θεός ὁ θεός τοῦ πατρὸς is made, and ἐσώσατο indicates his heavenly origin as does John 17:5, "the glory which I had with thee before the world was".

John 5:27, like some Synoptic references is related to Daniel 7:13ff., and John 5:29 seems to be dependent on Daniel 12:2, though the material may have been received through the channel of the early Christian tradition. The omission of the article in the use of Son of Man in John 5:27 may well be a return to the anarthrous use in Daniel 7:13. The function of judgement is given to him because he is "Son of Man". In this passage (5:19-29) the Son of Man is identified with the Son of God. The judgement has two aspects of salvation and condemnation. The Gospel concentrates on the life giving purpose of the Son of Man. The Son of Man gives the bread which, because it abides, gives abiding or eternal life, 6:27. The Son of Man gives this bread not Moses. Of course it is also true to say that the Father gives the bread which comes down from heaven, 6:32-33 (N.B. Kataβαίνειν in 6:33). But this bread could only be given as Jesus gave his flesh and blood in death, because he is the bread of life, 6:35, 48, 51, 53ff. (N.B. Kataβαίνειν in 6:51). The passage develops Eucharistic theology, but it is of secondary importance to the central point of the necessity of faith in the Son of Man (6:53), for eating and drinking are synonyms for believing. See also 9:35 where the challenge to believe in the Son of Man is made. To regard Jesus as a prophet is not enough, one must worship him as the Son of Man. This title was fitting as a description of the one who had descended from heaven,
and unlike the title Νόμος and the symbol "bread", it guarded against the danger of simply regarding Jesus in abstract terms or as a personification of some divine attribute. The Son of Man was a distinct personality.

The chapter dealing with the healing of the blind man leads from the confession that Jesus is a prophet (9:17) to his worship of Jesus as "the Son of Man", 9:35. The passage ends on the note of judgement which is the function of the Son of Man, but in 9:39 Jesus speaks in terms of his own coming as judgement, the judgement by the light. His presence caused division according to the response that men made to him, and "the blind" are those who refuse to see the light in Jesus because they regard their own illumination as sufficient. Compare Jn.5:35,39.

The ascent (ἀνάβασις) of the Son of Man (3:13; 6:62) is to be understood in terms of the ascension of Jesus (see Acts 2:34; Ephesians 4:8-10; John 20:17). Of the Johannine passages only 3:13 speaks of the ascension as a past event (because it is a comment from the ascension stand-point), and 3:14 goes on to make clear that at the stage the narrative of the Gospel had reached "the lifting up" of the Son of Man remained in the future. ὄψωθηναι is used of the exaltation of the Son of Man in John 3:14; 8:28; 12:34; and of Jesus in John 12:32. Compare Acts 2:33; 5:31; Philippians 2:9. The Son of Man of necessity "must" (σκέφτεται) be "lifted up", 3:14; 12:34; compare 12:23 and note the use of σκέφτεται in Mark 8:31 and compare Mark 9:12,31; Luke 17:25. Jesus' exaltation was to be by way of the cross upon which he was lifted up and through which he returned to the Father. By speaking of his lifting up he "signified" the manner of his death, 12:33; compare 18:32. In 12:32 Jesus' statement about his own lifting up was understood correctly as a reference to the lifting up of the Son of Man, 12:34. The evangelist emphasizes the necessity of the death of the Son of Man because it is in this way that he gives his flesh for the life of the world, 6:51. By being lifted up Jesus exerted his universal Lordship, drawing all men to himself, 12:32. It is significant that the statement in 12:32 is made after the coming of the Ἐλληνες πνευματικοί 12:20. At this point Jesus indicated that the hour of his glorification had come, 12:23. Prior to this, his hour had not yet come, 2:4; 7:30,39; 8:20; and the immediate
prospect of the hour is noted in 12:27,31; 13:1; 17:1. The exact identity of this group who come seeking Jesus is not important. They represent the Gentile world and constitute both, an indication that the time to draw "all men" including the Gentiles, has come, and a temptation to draw them by some means which avoided the cross, 12:27. But it was to be by the cross that the barriers of nationalism and religious discrimination were broken down and the kingdom of heaven opened to all believers 3:14. The uplifted Jesus draws men (12:32), and this does not contradict what is said about the drawing of men by the Father (6:44), because the evangelist understood the activity of the Father and of Jesus to be a unity (5:19). The love of God revealed in Jesus' death draws men, and this recalls Jeremiah 38(31):3 κυσικες οε εις δικτειφαιεα. (Concerning the drawing of proselytes see P. Aboth 1:12.)

To the "would be disciples" who were scandalised by his words, Jesus put the question of what would be the effect of seeing the Son of Man ascending to his former place. If his words scandalised them, then the cross would scandalise them further, 6:62. The question is hypothetical, but the object of sight is similar to 11:51. His Lordship and ascension are displayed from the cross by which his ascent to his former glory is made. Only when the Son of Man had been lifted up would men know his true significance 8:28, because in being lifted he was glorified, see John 7:39; 12:16,23; 13:31f. In lifting up the Son of Man the world is judged (12:31) and shown to be in error, and Jesus is shown to be who he claimed to be (8:28), the Son of Man, "I am". The way the judgement of the world is carried out is spoken of in 15:26-27; 16:7-11; and is shown to involve the activity of the Spirit. In speaking of Jesus' exaltation through death as his "glorification" the evangelist draws attention to the event in terms of revelation, 7:39; 12:16,23; 13:31. In the Old Testament sense "glory" is the manifestation of the divine reality. The divine glory was associated in a special way with the Temple, but in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is regarded as the new Temple (2:21) where the glory was to be seen (1:14). Throughout his ministry Jesus manifested his glory (2:11), but his passion is referred to as his glorification in a special sense. In this event the true
nature of his being is revealed as self-giving love, and this is the revelation of the Father, and hence it is said that the Father is glorified in him, 13:31; and see 17:1ff. Further through this event Jesus returned to his pre-incarnate glory 17:5. But more important, through this event he (and through him the Father) was effectively revealed because his glorification marked the coming of the Spirit (7:39; compare 16:17) who caused the disciples to remember in true faith what Jesus had said and done (12:16; 2:22; 14:26), and in doing this the Spirit of truth glorifies Jesus (16:14), that is, makes the revelation in Jesus effective for believers, thus giving them authentic faith. (There is also probably the secondary sense that the Spirit "honours" Jesus 16:14). But outside of faith it can only be said "you will die in your sins" 8:24. Thus the exaltation of the Son of Man condemns as well as gives life.

IV. The glorification of the Father and the Son.

The use of ἡσυχία in 8:54 is ambiguous. Jesus declared that if he glorified himself his glory was nothing. The sense is that of θεότης and θεότητα. But there is a deeper sense because the Father "glorifies" Jesus, which is to be understood in the sense of "honouring" but also in the deeper sense of revealing the divine reality in Jesus. Self-seeking is not the true glory, which the Father has given him 17:22; which is related to the Father's gift of the authority to have life in himself 5:26. This life is the glory in that it is the life given for the life of the world. Such glory is shame by the standards of the world, such life the world regards as death.

Jesus' prayer (12:28) for the Father to glorify his name is a request that the Father's will may be done and that the Father may be revealed in the events about to take place. The affirmation that God has glorified, and will glorify his name draws attention to the fact that the whole of Jesus' life, words and works, are to be regarded as the revelation of the Father, but the events of the passion have a peculiar place in that only through Jesus' exaltation does his life become effectively the revelation of the Father. In his passion the life of the Father is most clearly revealed, and through it the Paraclete comes to lead men into the truth.
In 17:1ff. the glorification of the Father and the Son in the passion events is made clear. In honouring the Father Jesus revealed him 17:5. In honouring the Son the Father was to reinstate him to his former glory 17:5. As we have already seen, Jesus' life can be regarded in terms of revelation 17:6, but special emphasis is laid on the passion (17:1) through which Jesus' true significance is revealed and in this the Father is revealed. The connection of the glorification of Father and Son draws attention to the Son's dependence on the Father.

The glorification of the Father in the Son continues through the activity of Jesus' disciples whose requests in Jesus' name are realized, thus revealing the activity of the Father in the Son. The Father is revealed in the world, after Jesus' departure, through those who believe in Jesus. The Father is glorified as the disciples act in faith, abide in Jesus, and thus perform his will, 15:8. The life revealed in Jesus is now revealed in them 17:10; because the glory the Father gave to Jesus, he gave to them 17:22. This glory is given in Jesus' words which he gave to the disciples 17:8. His words or God's word is the sanctifying, the separating power in their lives. But this can be regarded as a reality only from the standpoint of Jesus' glorification when Jesus had departed from them, and yet is ever present with them as the glorified Jesus who cannot be assessed in human terms, but the Jesus who must be encountered through the life of the Jesus of history. Only after the coming of the Paraclete was this relation possible.

Just as Jesus when he had faithfully revealed the Father in the world, thus glorifying him, entered into his heavenly glory 17:5; so Jesus' prayer indicates that the believers through whom the revelation continues in the world (17:22) will share in his heavenly glory. (27)
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Revelation and the Spirit.

The Spirit plays a significant role in the work of revelation, and it is made quite clear that there was no effective revelation prior to the glorification of Jesus when the Spirit was given, 7:39. But the evangelist does speak of the activity of the Spirit during the time of Jesus' ministry, though during this period only his relationship to Jesus is mentioned. Thus the revelation in Jesus remained ineffective until his glorification.

I. The presence and work of the Spirit prior to Jesus' glorification.

John 1:26-27, 32-34, should be compared with Mark 1:7-8,10; Matt.3:11,16; Luke 3:16,22. The evangelist does not record Jesus' baptism by John the Baptist, but he does record the descent of the Spirit on Jesus and the prediction that Jesus is the one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit. It seems probable that the evangelist knew and developed the Synoptic tradition here. Where he differs from the Synoptic Gospels we may indicate the particular emphasis that he intended to make. Firstly, the Baptist's prediction concerning the one who was to come after him is separated into two parts by his witness to Jesus, which included the account of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus. The prediction that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit followed this. Secondly, the Baptist's whole ministry is subjected to the purpose of revealing Jesus to Israel 1:31. Thirdly, it is the Baptist who sees the descent of the Spirit (not Jesus as in Matthew and Mark; Luke does not say who saw this), 1:32, and it is he (not the Father as in Matthew Mark Luke) who declared that Jesus was the Son of God, 1:34. Thus this whole event is subjected to purpose of revelation. The descent of the Spirit revealed Jesus to the Baptist, and he revealed Jesus to Israel. Fourthly, the Spirit is said to "abide" on Jesus 1:32,33, and the double emphasis should be noted. Jesus' relationship with Spirit was permanent. But the evangelist has gone out of his way to repudiate a Spirit Christology by emphasizing the purpose of the descent of the Spirit as a sign to the Baptist, and by following this event immediately by the prediction that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit. His relation to the Spirit is to be understood in terms
of his giving the Spirit to those who believe in him.

With John 1:32-33 we note 3:34. One interpretation understands God as subject throughout the verse, see 3:35. The omission of "the Spirit" in some texts is probably to be explained as the work of an editor who found the idea of the giving of the Spirit in these terms open to an adoptionist Christology. The use of ἐκ μετροῦ is hardly Greek, and is probably a Semitic expression, see R.Aha (Lev.R.15.2). Jesus, unlike the prophets, is given the Spirit in an unlimited way, and the Spirit abides permanently on him. Both 1:32-33; and 3:34 are declarations made by the Baptist, and this brings out the more clearly the difference between Jesus, the incarnate Word, and the prophets, whom the Baptist represents.

It is probable that 3:34 has been left ambiguous so that the meaning is also that Jesus does not give the Spirit by weight of measure, but permanently, to those who believe on him, 14:16-17. This interpretation is supported by the first half of 3:34. Jesus speaks God's words, he gives the Spirit fully, and 3:35 justifies this claim on the ground of the Father's love and gift of all things into Jesus' hand. The evangelist's emphasis is on Jesus as the one who bestows the Spirit.

In John 3:5 reference to the need to be born by water and Spirit is mentioned in a context where the Baptist still hovers in the background, see 1:26,33; 3:22-33. Nicodemus is challenged to come out into the open and accept the Baptist's baptism, and to believe in Jesus, the one to whom the Baptist bore witness, and thus to receive the Spirit. In the situation from which the Gospel was written reference to Christian baptism would be understood, but the main point was the challenge to believe in Jesus as the one who would give the Spirit. The distinction between flesh and Spirit in 3:6 concerns the distinction between man and God, see 3:3; 1:13. Nicodemus was challenged to see Jesus, not as a human teacher, but the one in whom God is present in life-giving power. The Spirit is not something which can be controlled by man (3:8), nor are those who are born of the Spirit to be recognized by the world which cannot recognize the Spirit either, 14:17; 15:18ff. The divine origin of the believer's life is not verifiable by methods which the world will accept.
In John 4:23-24 Jesus announced that the eschatological hour had struck (proleptically because he was not yet glorified, 7:39), and that now men were to worship God in Spirit and truth. Though this was a human impossibility, for man is flesh not Spirit (see Isaiah 31:3; John 1:13), it was a possibility because "God is Spirit", life-giving power. (For the Old Testament background see Gen.1:2; Ezek 31:1-14; Jesus is the truth (14:6) through whom the Spirit is given (7:38-39), but only after Jesus glorification 7:39. During his ministry Jesus drew attention to the life-giving power of his words, and indicated that the Spirit is active in them 6:63. But neither "the flesh" nor Jesus' words have any life-giving power apart from the activity of the Spirit, and hence apart from faith, because the Spirit is given to believers.

John agrees with the Luke-Acts tradition (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4,5,8; 2:1ff.) which relates the giving of the Spirit to Jesus' ascension, 7:39. (But note John's special interpretation of the ascension.) In 7:39 the giving of the Spirit is likened to rivers of living water, see 4:10ff. The verse could refer to water flowing from Jesus or believers, but as believers are not elsewhere said to give the Spirit and in 7:39 it is said that the Spirit was not yet given to believers because Jesus was not yet glorified we take this as a reference to Jesus' giving the Spirit. In 19:34 it is possible that the water from Jesus' side is to be understood in terms of the Spirit given through Jesus' death which was his glorification. In John 4:14 the living water which Jesus gives (the Spirit 7:38-39) is said to spring up in the one who drinks. But the idea is not that the one who drinks may then bestow living water, it is rather that having drunk he will never thirst again, for he has an inexhaustible source, he has eternal life.

The word Καρδία is used in a psychological sense in 11:33; 13:21; and probably 19:30 which would mean that Jesus died. But the evangelist may have been aware of the ambiguity of this statement and have understood it in terms of the giving of the Spirit at Jesus' death, his glorification.

II. The presence and work of the Spirit in the Farewell Discourses.
The block of material in chapters 13-17 is mainly discourse
material broken only by a few questions asked by the disciples. The absence of any "institution narrative" is notable, though it should be recognized that the significance of this event is not unrelated to the themes dealt with here. Likewise, although the Gethsemane narrative is not included, the evangelist's insight into this material is given in 12:23ff. (note 12:27-28); and chapter 17.

References to the Spirit are to be found only in chapters 14-16 in four fairly self-contained passages, and it has been suggested that these passages are insertions from a source. In support of this it is noted that the Spirit, besides being called the Holy Spirit 14:26; which we note in 1:33; is called "the Spirit of Truth", and the "Paraclete", John 14:16-17 etc. The last two titles (if such they are) are not found in the rest of the Gospel. Both are found in 1 John, though used in a different sense. John 14:16 "another Paraclete" perhaps suggest that Jesus is to be regarded as "Paraclete" as 1 John 2:1 states. In 1 John 4:6 reference is made to "the Spirit of Truth", but this reference is closer to the Qumran terminology ("the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error") than the use in the Gospel.

If these passages are to be regarded as the interpolation of alien material by an incompetent editor, the discourses are left without one reference to Spirit. Further, we need to ask why the material was not put in one block. If on the other hand it is suggested that source material may lie behind these passages which finally are to be regarded as the evangelist's work, objections fall away. But is a source theory necessary to explain the evangelist's use of these titles for the Spirit? The placing of these four passages in the context of the Farewell-discourses is intended to make clear the Spirit's relationship to Jesus which is briefly spoken of in John 1-12, see John 1:26-34; 7:38-39 etc. But we need to ask about the origin of these titles, and the reason for the limitation of their use in the New Testament to Johannine literature. Whatever the origin of the titles the evangelist identified them with the Holy Spirit 14:17,26. But if the evangelist was dealing with traditional material about the Holy Spirit why did he use other titles at this point? There seem to be two possible answers. Firstly, the Spirit of God may already have been associated with these
titles, and secondly, perhaps the evangelist's understanding of the functions of the Holy Spirit suggested to him the possibility of using titles which were known to him from another background.

"The Spirit of Truth". Similar vocabulary in the Qumran Texts may not be taken to mean an identity of ideas. In Judaism ideas about the Spirit developed both in psychological and apocalyptic directions. In the Apocalyptic literature we note that this is related to the development of the angelology of later Judaism. In the Qumran Texts we note that the Spirit of Truth is identified with God's Holy Spirit, and was thought to be active within the community performing functions concerned with revelation. The revelation concerned the Law along lines which the evangelist denies, but the vocabulary, which is related to the idea of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament, and is developed in an apocalyptic direction, supplied the evangelist with raw materials to express his understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit. Though the opposite figure to the Spirit of Truth is not found in the Gospel (but see 1 John 4:16), it may be that the evangelist's understanding of the devil should be taken into account at this point. The devil's opposition to the divine will is clearly indicated, see John 8:44. At Qumran we note that the Spirit of Truth was considered to be the "helper" and "counsellor" of the Sons of light, and though it should be admitted that there is no title which could be translated "Paraclete", some of the functions ascribed to the Spirit call to mind the activity of the Paraclete in the Gospel.

"The Paraclete" title in the Gospel remains an enigma. All attempts to find a pre-Johannine use of this title in the Johannine sense have failed. The original passive sense of Παράκλητος was "advocate" and this is the sense given for the title by Tertullian, "Paracletus, id est advocatus". It is true that the Holy Spirit is said to come to the disciples' defence in time of trial (see Matt.10:20; Acts 6:10), and in John references occur in a context where the persecution of the disciples is discussed, John 15:8-25; 16:2-3,32. But the Paraclete is not said to be the advocate of the disciples, he is the one who convicts the world, 16:8-11. His activity is that of a witness (15:26) for Jesus who is on trial. (Note this recurring theme in the Gospel, 5:31-40;
The witness of the Paraclete vindicates Jesus and convicts the world. This is done by bringing the evidence to bear on the disciples, and through them to the world. The witness is also a teacher. Thus "Advocate" is an inadequate translation, though not altogether irrelevant to the Johannine use. It is certain that "advocate" is the correct translation in 1 John 2:1. In later Judaism Ἱλίῳ (συνήγορος) was a synonym for ἱδρυθούς which probably transliterates Καρακλήτος, but as the evidence for synonymous use is second century A.D. it is of little value for our purpose to note that both of these words were used in the sense of an intercessor before God. We note Καρακλήτος used in the sense of an "advocate" with God in Philo (Vit. Mos. II, 134, etc.). But the activity in the Gospel is described in terms of his relationship with the disciples, not the Father.

That "Paraclete" should be translated "comforter" has been argued on the basis of the use of Καρακαλέων in the LXX. The verb is not used in the Gospel but the theme of consolation is clear in the context of Jesus' announcement of his departure to his sorrowing disciples, 16:16-7. But just when "Comforter" seems to be suggested the theme of judgement is developed, 16:8ff. In the LXX Καρακαλέων normally translates Νῦν, "to console" (61 of the 78 uses). It has been suggested that "Paraclete" translates the piel participle Νῦν which may mean "helper", "consoler", "advocate", according to the context. Though attractive, there is no real evidence for this theory. Καρακλήτων is used by Theodotion and Aquila in Job 16:2 for Οὐνήν where the LXX uses Καρακλήτων. But this is second century A.D. evidence.

We have so far neglected the New Testament evidence, and especially the characteristic importance of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. According to Bultmann(5) the evangelist understands the Spirit to be 'the power within the Church which brings forth both knowledge and proclamation of the Word'. We are brought back again to the theme of witness. The witness of the community to Jesus arising out of the witness of the Spirit to the community is to vindicate Jesus and to convict the world. Thus it has been suggested that the apostolic testimony suggests the title Paraclete for the prophetic Spirit of the Church. (6) Καρακαλέων and Καρακλήσις both refer to prophetic
Christian preaching... e.g. Acts 2:40; 1 Cor. 14:3; Acts 4:36; 11:23-24; 13:15; Romans 12:8; 1 Thessalonians 3:2; Hebrews 13:22.

Though neither ἑραμάκτην or ἀρακλησίας occur in John (Gospel or Epistles) the Paraclete is the Spirit of 'Apostolic' testimony, John 15:26-27. This material must be considered relevant. But there is also another sense in which both of these words may be understood, but only in their relationship to the LXX, where they are used to describe the 'consolation' of the Messianic age, see Isaiah 40:1 LXX and the use in the New Testament in Luke 2:25; and Matt. 5:4. The Christian preaching announced that the Messianic ἑρακλησίας had been manifest, and this was proved by appeal to the Old Testament, and on this basis a summons was issued to repent and enter the Messianic Salvation. Thus Professor Barrett concludes concerning the combination of both of these ideas of Christian ἑρακλησίας, 'it will be difficult to resist the view that the Paraclete is the Spirit of Christian Paraclesis.'

In spite of the fact that Professor Bultmann sees quite clearly the importance of the Paraclete's relationship to the proclamation, he does not look for the origin of the meaning of the title here. The Paraclete is supposedly part of the complex of ideas that have been borrowed from the Gnostic source used by the evangelist. Apart from the general argument of Gnostic background for the Gospel there are certain specific details to which Bultmann draws attention. The most telling of these is the argument that there is no place in the Farewell discourses for the Paraclete. In the source he was a second figure, but in the Gospel the Paraclete is only another way of talking of the presence of Jesus. Though the duality of figures remains in the Gospel the evangelist did not intend this duality to be taken literally. The duality of revealers is an indication that the source originated in a religious context where the revelation was thought to have come in a number of different messengers, that is in Gnosticism. The title Paraclete in the Gnostic sense means 'supporter' or 'helper', but is essentially a name for a revealer.

There are a number of objections to this Gnostic theory. First of all we may not presuppose any Gnostic source, though this does not rule
out such a possibility. The date of the documents used to indicate the dependence of the evangelist on a Gnostic source is too late to be conclusive. Further, the efforts to isolate source material in John do not seem to have been successful. We approach Bultmann's arguments concerning the origin of the Johannine Paraclete with some reservations concerning the validity of the Mandaean literature on which Bultmann bases his arguments. But even apart from this his evidence does not seem to be convincing.

Bultmann places much weight on John 14:16, ἐλλον παράκλητον which indicates a succession of Paracletes. But apart from the fact that this may be taken pleonastically to mean 'another one i.e. the Paraclete', at the most there are only two, whereas in the Mandaean writings there are a number of 'helpers'. But more important is the kind of relationship the Paraclete has to Jesus which is a marked contrast to the lack of relationship of the Mandaean 'helpers' to each other. They are not really a succession, for they appear together. Each is complete in himself. Further, the Mandaean 'helpers' do not have one consistent title. There are at least three, and if 'helper' is the right meaning, δονήθος would be a better translation than παράκλητος, and unlike παράκλητος is common in Biblical Greek.

There is one title that appears quite often 'Yawar', which Bultmann translates 'helper'. This title is the name of a particular revealer 'Yawar Ziva'. But it appears that it does not mean 'helper' but 'one who glows', and thus 'Yawar Ziva' means 'Glower of Heavenly Light'. The fact that the Mandaean glorified 'Yawar Ziva' as a figure of heavenly light supports this interpretation.

Two further objections may be raised from the context of the Gospel. Bultmann does not account for the forensic aspect of the Paraclete's activity, nor does it seem possible to do so by recourse to the Mandaean 'helpers'. But more important, Bultmann does not account for the identification of the Paraclete with the Holy Spirit. It does not seem to be credible to suggest that the evangelist was responsible for the belief in the coming of the Spirit which is foretold in the Synoptic Gospels, depicted in Acts, and spoken of as a matter of common knowledge by Paul. The evangelist had in the kerygma
a succession which he had to express. He had a relationship to make clear, that of the Holy Spirit to Jesus. There is no problem about a plurality of figures which forces us outside the Christian tradition in search of the title Paraclete. What causes the search is the title itself. Why should John call the Holy Spirit the Paraclete, and imply that Jesus is the original Paraclete?

We spoke of the relationship of the Paraclete to Jesus. Bultmann makes much of the fact that what is said of Jesus is also said of the Paraclete. He draws the conclusion that this means that they are both revealers of common status. But this overlooks the subordination of the Paraclete to Jesus. It is closer to the truth to say that the Paraclete stands to Jesus in a similar relationship to that which Jesus has with the Father. Thus it is not true to say that there are two parallel figures in John, and 14:16, even if it does imply that Jesus is also to be regarded as Paraclete, cannot sustain this claim.

Bultmann rejects the interpolation theory on the ground that the Paraclete is fundamental to the theme of the inspired witness of the community in the Farewell discourses. But this point is somewhat overlooked in his argument for the origin of the "Paraclete" in a Gnostic source. We must examine Bultmann's claim that the Paraclete is depicted as a parallel figure to Jesus because this is the basis for his argument for the Gnostic origin of this material. He sets out the parallelism thus:

The Paraclete: (i) Is sent by the Father 14:16; proceeds from the Father 15:26. (ii) Is not visible to the world, but only to believers 14:17. (iii) He teaches and leads believers into the truth 14:26; 16:13. (iv) He does not speak on his own account 16:13. (v) He bears witness to Jesus against the world, and convicts the world of sin 15:26; 16:8. In all of this he is described as the Revealer like Jesus himself.

For Jesus also (i) Is sent by God 5:30; 8:16; etc., has gone forth from God 9:42; 13:3 etc. (ii) Is visible only to believers as Revealer 1:10,12; 8:14,19; 17:8 etc. (iii) He teaches and leads believers into the truth 7:16f.; 8:32,40ff., etc. (iv) He does not speak on his own account 7:16f.; 12:49f., etc. (v) He bears witness to himself 8:14;
and convicts the world of sin 3:20; 7:7 etc.

The parallelism is striking, but Bultmann has failed to do justice to the very important differences to be seen in these lists, differences which are accentuated by material overlooked for the purpose of the comparison. We note the definite subordination of the Paraclete to Jesus, and this is seen in point (b) above. It is further brought out in that; (a) If the Paraclete is sent by the Father, he is sent only at the request of Jesus 14:16; in Jesus' name 14:26; or even, sent from the Father by Jesus 15:26; 16:7. (b) The Paraclete is known by those who believe in Jesus 14:17. (c) The activity of the Paraclete is Christ centered 14:26; 15:26; 16:13-15. As Bultmann points out, the whole burden of Jesus' ministry was the witness he bore to himself. He is the light of the world, the bread of life, the Good Shepherd, the way, the truth, and the life.

Bultmann does bring out the subordination of the Paraclete to Jesus in his discussion of the view, held by Bornkamm and others, that Jesus and the Paraclete develop the idea of succession to be seen in Moses and Joshua, Moses and the prophet like Moses, Deut. 18:15, cf. John 16:13-14. The concept of the Spirit is not divorced from this relationship, Deut. 34:9; 2 Kings 2:9,15. Bultmann objects that this would imply that the Spirit is superior to Jesus because the Baptist coming before Jesus is inferior, and this in turn suggests that Jesus, coming before the Paraclete, is also inferior. But this objection does not seem valid. Why may not this have come from a tradition where the former of the two was thought to be superior, Moses superior to Joshua, Elijah superior to Elisha etc. Of course this raises the problem at the other end. On this approach the Baptist should be superior to Jesus. What is more the evangelist has to argue against this. He is at pains to show that although the Baptist came before Jesus historically, he does not precede him in the eternal order.

Although Bultmann's objection to the theory of 'Succession' does not seem to be valid, it is hard to see what contribution such a theory makes. The origin of the succession of the Baptist, Jesus, and the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel is no problem, as we are aware of this from the Synoptic tradition. The problem is, why did the evangelist
refer to the Holy Spirit who came after Jesus' exaltation the Paraclete implying at the same time that Jesus was the original Paraclete? It is because the evangelist understands the Paraclete to be the Spirit of the Christian Paraclesis.

The Johannine use of the title Paraclete has no known contemporary parallel, but in the Qumran Texts some of the terminology used of the Paraclete appears, and we note the use of γεων "witness", ἔρως "help", γρηγόρος "interpreter" or "mediator", ἀνάπτυξις "teacher", μεθοδίος "man of insight" or "teacher", ἀνάπτυξις "corrector", ἡμιλίος "consoler". But there is no equivalent of ἀνάπτυξις, μεθοδίος, and the role of the Paraclete in John differs greatly from the role of the Spirit of Truth in the Qumran Texts. The meaning of the title Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel is indicated within the context of the passages where the title is used.

1. The relationship of the Paraclete to the Holy Spirit.

The Paraclete is identified with the Holy Spirit 14:26; (and also the Spirit of Truth 14:17) and reference is made to the Holy Spirit in 1:33; 7:39; 20:21. In 7:39 the coming of the Holy Spirit is said to be a consequence of Jesus' glorification, and in 16:7 the coming of the Paraclete is said to depend on Jesus' departure. That Jesus was to give the Spirit is mentioned in 1:33; 20:21; and in 15:26 Jesus promised to send the Paraclete. The coming of the Spirit of Truth is apparently regarded as a past event in 14:17. In this verse both μένει and ἐστίν are to be read. ἐστίν is probably the result of a scribal attempt to reconcile this verse with 7:39; 16:7; etc. But the discourse here is to be understood from the standpoint of Jesus' glorification. From this point of view the Spirit abides with them and is in them. The force of 14:17 stated in realized terminology as μένει and ἐστίν is spoken of as a future event in 14:16, where it is said that Jesus asks the Father for another Paraclete ἵνα μὴ ἐμφάνισθη ἐπὶ τὸν 

The Paraclete is not associated with baptism and birth from above as the Spirit is in 1:33; 3:5. The question of initiation into the true worship is not in view in the Farewell discourses. The disciples had already been initiated through the ministry of Jesus. The question that is raised in these discourses is, how will the disciples continue
An exposition of the passages concerning the Paraclete.

a. The Coming of the Paraclete

The Paraclete is given to those who believe in Jesus, ἀρματος, being a masculine noun is more suitable than κυριομικος for a personal title. The personal nature is indicated also in 14:16 by referring to the Spirit as ἀλον καρακλητον where Jesus himself is almost certainly thought to be the original Paraclete. In 14:16 Jesus makes a petition to the Father on behalf of the disciples, and chapter 17, although the Spirit is not mentioned, this point is developed. By calling the Paraclete "the Spirit of Truth" attention is drawn to the relationship of the Spirit to Jesus, who is the Truth 14:16. (1) Thus in 14:16 it is said that the Father will give (δωσε) the Paraclete at Jesus' request. It is also said that the Father will send the Paraclete (κέρυκι) in Jesus' name 14:26. (2) The expediency of Jesus' departure is explained in terms of the coming of the Paraclete (ἐλθοντες, ἐλθειν) 16:7,13; 15:26. (3) Jesus promised, that as a consequence of his departure he would send (κέρυκι) the Paraclete to his disciples (16:7) from the Father 15:26. (4) The Paraclete is said to proceed (ἐκπορευεται) from the Father 15:26.

The present tense of ἐκπορευεται is in contrast to the promised coming in the future indicative, and aorist subjunctive. These refer to the historic sending of the Spirit just as the references to Jesus' sending and coming in the incarnation are spoken of in the aorist and perfect tenses, 3:19; 8:42; 13:3; 16:27; 17:8; etc.; and once in a periphrastic imperfect, 1:9; but never in the present tense. The present tense ἐκπορευεται denotes the eternal relationship between the Father and the Spirit. The Spirit is ever going out from the Father. The Mission of the Spirit, consequent on Jesus' departure is to be understood as a particular instance of this procession. The sending of the Paraclete by the Father and by Jesus indicates the unity of the Father and the Son, but in such a way as to show the subordination of the Son to Father in that he requests the Father to send the Spirit.

The coming of the Paraclete (14:16f.) is spoken of in the same
context as Jesus' own coming 14:18; and the coming of the Father and the Son 14:23. In 14:18 the evangelist is referring to the coming of Jesus in the resurrection (20:19,26) having been parted from the disciples for a little while. His death does not leave them in a perpetual state of bereavement, for he will come to them after the resurrection. This language is open to eschatological interpretation because the evangelist intended to draw attention to the eschatological importance of Jesus' resurrection. His resurrection guarantees the resurrection of the disciples. But there is perhaps also a certain ambivalence of meaning. The evangelist has not interpreted the resurrection in terms of the Parousia. Reference to the Parousia is certainly meant in 14:3, and there is in John the idea of the end-time judgement and physical resurrection 5:28-29. But here in 14:18 Jesus' coming in the resurrection is connected to the coming of the Paraclete, for it is in his coming after the resurrection that the Spirit is given 20:22. We have also to look at the reference to the coming of the Father and Son to make their άνάπαύσις in the true disciples. This cannot be a reference to 14:3 where it is said that Jesus goes to prepare a place (τούκοι), described collectively as ἀνάπαυσις in 14:2, because that place is in his Father's house, to which Jesus goes through death, and to which the disciples will follow through death 13:36ff. The reference in 14:23 is related more closely to 14:16-17. The abiding of the Father and the Son in the disciples takes place in the coming of the Paraclete who abides with them for ever. The Paraclete is for the disciples the continual presence of the exalted Jesus who sends the Paraclete to them as his envoy, but not as his envoy only, for he himself is one who has been sent by the Father. The Paraclete is sent by the Father also, but not as an envoy independent of Jesus, and this is brought out by the texts indicating that the Paraclete is sent by Jesus. In the history of salvation described in John, the Father is the initiator of all action. This is clear from the texts concerning his sending the Son and the Paraclete. But the Son is the focus of all attention, and this is made clear in that even after his departure the Spirit sent by the Father does not operate independently of Jesus but as his special messenger. Thus the Father and the Son may be said to be present in him. The source of the Spirit in
his procession is the Father 15:26, making quite clear that the Son, though he may be said to send the Spirit, is not the real origin, for even in the sending, he sends the Paraclete 'from the Father'. Thus as Μονογενής Λόγος, his own subordination to the Father is made clear in the procession from the Father. But the mission of the Son has not been forgotten in the sending of the Paraclete as is shown by the texts which speak of Jesus as the sender as well as the Father, and when the Father is said to be the sender, he sends the Paraclete at Jesus' request and in Jesus' name. (The manifestation of Jesus to his disciples takes place through the activity of the Paraclete. See 14:21-23.)

b. The Paraclete and the disciples

The Paraclete is sent to the disciples, and not to the world 14:16-17. He is to the disciples the presence of the exalted Jesus so that they are not left bereft, 14:18,23. His presence with the disciples is unknown to the world for unlike Jesus, his presence is not discernible to the naked eye 14:17. But what are the functions of the Paraclete beyond consoling the disciples in their experience of abandonment?

Just as Jesus was the teacher (see 3:2), so the Paraclete is to teach the disciples, and he is to teach them comprehensively. The method of teaching is not that of supplying new material, but of reminding them (μνημονεύειν) of all that Jesus had said to them. But as teacher he does not merely remind them, for in doing this he brings out the true meaning which up till now had not been grasped 14:26. The authentic knowledge which the disciples shall have is reserved until that day when the Spirit is their teacher 14:20. That the remembrance caused by the Paraclete is interpretative is confirmed by 2:22 and 12:16. In 2:17 the disciples are said to have remembered the Scripture quotation of Psalm 69:9 in relation to Jesus' action. But in 2:22 the remembrance consequent to Jesus' resurrection is associated with believing the Scripture and Jesus' word about himself. This remembrance included a new understanding of Jesus due to the teaching of the Spirit. In 12:16 we notice a failure of the disciples to understand an event connected in its meaning to the Old Testament. After Jesus' glorification they remembered the event in the light of the Old Testament. The coming of the Paraclete was to remind the disciples of Jesus in his place in the history of salvation,
and thus the believing remembrance which he brought into being is also related to the Old Testament witness. (We note that although knowledge is remembering in this context, it differs greatly from the Gnostic idea where it is the heavenly origin which is recalled.)

At the time of Jesus’ departure the disciples were not ready to hear what he had to tell them 16:12. This situation was to be changed by the coming of the Spirit of Truth 16:13 (See the LXX of Psalm 142(143):10 for the leading and teaching work of the Spirit of Yahweh.) He will guide (ὁδηγεῖ) them into all truth 16:13. Thus the name Spirit of Truth indicates that the Spirit communicates the truth and that truth is Jesus 14:16. The Spirit speaks what he hears (as does Jesus 15:15; 5:30), and this indicates the subordination of the Spirit to his function (as Jesus was also). But in contrast to Jesus in whom the Father is known and eternal life is received, the presence of the Spirit is known only in the awareness of the presence and significance of Jesus 16:13.

The threefold use of ἀναγγέλλει (16:13-15) draws attention to the revealing work of the Paraclete. He reveals ἡ ἐρμόμενα, which from the standpoint of the discourses would refer to the passion, and includes the judgement involved in Jesus’ coming (3:19, etc.) and glorification 12:31f. The judgement continues in the activity of the Paraclete 16:18ff.; and can be viewed from the point of view of the last day in the future 5:28-29. The activity of the Spirit as the one who reveals Jesus (16:14-15) is justified by the Father’s gift of all things to the Son 5:19ff.; 16:15. Thus in revealing Jesus the Paraclete reveals the Father.

The means by which the Spirit of Truth will glorify (δόξα) Jesus is indicated by the threefold use of ἀναγγέλλει (16:13ff). The Spirit reveals Jesus in his true significance and thus honours him. The double meaning of δόξα should be noted. It is also said that the Paraclete will bear witness to Jesus (15:26) as also will the Apostles 15:27. But the Paraclete is not experienced by the world (14:17) and thus the witness borne by him must be to the Apostles and in the Apostles. The witness spoken of in 15:27 is to be regarded as the inspired witness of the Apostles which arose out of their relationship to the historical Jesus, and their experience of the prophetic Spirit. (Compare the witness of the Apostles in Acts 2, and the qualifications of an Apostle
The world does not experience the Paraclete, but the world experiences the witness of the Paraclete in the inspired witness of the Apostles (14:26-27) who had been with Jesus from the beginning. Thus the inspired witness is also to be understood as historical testimony, the true assessment of the history of Jesus of Nazareth, based on a personal acquaintance with Jesus, a believing relationship illuminated by the Paraclete. The Spirit did not operate where there was no acquaintance with Jesus, but brought true knowledge to those who believed in him. Thus the Apostles have a unique place in the history of salvation, and this point is made in the Gospel by the claim to believing eye-witness experience of Jesus, e.g. John 1:14.

The witness of the Paraclete which confronts the world in the Apostolic witness brings the world under judgement 16:8-11, just as Jesus did in his coming 3:19ff. etc. In 16:8ff. it is not said by what means the Spirit convicts the world. We have suggested that 15:26-27 is an indication that conviction takes place through the witness of the Apostles or the Church's witness arising out of the Apostolic testimony. But this witness may not be the only means, though it is the primary means by which the Spirit convicts the world. The eschatological life of the community manifest in brotherly love is also involved 13:35. The new commandment was realised in the disciples only after Jesus' glorification, and this seems to indicate that the Spirit is the power and norm of Christian conduct which marks them off from the world. The teaching on the new birth supports this interpretation. The new life is the new eschatological existence in the Spirit which is characterized by love. 12)

The activity of the Paraclete in the community "brings forth both the knowledge and the proclamation of the Word," and it is this that exposes the sin of the world. 13)

The proclamation, like the ministry of Jesus, provokes unbelief alongside faith, and the world in its unbelieving rejection of the proclamation is exposed, see 9:39ff.; 15:22ff. If the world is exposed in its sinfulness, Jesus is proclaimed as vindicated, and it is this vindication which is the theme of the proclamation whose cutting edge...
exposes the sin of the world. The Paraclete at work in the Church reverses the verdict of Jesus' trial, in fact the accuser becomes the accused. The trial which judged Jesus guilty is annulled, and the world is declared guilty instead. Jesus' vindication is the foundation of this reversal. In his death, because it is a vindicated death, the prince of this world is judged (12:31). In the drama of salvation the crucial event is the lifting up or glorification of Jesus through which deliverance comes to the world, because the judgement of the world is also the opportunity for the world to be saved. The vindication of Jesus is the revelation of the judgement of the world. The world is brought in touch with the theme of future judgement, for the Spirit also announces the things to come, (16:13). The evangelist's eschatology, while recognizing the present significance of what has been achieved in Jesus, remains orientated towards the future. The time is yet to come when the act of judgement which took place in Jesus will be fully realized (5:28-29). Thus the Paraclete at work in the Church exposes the sin of the world, announces the vindication of Jesus, and the certainty of judgement because the prince of this world has been judged. (14)

d. Chapters 13 and 17

There is no reference to the Paraclete (or the Spirit) in either of these chapters. In chapter 13 Jesus, through example and command, indicates the kind of life befitting a disciple. Such a life is not to be thought of as the automatic result of being a disciple of Jesus. Jesus' example and his command require that the disciple should obey, and there is no pretence that obedience will be easy, nor is it a foregone conclusion as Peter discovers (13:36ff). This remains true even after the coming of the Paraclete. But chapters 14-16 indicate that in the life and task committed to them the disciples are not left alone. The Paraclete will be with them for ever. In chapter 17 Jesus makes request to the Father on the disciples' behalf, but not for the sending of the Paraclete. The requests made by Jesus are elsewhere said to be fulfilled by the Paraclete. Further, (14:16) does not make specific the content of Jesus' request, though in response to this request the Paraclete is promised. What we suggest is that the nature of Jesus' request is indicated by chapter 17, and that the Paraclete is the
Father's answer to this prayer.

Jesus prays 'that they may know you, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom you sent.' 17:3. When Jesus was glorified and the Paraclete had come the disciples would know the unity of Father and Son 14:20. What is more this request in chapter 17 follows a request that the Father glorify him 17:1f. After the prayer for knowledge it seems to be assumed that the disciples have knowledge, and the request changes to "Holy Father, keep them in your name which you have given to me, that they may be one even as we. Because when I was with them, I kept them in your name which you gave to me, ..." 17:11-12. The name of God is another way of referring to his revealed character, 17:6,26. Through the revelation of the name of God in Jesus the disciples were separated from the world and made God's possession. But now that Jesus is departing the disciples in their experience of abandonment are in danger of falling back to become the prey of the world. Thus Jesus prays that the work of separating the disciples from the world may be continued in his absence. Jesus for his part has given the disciples God's word 17:14, and it is this that is to sanctify them 17:17. Just as Jesus consecrated himself for his mission (17:18-19; see 10:36), so the word that Jesus has given the disciples is to consecrate them for their mission. The prayer continues in verse 20 making clear what the mission is. Jesus prays for those who believe through the disciples word. This word is the proclamation of the same word through which the disciples were themselves separated from the world. The proclamation of this word is dependent on the effective separation of the disciples through the word which had been given to them by Jesus. In their effective separation the opportunity remains for the world to believe 17:21, and those who believe through the apostles' word are separated from the world, and become one with the Father and the Son in the mission to the world. In this way the revelation of the Father which took place in the Son continues in the disciples 17:22f. It is the word that separates the disciples from the world and effects their mission. But this presupposes that the word is truly received and known. Elsewhere it is said that the Paraclete brings about this sure knowledge and proclamation of the word. The Paraclete is at work in
the response to the revelation in Jesus. Without his work the revelation in Jesus would not be effective. Jesus, having already made the Father's name known (17:6) speaks of a future revelation of the name 17:26. From the standpoint of the discourses this refers to his passion, his glorification. But it probably also refers to the activity of the Paraclete (14:26) and the final revelation on the other side of death 17:24.

Thus we conclude that the revelation of Jesus with which the evangelist is concerned arises out of the eye-witness account of the words and works of Jesus, but not apart from the Paraclete for whose coming Jesus is responsible. In the witness of the apostles, and those who believe through the word of the apostles, the Paraclete bears witness to Jesus. The revelation is therefore indirect, as Bultmann indicates so strongly.

III. The giving of the Holy Spirit according to John 20:22.

Following the Farewell discourses this is the only reference to the Spirit. The fulfilment of the promise is here portrayed in terms of Genesis 2:7. The coming of the Holy Spirit gives that birth from above. His coming is also the assurance that the mission charged to them 20:21, will be effective. Just as God confronted men in Jesus, so Jesus the Son of God confronts the world in the Church's mission.

In conclusion it may be said that the teaching about the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel moves in the opposite direction to "mysticism". We note to begin with the emphasis on the fact that God is encountered in the Jesus of history, and consequently there is strong emphasis on the witness that is to be borne to him. The Spirit is not known in "mystical" experience of the direct encounter of the soul with God but through the historical testimony to Jesus. Further the presence of the Spirit is not made known in a growing awareness of the Spirit but in a growing appreciation of the significance of Jesus. The Spirit has nothing to say about himself, but draws attention to the significance of Jesus and in the inspired witness of believers bears witness to the world.
The Idea of "Knowledge" in the Fourth Gospel.

From the point of view of the revelation, the coming of the Paraclete separates the period of Jesus' ministry from the time subsequent to his glorification; see 7:39; 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7,13; and 2:22; 12:16. We may note four aspects of knowledge from this point of view. Firstly, the complete failure to know, the rejection of Jesus. Secondly, the partial knowledge possible prior to the coming of the Paraclete, but which failed to break with the limitations of Judaism, and consequently failed to really understand Jesus. Thirdly, there is the historical knowledge which contemporaries of Jesus (the Apostles) were able to experience through the recollection of faith brought about by the coming of the Paraclete. Fourthly, faith arising out of the historical testimony of the Apostles, which was inspired by the Paraclete, continued the possibility of knowing Jesus for those who were not his historical contemporaries. Though the first three points refer to the response of Jesus' contemporaries, the first two also depict the possible response which continues. The world continues to reject Jesus. There are still those whose response is only partial because of the presuppositions which prevent full faith as long as they are maintained. But full faith comes through the acceptance of the Apostolic testimony to Jesus, and in this testimony Jesus is truly known as the one in whom the Father is known. Our study of the theme of revelation leads us to expect these results in the study of the idea of knowledge.

There can be different types (or levels) of knowledge. If this is so, how are these various types of knowledge acquired? What is the content of knowledge? Can knowledge be verified in any way? Because there are different types of knowledge we must ask whether the various words of perception have more than one level of meaning, and in particular we will ask whether the functions which are described by more than one word fall into this category.

The idea of knowledge also varies in meaning according to the subject and object of knowledge. Our classification of knowledge will take into account the following categories: I. The Father's knowledge of the Son. II. The Father's knowledge of the world. III. The Son's knowledge of the
Father. IV. The Son's knowledge of men. V. Human knowledge (and failure to know) of the revelation. VI. Ordinary human knowledge. The point to which we draw attention is that the meaning of knowledge is determined by the knowing subject and the object that is known. The type of knowledge is appropriate to both the subject and the object.

I. Knowledge may be acquired through sight.

There are six different verbal forms which express the activity of seeing. Bultmann is of the opinion that these forms are used without any difference of meaning being intended. But he suggests a threefold use of the verbs of seeing. 1. Concerning the general perception of events. 2. Concerning the perception of supernatural objects by certain people. 3. Concerning the seeing of faith which has the revelation in view, and as such includes "knowledge". Thus both seeing and knowing may be used of the Son's relationship to the Father which is never described in terms of believing. Seeing used of the disciples relationship to Jesus does not refer specifically to the Apostolic eye-witness situation but the faith of the believing community which arises out of the testimony of the eye-witnesses. Thus with the categories listed from the point of view of types of object we note two types of sight. (1) Physical sight. (2) The vision of faith, which is fulfilled faith, and consequently includes knowledge.

Bultmann's answer is inadequate, though we hope to show that he is right about the use of the various verb forms being indistinguishable except from the point of view of the appropriateness of the tenses of certain forms. We will question the interpretation of the third category as the seeing of faith especially with 20:29 in view. But before looking further into this point we will examine the relationship of the various verbs of seeing to each other.

The verb forms range over the various different aspects of seeing in the Gospel.

A. Normal physical vision is spoken of using: (1) ἴδειν in 1:29,36, 42; 9:7,11,15,18,19,21,25; 11:9; 13:22; 20:1,5; 21:9,20. In 20:5 ἴδειν is used in the same sense as ἰδωρέω in 20:16; and ἴδειν in 20:18; and the fact that this sight leads on to faith may not be understood as an indication that another kind of sight is in view. Seeing which leads
on to believing may be described by θεωροῦντες 2:23 or ἔχοντας 4:45 (to "receive" Jesus is to believe in him, see 1:12) or expressed in the negative as the failure to believe as a result of seeing (ἐπισκέπτεται) 6:36. (2) Using ἰδεῖν 1:39, 46, 47, 48, 50; 4:29; 5:16; 6:22, 24; 7:52; 9:1; 11:31, 32, 33, 34; 12:9, 21; 18:26; 19:6, 26, 33; (20:8, 25, 27); 21:21. The aorist expresses sight in the narrative form normally. In 1:39 εἶδον and ὄψετε refer to the same act from a different standpoint in time. (3) Using ὃπαν 4:45; 6:36; and 8:57; and although 9:37 has theological overtones it has reference to the giving of physical sight to the man born blind. The small number of uses in this category may be accounted for by the fact that the perfect tense in which this verb is normally used is normally used in discourse material. (4) Using ὃπερβαίνει in 1:39 there may be theological overtones. The future tense does not lend itself to the narrative form but is theologically important as long as revelation remains an event of the future. (5) Using ἠμωρεῖν in 6:40 (compare in negative form 6:36 which uses ὃπαν and note 12:37 where seeing is implied). See also 9:3; 10:12; 12:19; 14:19; 16:10, 16, 17, 19; 20:16. (6) Using θεοῦσαν in 1:38; 4:35; 6:5.

B. It is said that only Jesus has seen God and the heavenly mysteries: (1) Using ὅπαν in 1:18; 5:37; 6:46; in the perfect tense which is appropriately used to deny that any one else has seen God; and in 3:11, 32; 6:46; 8:38 the perfect tense is conveniently used to make clear that Jesus' witness arose out of having seen the Father. (2) Using ἴδεῖν in 5:19 it is said that the Son does what he sees the Father doing.

C. Sight is sometimes spoken of with reference to a supernatural object. (1) Using ἰδεῖν in 1:33 of the same act spoken of in 1:32 using ἴδον. Perhaps we should include references to Jesus' resurrection appearances, but physical sight in clearly in view. Seeing "signs" is spoken of as way which may lead to faith in 4:48; 6:14; 6:26, 30; see also 2:18, 29. For the use of ὃπαν in this way see 4:45; 6:2; see also 6:36; 20:29, and ἠμωρεῖν in 2:23; 6:2; (6:40); 7:3; and θεοῦσαν in 11:45. (2) Using ὃπαν with a supernatural object in 1:34; 4:45; (6:2); see also 6:36; 20:29. (3) Using ἠμωρεῖν in 2:23; (6:2); (6:40); 7:3; 20:12, 14. (4) Using θεοῦσαν in 1:32; 11:45.
D. Sight is sometimes said to have the revelation in view.

1. Using ἴδείν in 8:56; 12:41, and possibly also 20:20, 29 which should be compared with the use of ὄραν in 20:18, 25; and ὅφεσθαι in 1:14. (2) Using ὄραν in 9:37 the man who had been blind was told that he had seen the Son of Man (see Acts 7:56). To have seen Jesus is to have seen the Father 14:7, 9; 15:24. The witness of faith based on eye-witness experience is referred to in 19:35; 20:18, 25. (3) ὅφεσθαι is used of the promise of future revelation 1:50, 51; 11:40; 16:16, 17, 19(22). See also 19:37 (see Rev. 17) Compare with 16:16, 17, 19(22) the proleptic use of ὅραν in 14:19. The resurrection appearances are described in "Parascia" terminology also in Mk.16:7; see Mk.13:26; 14:62. (4) Using ὅραν in 4:19; 6:52; compare 1:50-51; 12:45; compare 14:7, 9, 15:24.

5. Using ὅφεσθαι in 1:14. In seeing the revelation the eye-witness situation is presupposed, but it is clear that the eye-witnesses saw the revelation only in the reflection of faith.

E. Sight is used as a formalised expression:

1. Using βλέπειν in 9:39, 41 to express the possession of life. Those who think they can see, that is, think that they have life are condemned to remain blind, without life. Those who acknowledge their blindness have the possibility of sight, that is, eternal life. (2) Using ἴδείν in 3:3 "to see the Kingdom of God" is in parallelism with 3:5; "to enter the Kingdom of God". (3) Using ὅφεσθαι in 3:36 "to see life" means to have life. Compare 5:24. (4) Using ὅραν in 8:51 "to see death" means "to taste of death" 8:52, that is "to experience death". See Psalm 89:48. In 7:24 "to see" means to "share in" Jesus' glory. Thus in these formalised expressions "seeing" is "experiencing" which is an essential aspect of the Hebraic idea of knowledge. See Isaiah 47:8; 53:3. (5)

The choice of the different verbs of seeing is determined by the appropriateness of the tenses which the different forms supply. (1) The present tense in all moods is supplied by βλέπειν and ὅραν which replaced the present tense of ὄραν in common usage. (2) It may not be assumed that βλέπειν is used for a low form of physical sight only while ὅραν goes beyond this as the use of βλέπειν in 5:19; and 9:39ff. indicate. (2) The future tense is supplied by ὅφεσθαι and
is used proleptically in a future sense in 14:21. (3) ἔστήκεν supplies most of the instances where the aorist tense is used. ἐστήκεν is used five times out of six in the aorist tense, and a compound form of ἔληκεν is used three times while ἔστηκεν is used twice. (4) The imperfect tense is used only twice, once ἐλήκεν and once ἔστηκεν or ἔσταν (6:2). (5) Twenty of the twenty one uses of the perfect tense use ἔστηκεν while ἐστήκεν supplies the other. Thus it is clear that the present, future, aorist, and perfect tenses each uses a different verb form. It is tense, not type of sight which determines the verb form.

Verbs of seeing are used 115(114) times in the Fourth Gospel compared with 107 uses in Luke for instance. But the Johannine usage is more important theologically. John takes up the Transfiguration theme (Luke 9:32 etc) in John 1:14 in terms of what was seen originally and is now understood in the reflection of faith. The eschatological vision of the Son of Man (Mk.13:26; 14:62) is taken up in the Fourth Gospel 1:51-52; 6:62 and can be modified to a present vision of the Son of Man in Jn.9:37. In Mk.16:7 the future tense is used of the disciples seeing the risen Jesus, a theme which the evangelist takes up in John 14:19; 16:16,17,19 (22). It is not in the use of verbs of seeing that the special thought of the Fourth Gospel stands out most clearly, though the use of verbs of sight has been influenced by the evangelist's developments in the Gospel.

A. Jesus is spoken of as one who has sight.

a. Normal human sight of physical objects is in view in 1:30,42,47; 5:16; 6:5; 8:57; 9:1; 11:33,34; 19:26. In 1:42 ἐμβλεψάειν has no special sense. The compound form is used in the aorist participle (see 1:29,36). Jesus' knowledge of the paralytic (5:6) is not said to be a consequence of seeing him at the pool.

b. Supernatural sight is spoken of in John 1:48,50; 16:22. Jesus' knowledge of Nathaniel was based on having seen him before their meeting under conditions which are regarded to be humanly impossible, 1:48,50. Knowledge through supernatural sight, like the performance of signs, is able to produce a confession of faith 1:49. Like faith based on signs it is regarded to be inadequate 1:50-51; see 2:23-25. In the circumstances Jesus pointed the faith of Nathaniel away from a small and trivial
incident to the glorification of the Son of Man 1:50-51.

Jesus speaks of seeing the disciples again after the resurrection 16:22. The language has overtones of the parousia; note the future tense and θητεία in the promise to come again 14:3. The reference in 16:22 is to physical sight, but the subject is the risen glorified Lord. It is possible that there are also overtones of Jesus' presence through the coming of the Paraclete (14:16, 18, 21, 23), but sight does not appear to be in keeping with this relationship as it is concerning the resurrection appearances and the parousia.

c. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel claims to have experienced the vision of God. God himself is never the subject of verbs of seeing, and apart from negative statements God is the object of verbs of seeing only when Jesus is subject 1:18; (3:11); 3:32; 5:19, 37; 6:46; 8:38. These passages indicate Jesus' unique relationship with the Father of whom it is said that no man has seen him, 1:18, 5:37; 6:46. Jesus on the other hand is said to have seen God and to see him in the present. The statements in the perfect tense refer naturally to Jesus' pre-incarnate relationship with the Father (3:11); 3:32; 6:46; 8:38. Only Jesus who has come from God has seen God 6:46; see 3:13, 31-32. The claim to have seen God is at the same time the claim to have been sent by God 3:32ff. Seeing God is distinguished from hearing and learning from the Father (6:45-46) which are a possibility for men. The claim to have seen God is used as the basis for Jesus' claim to authority because Jesus' witness conforms to what he has seen from the Father 3:32; 8:38.

Jesus' relationship with the Father is also described in terms of a present and continuous vision 5:19ff. This statement is made in response to the charge that Jesus had made himself Ἰησοῦς θεοῦ θεοῦ which the Jews understood to mean "independent of God". But Jesus asserted that his authority was based on dependence, not independence. Such is his relationship to the Father that he is not able to do anything apart from what he sees the Father doing. Thus Jesus claims, not only dependence on the Father, but participation in the Father's activity. This dependence and participation is grounded in the Father's love for him in revealing all that he does to him. While it is true that the emphasis here is on
the present relationship, it is a relationship which is orientated towards the future. The fact that the Father has given judgement into the hands of the Son (5:22) is also spoken of in terms of the future when the Father would show greater things to the Son 5:20. In the relationship of seeing what the Father does Jesus is the active agent in the performance of the works. Thus it may be said without contradiction that the Father draws men 6:44; and that Jesus draws men 12:32. While it is true that we note inaugurated eschatology in 5:19ff., in that the word of Jesus rings out for men to believe, the future resurrection from the tombs and final judgement constitute the greater works of 5:20ff.

The possibility that men may hear from God, but not see him (6:45-46) draws attention to the difference of relationship between Jesus and his Father and the Jews and their father, the devil 8:38. Jesus said,

δε ένις εεορεικα καρη το ιαπε λαλει και ουτας κε ηκοβετε καρη τα του καπες ξοείτε. There are many textual problems involved here but the variants are explicable as the tendency to make the parallelism between the two halves of the verse more complete. Thus some texts read "have seen", and "do" in both statements. More than likely "speak" and "do" are correct because Jesus' words and the activity of the Jews in seeking to kill Jesus are in view. Further, it would be in keeping with the Gospel to indicate the directness of Jesus' relationship with his Father in contrast to the indirect relationship of the Jews to their Father the devil which is expressed in terms of hearing rather than seeing. Further it is more likely that the evangelist would use the aorist ηκοβετε than the perfect εεοειτε which could imply the pre-existence of the Jews in this context. (7)

The interpretation of 3:11 is complicated by the use of verbs in the plural "we". Had this verse been expressed in the singular it would have fitted well with the sense of 3:32. This line of interpretation seems to be suggested by the solemn introduction "Truly truly..." which seems to be reserved as an introduction to the sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. There is no obvious break in the discourse to Nicodemus, and it would seem best to understand this saying with reference to Jesus, but also in the light of the post resurrection experience of the disciples with whom Jesus is associated in this saying. What the
disciples have seen and known is to be understood in terms of the activity of the Spirit in the reflection of faith which has the Jesus of history in view. They, with Jesus, have borne witness to the possibility of the new birth, but the Jews rejected their witness as they had rejected Jesus' witness.

The relationship of Jesus to the Father spoken of in terms of his pre-incarnate vision and his continuing vision throughout his incarnate life indicates both the authority and dependence of Jesus. We note the following points in 3:32ff and 5:19ff. (1) In 3:32 reference is made to the Son's pre-incarnate vision of the heavenly things and in 5:19 it is said that the Son sees what the Father is doing. (2) In 3:32 it is said that the Son witnesses to what he has seen and heard (see 8:38); and in 5:19 it is said that he does what he sees the Father doing. (3) In 3:35 it is said that the Father loves (ἀγάπη) the Son and has given all things into his hand; and in 5:20 it said that the Father loves (φιλέω) the Son and shows him all that he does. (4) In both contexts the showing and giving by the Father involve the giving of life and the execution of judgement 3:36; 5:21ff. The authority given to Jesus, far from indicating independence, can only be understood in terms of dependence on the Father and the participation in his works. Thus the words and actions of Jesus are veritable words and actions of the Father.

B. Seeing as a way to faith.

1. Not all sight has reference to faith. The following references are to physical sight of material objects 1:39, 46; 4:35; 6:22, 24; 7:52; 9:7, 8, 11, 15, 18, 19, 21, 25; 10:12; 11:9, 31; 12:9, 19; 13:22; 15:26; 20:1, 5, 6; 21:9, 20, 21. Not all sight which has Jesus as its object has faith in view. The chief priests and officers saw Jesus and demanded his crucifixion 19:6. The soldiers saw that Jesus was already dead 19:33; and in 19:37 (see Zechariah 12:10; and Rev. 1:7) the evangelist applied the prophecy, presumably, to the unbelieving Jews and soldiers. In 4:29 the Samaritans were asked to come and see Jesus, and the "Greeks" asked to see Jesus 12:21. Seeing Jesus depended on his physical presence which was withdrawn through his death 14:19; 16:10, 16, 17, 19. This withdrawal was an act of judgement on the world.

In 14:17 it is said that the world is not able to receive the Spirit
of Truth because it does not see or know him. The meaning of this verse is not clear because: (1) It is not said that the disciples see the Spirit, though it is said that they know him. (2) In John 3:8ff, it is said that the Spirit cannot be regarded as a visible phenomenon. Thus it would seem that the world demanded visible evidence of the presence of the Spirit just as it demanded tangible evidence from Jesus concerning his authority 6:30. The disciples did not require such evidence, but knew the abiding presence of the Spirit whose activity was manifest in their life and witness. In other words, the Spirit cannot be seen, but those born of the Spirit may be 3:8ff. But the world demands to see the Spirit if it is to receive him, and this condition cannot be fulfilled.

2. Seeing "Signs" as a way to faith.

i. Not all who were contemporaries of Jesus saw the "signs" which he performed. In 6:26 we read of those who sought Jesus (ἵνα ἰδοὺ τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἤπειρον) because they ate the loaves, not because they saw the "signs". This "seeking" is not the "seeking" of faith as is shown by the refusal to see the "signs" which Jesus had done, and in the request for Jesus to perform a further "sign" for them to see that they may believe him 6:29ff. The request for a "sign" in the context of the feeding miracle seems strange, but the way for this request has been prepared by 6:26 which indicates that the people had not seen the "signs". The evangelist may be dependent on the Synoptic tradition at this point (see Mark 8:11ff and parallels) where we note that the feeding of the four thousand (which is not referred to as a sign) is followed by the demand for a sign from heaven. The feeding did not constitute "a sign from heaven" as conceived by the Jews. It is interesting that although in John the Jews did not ask for "a sign from heaven", the subject of "bread from heaven" is raised in relation to the request for a "sign". The demand for a "sign" from Jesus to authenticate his authority occurs early in John after the cleansing of the temple 2:18; and here John appears to be acquainted with the tradition recorded in Matt.16:1ff. (which follows the feeding of the four thousand) where Jesus refused to give any sign but the "sign" of Jonah which had already been interpreted in terms of a prediction of Jesus' resurrection on the third day, which is the "sign" given by Jesus, in different terms, in John 2:19. In John, as much as in the Synoptic
Gospels, Jesus refused to give "signs" simply to display his power and authority. His "signs" were misconstrued (6:14), for the real point of them was to lead men to the one who could give them eternal life, 6:69f; 20:31.

The theme of "the Messianic secret" which has been recognized in the Synoptic Gospels is to be found also in the Fourth Gospel. The suggestion that Jesus should show himself to the world "that they may see your works" 7:3-4, made by Jesus' unbelieving brothers indicates that Jesus did not perform his "signs" openly, and that those who did not believe did not see them as "signs". The fact that Jesus' notable works were not done theatrically for all to see was taken to mean by those who did not believe that they were not authentic "signs" (see 9:18). Works such as were asked for were taken to indicate a worldly authority (see 6:14f.) whereas the authority of Jesus was not of this world 18:36. The suggestion of 7:3-4 was contrary to the aims of Jesus' ministry. Jesus' "signs" were performed in response to human need, and the evangelist was more selective in recording miracles than the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, because his purpose in recording them was to reveal Jesus as the one who gives eternal life to men, 20:30-31.

The fact that Jesus' works were not seen as "signs" prevented faith. But what was it that prevented those who saw Jesus' works from seeing them as "signs", and believing as a consequence? The evangelist's answer is given in 12:37ff. where the evangelist appealed to Isaiah 6:10 (see Mk.4:12). The evangelist did not quote the Hebrew or the LXX, though he is closer to the Hebrew than the LXX. John 12:40 "adopts the Old Testament view that the activity of υολείν takes place in the heart... Knowledge has religious and moral significance as a function of the central organ of the life of the human spirit... Schl.J., ad loc. rightly concludes from the combination of υολείν and καπσία that there can have been no Greek influence on the choice of the verb". (8)

The result of the changed text which appears in John 12:40 is that the agent of blinding and hardening is spoken of in the third person singular while the one who would heal the Jews is spoken of in the first person singular. The one who has hardened and blinded the Jews cannot be the one who would heal them. In the Hebrew the prophet and his word
are the instrument of blinding and hardening as is indicated by the use of the imperatives, and the healing is spoken of in the passive voice "and be healed". In the LXX hardening is spoken of in the passive voice whereas in Hebrew it is spoken of in the imperative active. Further in the LXX and John the verb used of healing is first person singular future active whereas it is passive in Hebrew. But in John the subject of blinding and hardening is spoken of in the third person singular.

As John is quoting what Isaiah said (12:39) the third person singular cannot refer to him. The first person singular may not be taken as referring to the prophet either because the prophet's failure to heal the people would not explain the Jews' failure to see Jesus' "signs".

The alternative interpretations may be set out as follows (1) God has hardened and blinded the Jews so that Jesus may not heal them. (2) God has hardened and blinded the Jews so that the evangelist through his Gospel may not heal them. (3) The signs have blinded the Jews so that God, or Jesus, may not heal them. (The "arm of the Lord" 12:38, may suggest that the "signs" were performed by the arm of the Lord). (4) The prince of this world has blinded the Jews so that God, or Jesus, may not heal them.

Of these alternatives the first two do not seem possible. (1) The evangelist would not have thought of the Father as acting in opposition to the Son; (2) Nor does it seem likely that the evangelist would have introduced his own situation so completely into the Gospel context, and if this had been the point it would not have offered any explanation for the rejection of Jesus by the Jews. (3) The third suggestion has some points in its favour. In 6:26 ff. the Jews failed to see Jesus' "signs" and consequently sought further "signs" as a basis for their faith. They sought the wrong kind of "sign"; and consequently missed the true "signs". The ministry of the prophet envisaged in Isaiah 6:9ff. is described in terms of judgement as are the parables of Jesus' ministry according to Mark 4:12. It would not be surprising if the evangelist indicated that Jesus' "signs" had the same blinding and hardening effect. But against this is the fact that in John the problem of the failure to believe is said to lie in the failure to see the "signs". Seeing the "signs" leads to believing in Jesus. The
question concerning the blindness of the Jews goes beyond the signs. We are left with the fourth suggestion. The agent of blinding and hardening is the prince of this world, last mentioned in 12:31, who prevents the Jews from turning to Jesus that he may heal them. This interpretation has a remarkable parallel in 2 Cor. 4:4 "...the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them". Here Paul is dealing with the question of the failure to believe, and the problem is said to lie with neither the gospel, nor the preaching of it, but with Satan who had successfully blinded those who do not believe. They do not believe because Satan has blinded them.

In 1 John 2:11 the darkness is said to have blinded the eyes of those who walk in darkness. Thus in John 12:40; 2 Cor. 4:4; and 1 John 2:11 (the only three occurrences of ἀνοίγων in the New Testament) God is not said to be the agent of blinding and in 2 Cor. 4:4 and 1 John 2:11 it is clear that he is not. Note also Eph. 6:12; Col. 1:13; 1 John 5:19; Luke 8:12; and in the Qumran Texts 1 QM XIII-XIV:9; and 1 QS III:13-26 especially 1 QS III:20-24. In John the god of this world is the power of darkness, the prince of this world, 12:31; 14:30; 16:11. Having mentioned the prince of this world in 12:31, attention is drawn to the blinding effect of walking in the darkness, 12:35ff.; see 1 John 2:11. Jesus announced that the light (he himself; see 8:12 etc.) was to be present for but a short time, and exhorted his hearers to walk in the light while it was with them so that the darkness should not overtake them (καταλάβη). Those who refuse to believe in the light do so because the darkness has overcome them. Jesus was not overcome by the darkness 1:5 (οὐ κατέλαβεν) but himself overcame the world 16:33. The only way for the Jews to overcome the darkness was to believe in Jesus (the light) that they may become the sons of light. But the power of darkness had its sway and they could not believe.

This interpretation of John 12:40 has the support of Origen and Clement of Alexandria, but since the time of Augustine, who emphasized the sovereign activity of God in interpreting this verse, this possibility has been overlooked. (9) That John has "the power of darkness"
In mind is suggested also by the relationship of John 12 to the Gethsemane account in Luke. Jesus is recorded as having said: "but this is your hour, and the power of darkness" Lk. 22:53. Although in John the arrest narrative does not come until Chapter 18; John 12:27 is related to the prayer in Gethsemane recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, and in what follows Jesus' conflict with the prince of this world, and the conflict of the light with the darkness are mentioned 12:31-36. (10) The evangelist, in common with Paul and the sectarian writings of Qumran, recognized that, although God is in control of the whole of creation, the power of darkness and falsehood cannot be overlooked.

The judgement of the world through Jesus involved the casting out of the prince of this world, and effected the possibility of believing in Jesus. But the power of darkness has its sway over those who do not believe 8:12, 37f.; 12:46; etc., who having made their choice are condemned irrevocably to the darkness 3:19-21; 9:39ff.; 12:31ff. But 12:42 indicates that the power of the prince of this world had been broken in that "even of the rulers many believed" in Jesus. But this faith leaves much to be desired, 12:42-43. Those who did not believe failed to see, in spite of the fact that Jesus had done many "signs" before them 12:37. They failed to see in the works which Jesus performed "signs" which drew attention to him as the giver of eternal life.

11. Seeing "signs" as a way to faith. The nature of the "signs" performed by Jesus was such that those who saw them should have been led in the direction of recognizing Jesus in his true significance. Consequently faith is often spoken of as a consequence of having seen Jesus' "signs" 2:23; 4:45; 6:2; 6:14; 7:31; 9:16; 11:45, 47f.; 12:37-43. But although the faith resulting from seeing "signs" should be recognized, it is to be regarded as inadequate, and only a beginning which may become fully authentic faith. The inadequacy of this faith is indicated by Jesus' refusal to trust those who believed as a consequence of having seen "signs" 2:24f.; and the reception given to Jesus (4:45) is brought into question 4:48. Those who make "signs" a condition of belief distort the meaning of the "signs". ἡμεῖς καί
TCPi is used only in 4:48 in the Gospel, and emphasizes the miraculous nature of the events rather than the meaning of the "signs". (11)

There is a problem concerning 4:48. No "sign" was asked for as a condition of belief, and it may be said that the coming of the nobleman to Jesus implies faith. But it is faith in Jesus as one who solves problems. This faith progresses 4:50,53 (see Acts 18:9). Jesus' challenge in 4:48 forced the nobleman to look beyond the miraculous event to the significance of Jesus. The faith mentioned in 6:2 also proves faulty 6:14f. "The prophet" probably refers to the hoped for figure of Deut.18:15,18, the second Moses. Recognizing Jesus as "the prophet" led to the attempt to make him king 6:15. Jesus' withdrawal indicates the misleading nature of this recognition. It is not denied that Jesus is "the prophet", and in the words, "who is coming into the world", the evangelist caused the men to utter a truth more profound than they knew, about the origin of Jesus. The recognition was not mistaken, the mistake was to think that Jesus was an earthly king (see 18:33-37). Some of those with superficial faith were scandalized by Jesus' challenge to authentic faith (6:60-66) and others were led on to authentic faith 6:68f.

In 7:31f. those who believed in Jesus did so on the basis of "signs". The reference to the murmurings (γογγὺς) of the crowd indicates the vacillation which may turn to real faith or utter rejection of Jesus, (See also 9:16). The chief priests and Pharisees were unwilling to wait and risk the outcome of the crowd's indecision. They ordered Jesus' arrest.

In 11:45,47f. those who saw Jesus' "signs" and believed in him, are said, with Jesus, to constitute a threat in the eyes of the Romans. In this way it is indicated that the recognition of Jesus by those who believed was partial, and was a misunderstanding of his true significance. He was making no political claim for himself, see 6:14f.; 18:36ff. The unsatisfactory nature of the faith of the rulers who believed in Jesus (12:42), evidently on the basis of the "signs" mentioned in 12:37, is shown by their refusal to confess faith in Jesus openly 12:42-43. The consequence of Jesus' "signs" may be
described at two levels at this stage. There were those who failed to see in Jesus' "works" anything of the nature of "signs", that is, they failed to see the "works" as indications of Jesus' true significance. Secondly, there were those who, however inadequately, saw Jesus' works as indications of his significance. Consequently this seeing leads to faith, but this faith is again and again said to be inadequate. The reason for this is that Jesus true significance was not revealed until his glorification and the coming of the Paraclete.

Following the glorification of Jesus and the coming of the Paraclete Jesus' "signs" take on a new significance. They cannot be seen any longer, but the "signs" may be spoken of and recorded in writing. This witness of "signs", while maintaining a historical perspective which involved rejection and a failure to fully understand the "signs", was written from the perspective of Jesus' glorification and the presence of the Paraclete in the reflection of faith 20:30-31. Thus while the "signs" during Jesus' ministry led to rejection, misunderstanding, and at best partial understanding, the witness of the "signs" may now lead men to authentic faith. The Apostles who originally saw the "signs" were led to believe in Jesus 2:11. Here it is said that Jesus manifested his glory, and in 1:14 the Apostles affirm "we beheld his glory". The question must be raised concerning the historical correctness of 1:14 and 2:11. At what stage did the Apostles see Jesus' glory, and when did they truly believe. Their commitment was greater than the faith of the crowds, but they did not yet have authentic faith 16:31ff. Looking back on the events with the reflection of faith they were aware of the glory that had been revealed. The events had been seen with their eyes, but the glory was only recognized in authentic faith. Thus the "signs" were selected to lead men to faith in Jesus. It is not said that through hearing of the "signs" men may see Jesus' glory. Such seeing was possible only for the original eyewitnesses, and not for all of them, but only those who came to authentic faith. Through the testimony of these eyewitnesses eternal life through faith in Jesus is held out to the world.

iii. Seeing Jesus as a way to faith. Not all who saw Jesus came to believe in him as we have noted, and in particular attention is drawn
to 6:36; and 15:24. (12) Jesus could be seen by the physical eye without evoking faith. Having seen Jesus, the crowd should have believed, the failure to believe is reprehensible.

In John 4:19 "seeing" is used metaphorically to denote perception which in fact came about through hearing rather than sight. This perception was an important step on the way to faith. Seeing Jesus opened up an opportunity for believing in him 6:40. But it is not suggested that only those who saw Jesus could believe in him, and the possibility of faith for those who have not seen Jesus is emphasized in 20:29.

When the man who had been blind was asked if he believed in the Son of Man, Jesus identified himself with the Son of Man by telling the man whom he had healed that he had seen and was talking to the Son of Man. Seeing in this case was a means of identifying Jesus for the purpose of believing in him. Thus the appeal to having seen, rather than that act of seeing in itself, led to faith.

Belief in Jesus in the full sense involved belief in his resurrection and this is indicated in 20:8 where the beloved disciple, having seen the empty tomb is said to have believed. 20:9 implies that he believed that Jesus had risen from the dead. In 20:29 the faith of Thomas is said to have been a consequence of having seen the risen Lord. Jesus' physical presence was the object of Thomas' sight. In 20:8 and 20:29 we are meant to understand full Christian faith, and consequently faith is given no object.

No one except Jesus has seen the Father 1:18; 5:37; 6:46. Jesus' relationship with the Father is the basis of his unique activity of revealing the Father to men. Thus to have seen him is to have seen the Father 12:45; 14:7,9. Seeing Jesus is spoken of in a straightforward historical sense, but the awareness that in seeing Jesus the Father was to be seen involved the recognition of faith. Thus in 15:24 there are not two acts of sight and hatred, but one in which the revelation of the Father in Jesus was seen, but not recognized, and rejected. The Jews' refusal to hear God's voice and to see his form is demonstrated in their refusal to hear and see God in Jesus, that is their refusal to
believe in him 5:37-38. But of course this possibility of seeing the Father in Jesus was open only to those who saw Jesus in his earthly life.

Faith in Jesus remains possible for those who, unlike Thomas, are not eyewitnesses of the resurrection 20:29ff. Though not having seen, their faith rests on the witness of those who have seen 17:20, and thus those who have seen have a unique and unrepeatable role in the foundation of the Church, 15:27. See also 4:39ff. in which this same point may be made by reflecting the post-resurrection situation into the ministry of Jesus so show how faith based on witness is really faith in Jesus.

iv. Faith which leads to sight. Nathaniel’s confession of faith in Jesus is shown to be inadequate by the prediction of 1:50-51. Nathaniel’s faith will be based on his vision of the glorification of the Son of Man, his enthronement by way of the cross. The crucifixion was an event to be seen by the physical eye, but only faith could see this event as the glorification of the Son of Man. The prediction is an indication that although Nathaniel’s was not yet full faith, it had within it the certainty of becoming full faith. This certainty stands in contrast to the hypothetical question of 6:62. The would be disciples who were scandalized by Jesus’ words were asked how they would react if they saw the event about which Jesus spoke, the ascent of the Son of Man by way of the cross.

John 11:40 reverses the order of 2:11, where the glory revealed in a miracle led the disciples to believe. In 11:40 the miracle is performed in response to faith, a theme common in the Synoptic Gospels; see Mk. 1:40; 2:5; 5:23,28,34,36; 9:23ff.; 10:52. But there is more in the Johannine use here than this straightforward meaning, and the depth of meaning arises from the use of ἁμαρτία. In the resurrection of Lazarus the glory of God is revealed in terms of his grace and truth, his faithfulness and love, see 1:14. But the glory in this sense was only to be seen by those who in the reflection of faith recalled what they had seen with their eyes. For others who saw this event as a miracle the glory was to lead them to believe, 11:45; see 2:11.

Jesus’ resurrection appearances were restricted to believers 14:19; 16:16,17,19, who, although prior to the resurrection they did
not have full authentic faith in Jesus (see 20:9; 16:31ff.; 2:22) in contrast to the world they were the believers. The reference to seeing Jesus again after his death does not refer to the coming of the Paraclete (14:17) as is clear from the fact that the disciples are nowhere said to be able to see him. It is probable that the prediction that the disciples would see Jesus in the future has overtones of the Parousia as in the Synoptic Gospels, see Mark 13:26; 14:62.

Jesus' prayer that his disciples may see the glory which he had with the Father (17:24), is qualified by the request that they may be with him, see also 14:3. To "see" is to be taken literally, but not in the sense of bystanders. To see here means to share in this glory. Participation in eternal life is not exhausted by historical existence. Beyond death believers will be with Jesus, see 1 John 3:2.

v. The eyewitness reflection and confession of faith. In John 1:14 the whole of the post-resurrection understanding of Jesus is spoken of in terms of the historical Jesus. The aorist tense ἔδειξαν μετ' αὐτοῦ indicates the historical nature of the eyewitness. This glory had not forced itself on the awareness of those who had seen Jesus, in fact before the resurrection no one was truly aware of this glory. What appeared to be a terrible disaster before the resurrection, was in fact the revelation of Jesus' glory. In the reflection of authentic faith the disciples looked back at events which they had seen with their own eyes and discerned the true significance of them.

In 1:29,36 the Baptist saw Jesus coming and bore witness to him. But although the Baptist was aware of Jesus' presence through seeing him, the understanding reflected in his confession was the result of having seen the sign which had marked Jesus out as the one who would baptize with the Holy Spirit. It seems likely that the form of the Baptist's confession has also been moulded by the post-resurrection understanding of Jesus. The witness of the Baptist is to be understood along with the witness of the Old Testament, see 8:36; 12:41. Abraham in prophetic foresight took hold of the promises fulfilled in Jesus, thus he foresaw the day of Christ. The glory seen by Isaiah was that of the eternal Word, see 17:5. It was the eternal Word who was revealed to Moses and the prophets, and they bore witness to him, see 5:39ff.
The historical nature of the witness is emphasized in 19:35. This attestation refers to the crucifixion and was intended to show beyond any doubt that Jesus had really died. Having attested the death of Jesus it was asserted that he was alive again 20:18, 20, 25. The testimony "We have seen the Lord" is a full confession of faith in Jesus as the one who comes from God and gives eternal life. The Apostles as eyewitnesses of the resurrection, as well as Jesus' ministry (see 15:27) are those whose witness is the foundation of the Church. (13)

II. Knowledge may be acquired through hearing.

1. God is the subject of verbs of "hearing" in 9:31, 11:41, 42. In general it is said that he hears the godly but not sinners, and in particular it is said that he hears Jesus, thus indirectly making an assertion about the nature of Christ. "Hearing" in these texts means more than being aware of certain sounds. In this sense God hears all. It involves heeding and granting the request that has been made. Which righteous man could be certain that God always hears him in this sense? 11:42. This claim is an indication of the intimate relationship which exists between the Father and the Son.

ii. The Spirit of Truth is promised to the disciples to lead them into the truth. But the truth does not concern the Spirit, for he does not speak of himself or from himself, but he speaks what he hears 16:13. The threefold use of ἀκούειν in 16:13-15 emphasizes the role of the Spirit in the work of revelation. He glorifies Jesus by revealing him to the disciples. "The things to come" from the standpoint of the discourse concern Jesus' passion, but also should be understood in terms of the Parousia and eschatological judgment. Whether ἀκούειν in 16:13 is present or future indicative, or aorist subjunctive makes little difference. The present tense would describe the eternal relationship of divine persons, but if the future tense is to be understood our attention is drawn to the fact that the activity of the Spirit is regarded as future from the standpoint of Jesus' ministry, 7:39; 14:16, 26. By emphasizing that the Spirit speaks what he hears, as Jesus does 8:26, the origin of the revelation in the Father is emphasized.

iii. Jesus is the subject of "hearing" in 9:35; 11:45, 6 where the meaning is simply that he heard in an intelligent way information
passed on in the normal manner. There are five references which are theologically important, 3:32; 5:30; 8:26; 8:40; 15:15. Jesus bears witness, speaks and acts in accordance with what he has heard from the Father. His appeal to having heard is at once an indication of his dependence and his authority. His authority arises out of the fact that he hears and obeys the Father's will. Consequently his works are God's works and his words God's words. This relationship characterised by hearing is the basis of Jesus' activity of revelation. He has made known to the disciples all that he has heard from the Father 15:15. There is only one source of revelation. In these references ἀκούω bears the meaning of ὄνειρος in the Old Testament which involves "keeping" or "obeying", see Deut.6:4; 18:15-19; Jer.25:7-8 in LXX, and Luke 6:47-49; Matt.7:24-27.

iv. Hearing as a way to faith. Not all references to hearing have a bearing on the development of faith. Ordinary physical hearing is in view in 4:1; 7:32; (8:9); 9:32,40; 11:20,29; 12:12,29; 18:21; 19:8,13; 21:7. There are also some metaphorical uses of "hearing". In 3:8 ἀκούω is used in a symbolical context governing the accusative case to mean "to perceive by hearing". The Baptist likened his relationship to Jesus to friend who hears the bridegrooms voice, and rejoices 3:29. In 7:51 it is said that the Law hears before judging, meaning that a man's case is to be heard before he is judged, and in 12:34 the appeal is made "we have heard from the Law...", which indicates the hearing of the Law in public reading. These references do not have a direct bearing on hearing as a way to faith.

The Jews who rejected Jesus are said to have done so because they listened to their father the devil 8:38,44. They had not heard from God nor seen his form (5:37-38) as their rejection of Jesus indicated. Jesus' relationship to the Father is described in terms of hearing and the "would be disciples" relationship to the devil is also described in terms of hearing. Thus their standard of reference was opposed to the truth 8:44. Jesus spoke the truth to them but because their standard was falsehood they could not understand the truth and were unable to "hear", that is receive and obey, Jesus' word 8:43. Their rejection of his word indicated that they did not hear God, they were not of
God 8:47. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the devil is regarded to be the cause of the failure to hear Jesus' word, just as we noted that he prevented those who rejected Jesus from seeing his signs. (14)

The nobleman "heard" that Jesus had come into Galilee and came to see him 4:47. The nobleman must already have believed in some sense as his coming to Jesus indicates. But the consequence of his coming is the development of faith 4:48, 50, 53. The action of the crowd in 12:18, going out to meet Jesus as a consequence of hearing of the "sign" Jesus had performed (the raising of Lazarus), is more important. This is the only mention of hearing about a sign in the Gospel, but see 20:30-31. The crowd that had witnessed the "sign" bore witness to it (12:17), and the consequence was an apparent mass conversion 12:19. No doubt the evangelist has in mind to demonstrate the church's witness to Jesus and its effectiveness.

In 5:24 hearing and believing are made the condition of having eternal life, but it is not to be understood as a double condition of hearing and believing. By believing alone one may have eternal life 3:15, 16, 36 etc. Hearing Jesus' words was one way to come to faith in him 7:40. Hearing Jesus' words apart from "believing" or "keeping" was of no consequence. The eschatological significance of the hearing of faith is brought out by indicating the believers' deliverance from judgement and death 5:24-25. The dead of 5:25 who "now" hear the voice of the Son of God and as a consequence believe are those who have to this point been dead in the sense of not having eternal life. Through the hearing of faith they have eternal life. But in 5:28 we note the omission of ΚΑΙ ΒΟΞ ΕΤΙΤΙΟ, and also the mention of "the tombs" and the fact that "all in the tombs" hear his voice. Those who did not keep his words are judged by those words at the last day 12:48. Although in chapter 11 we have a demonstration of Jesus' authority to call men from the tombs in the raising of Lazarus, the general resurrection of good and evil awaits in the future for the coming of the last day 5:28; 11:24-26; 12:48; 6:39-40, 44, 54. In the time of Jesus' ministry "to hear the voice of the Son of God" involved recognition and belief, but at the last day all will hear his voice.
giving life or condemnation because the Father had given this task of judgement to the Son.

The problem is raised again concerning those who hear and those who refuse to hear Jesus' word, 10:3,4,8,16,27. The hearing in question is the obedience of faith. Jesus' sheep did not respond to others who called for their allegiance. Those who were not Jesus' sheep did not respond to him. At this point there appears to be a dualism concerning the nature of men, those who are Jesus sheep and those who are not. The response given apparently arises from the nature of being 10:26. But the whole movement of the Gospel is in the direction of the universal offer of salvation (3:16), and in 10:16 we have what is a probable reference to the gentile mission "other sheep I have". They are viewed as already being Jesus' sheep, but this is a proleptic way of stating the case. The answer to this problem would seem to be that those who believe in Jesus become his sheep and consequently "hear", that is obey his voice. But Jesus told the Jews "You are not able to believe because you are not my sheep" 10:26. The fact that they were not Jesus' sheep was demonstrated by their unbelief, but further they did not believe because they had been blinded by the devil 12:40; to whom they had given heed 8:38ff., and consequently they were determined by falsehood and not the truth 8:44. Had they been of the truth they would have given heed to Jesus 18:37. But even though the past has been determined by falsehood and darkness the possibility of becoming sons of light through faith is offered 12:36. The rejection of this offer arises out of the fact that they are not his sheep, they belong to the devil. They are unable to understand Jesus claims because they could not hear (in faith) Jesus' words 8:43.

In 10:20ff the Jews were divided through the words Jesus spoke to them. Many claimed that he was demon possessed and asked, as they were about to leave, "why do you hear him?" The meaning is probably "why do you continue to listen to him?" The response indicates that this group refused to accept the statement that Jesus was demon possessed. But those who rejected Jesus did so on the grounds that he was demon possessed. Their values were so distorted that they could not believe. Their whole standard of reference had been turned upside down. Thus
falsehood is called truth and the devil is their God, and the one whom God sent is called demon possessed. The statements that those who have heard from God and learned come to Jesus (6:45) and that those who are of God hear God's word (8:47), make faith in Jesus the test of all claims to know God. The test is similar to that of 1 John 4:6 but it has been expressed in terms appropriate to the Gospel framework.

Hearing as a way to faith does not always have Jesus' words directly in view. The witness of those who already believe in Jesus is the means by which those who hear may themselves come to believe 1:7, 37, 40; 4:39, 42; see also 10:41-42. In 9:27 the man who had been blind ironically suggested that the request to hear his story again could be motivated by the desire to become Jesus' disciples, and in 12:17-18 we note the faith of the crowd which heard of the resurrection of Lazarus. Apparently the word of the witnessing Church is to fare exactly as Jesus' own word because it is fundamentally the same, 15:20. 17:20 draws attention to those who believe through the Apostolic testimony. Jesus' prayer for them that they may be one, united in their obedience to the word that Jesus had given. In the witness the possibility of faith continues for the world, and in this faith there is no graded scale of believers who have seen Jesus at one level and those who have not at another. All are united through faith which was possible for Jesus' contemporaries and remains a possibility for succeeding generations. If the balance still seems to swing in favour of the eyewitness believers 20:29 adds a corrective. It seems to be suggested that Thomas should have believed those who bore witness 20:25. The blessing which rests on those who believe without having seen Jesus removes any sense of their inferiority 20:29. But the purpose of these words was not to assert the superiority of those who had not seen Jesus. It was to counter the claim that those who had seen Jesus were superior to those who had believed on the basis of the witness of those who had seen him.

"Hearing" in the Gospel may mean no more than the physical act without reference to understanding (12:47), but the hearing of discipleship involves "keeping", that is the obedience of faith.

III. Knowledge and abiding. Jesus drew attention to the fact that it
was possible to hear his word and to fail to keep it 12:47 (See Lk. 6: 47-49; Matt. 7:24-27). This keeping (φυλάσσει) is the obedience of faith. Hearing in the physical sense did not necessarily lead to faith. Further, the Jews who had come to believe in Jesus (in a preliminary way) through hearing Jesus' words were told that if they would abide (μιμήσετε) in Jesus' words they would truly be his disciples 8:30ff. Thus even when hearing has progressed in the preliminary stage of faith the challenge is given to abide in Jesus' words, to continue to obey them. The point of this challenge can be seen in 6:56, 60. Jesus scandalized the would be disciples by declaring their complete dependence on him for eternal life. In 8:30ff the challenge to be heard consists in the understanding of the slavery of sin and the need to be freed from sin by Jesus 8:32-36. Only by accepting this word could they be freed. The same point is made in 8:51 where Jesus indicated that any one who keeps (τηρήσῃ) his word shall never see death. This keeping is genuine faith. Abiding in Jesus' word(s) or commandment(s) 8:31, is the same as keeping his word(s) or commandment(s), 14:15, 21, 23, 24, and is to be understood in terms of obedience. Jesus' words are also to abide in his disciples, 5:38; 15:17. His words are to continue to determine their lives. The word or command which Jesus gave to his disciples concerns their "abiding" in his love even as Jesus abides in the Father's love 15:10. This abiding is manifest in obedience, which for Jesus involved the laying down of his life and taking it again 15:18, and for the disciples it means to believe in Jesus, and to love one another, 13:34; 14:1. (see 1 John 3:23) "Abiding in love" is another way of saying this. It means to continue both in the awareness of being loved, and also in loving action 15:10; 17:26.

There are references to persons abiding, or being in others; the mutual abiding of the Father and the Son (10:38; 14:10, 11, 20; 17:21, 23), and of the Son and his disciples (6:56; 15:4, 5, 6, 7; 14:20; 17:21, 23, 26). It is also said that the disciples are in the Father and the Son 17:21, and that the Father and Son will make their dwelling place with those who love Jesus and keep his word 14:23. It is also said (from the stand-point of Jesus' exaltation) that the Spirit of Truth abides with
and is in the disciples 14:17. The nearest the Gospel comes to saying that the disciples will be in the Spirit occurs in 4:23 where it is stated that the true worshippers will worship God in Spirit and Truth. The references; "being in" (see 14:10; 17:21,23,26), or those where "being" is implicit, are not essentially different in meaning from the references to "abiding in", but the stress is different.

1. Jesus' unity with the Father. Jesus' relationship with the Father is described in terms of unity, 10:30; 17:21f. In 17:21 Jesus' unity with the Father is described in terms of mutual indwelling as the use or indicates. The same terminology is used in 10:38; 14:10,11,20; 17:21,23. "Unity" and "mutual indwelling" explain each other.  

Jesus and the Father are not said to abide in each other. They are said to be in each other. "Abide" is only used of those situations where the permanent nature of the relationship is being emphasized. "Abide" is used in 15:10 where Jesus indicates that he has kept (κοινωνεί) his Father's commandments and "abides" in his love. This passage occurs in the context of Jesus' discourse on abiding in the vine which contains all but one of the references using μένειν to describe mutual abiding (see also 6:56). The allegory of the vine suggests the need to abide and provides the right context for Jesus' exhortation to his disciples. 6:56 with its clear reference to the Lord's Supper makes two points. Firstly it indicates that genuine faith must be faith in the glorified Son of Man, that is faith which arises out of the crucifixion and resurrection. Thus the stress on eating his flesh and drinking his blood, which as we have seen, means to come to him and believe in him, 6:35; but in the post-Easter sense. Secondly, the 'sacramental' aspect probably is meant to indicate that such faith is only possible within the Christian community where the Lord's Supper is shared by believers.

In John 8:55 Jesus says that he knows God (the Father) and keeps his words. Keeping God's word is the same as abiding in it as we see from Jesus' exhortation to abide in his word, 8:31; and to keep his word 8:51f. Jesus abides in the Father's word and the Father's love. But these two things are not exactly the same as we have seen in 15:10 where
keeping the commandments is the means of abiding in love. Obedience is necessary, from this point of view, for an effective relationship of love. Thus Jesus' abiding or being in the Father refers to his obedience through which the Father is in him so that it is not he himself but the Father who is to be seen and who does the works, 14:10. It is through this relationship of mutual abiding that Jesus is able to reveal the Father. Because his life comes from the Father and is lived in dependence on him, 6:57, the Father is the directing agent in what he says and does. Jesus comes from the Father, but is one with him in that the Father has given him his word, and has shown him all things, and has committed all judgement to his hand because he loves the Son, 6:57; 3:32,35,36; 5:19-23. The relationship between the Father and Jesus revealed in history has its full significance only when it is seen from before creation. It is because he has this relationship that Jesus is able to abide in the Father's love and keep his commandments, because from eternity he has delighted to do this. The Father is in him in that he has given him his word and authority, and he is in the Father because he keeps that word. Thus the unity of the Father and the Son is a processional unity which involves the sending of the Son in the Father's name and with his authority to perform his will to save the world because of his love for it. For Jesus it means obedience in revealing God's love for the world and this involved becoming God's act of love for the world.

We note in 1:32f the reference to the Spirit abiding on Jesus. In the Synoptic Gospels the descent of the Spirit on Jesus indicated God's presence and activity in Jesus. This remains true in John but we have shown that the emphasis has changed here to mark Jesus out as the one who was baptized with the Spirit. Rather than being the receiver of the Spirit, he is the one who bestows the Spirit, but the use of ΜΕΝΕΙΒΑ with which is not used in the Synoptic accounts, emphasizes that Jesus' relationship to the Spirit is permanent, as the believers relationship after the glorification of Jesus also is to be 14:17.

11. The disciples' unity with the Father and the Son. The disciples' relationship to the Father and the Son is ideally one of unity with them on the model of Jesus' relationship with the Father 17:21. The meaning is not that disciples should indwell each other, but that after the
model of Jesus' relationship with the Father they should be in the Father and the Son. Jesus prayed for those who would believe through the Apostolic witness as well as for the believing eyewitnesses 17:20. Those who had personally encountered Jesus would understand more easily how their lives were to be wholly directed by him, and thus they would abide in him, and he in them. But the prayer asks specifically that those who had never seen him may find their source of life in him. In 17:22 the nature of the unity is further clarified. As the Father had given his glory to the Son, now the Son has given his glory to his disciples. Thus the processional nature of the unity is emphasized. As the Father works in and through the Son so the Son works in and through his disciples. The glory with which they are equipped is the life of loving faithfulness which was revealed in him 1:14. This life is received through "having" the Son, or "abiding" in him, or "believing" in him. These descriptions are not alternative methods of possessing eternal life, but different ways of speaking of the one relationship.

In this prayer Jesus was concerned with the continuation of his work of challenging the world to believe (see 17:21,23,) which, after his departure was to be carried on by his disciples. The disciples had been given to Jesus 'out of the world' (17:6) through his manifestation of God's name. During Jesus' ministry he gave them God's words, which had first been given to him, and they received them and knew and believed that Jesus was sent by the Father (17:8); they kept God's word, 17:6. But now at the moment of his departure Jesus was concerned that the disciples should not fall back into the power of the world out of which they had been called, 17:11ff. During his ministry Jesus had kept them within the sphere of the revelation which had the power to keep them from the world, 17:12. At his departure Jesus acknowledged the danger that his disciples may fall back into the world, not in any physical sense, for Jesus makes quite clear that it is the power of the evil one that he is concerned with, not physical existence. He did not ask that they should be taken out of the world, but kept from the evil one, 17:15. Jesus asked for the continuing power of the revelation in the lives of believers. It is this which gives believers their
mission to the world and enables them to carry it out, 17:17ff. The oneness of believers with the Father and the Son depends on the continuing power of the word of God in the Christian community. It is through this word that faith remains a possibility, for the word sanctifies or separates the believers for their mission to the world. Thus Jesus asked that through the word that he had given to the apostles, which they had kept themselves, those who believed through their witness may also be sent into the world as those whose lives had been separated, kept from the power of the evil one. Thus faith continues to be a possibility for the world, 17:20-23.

This relationship to God through Jesus means that there is a procession of the word of God through believers to the world, and that there is a procession of love through Jesus to them 17:26. The oneness with the Father and the Son is a relationship which brings believers into contact with the life-giving love of God which was revealed in Jesus. Through abiding in Jesus (and thus also the Father as he is in the Son) they receive this life from him. But apart from him they cannot have this life. This is the whole point of the allegory of the vine, 15:4,5,6,7. The disciples can only be effective as they abide in Jesus, and as his words abide in them, 15:7. To cut themselves off from Jesus is to turn from the source of life.

The abiding of the disciples is the abiding of authentic faith which cannot be dispensed with by passing on to a higher experience. To pass from this experience is to return to death 15:16. The abiding of Jesus' word, or of Jesus and the Father indicates the continuing power of the revelation after Jesus' departure. The believing community has abiding in it the revelation which Jesus mediated to the Apostles, and which continues his presence in the community. But in chapter 17 where the power of the word of revelation is spoken of there is no mention of the work of the Spirit of Truth whose functions (see 14:16-17,26; 15:26,27; 16:7-15) are closely related to the functions ascribed to the word of revelation. The same point should be made concerning 15:1-25, and to some extent, chapter 13.

To those who believed, who love Jesus and keep his commandments, Jesus promised the Paraclete to be with them for ever, 14:15-17. (19)
The Paraclete continues Jesus' presence with the disciples. In chapter 17 the "word" is said to keep the disciples, but in the passages concerning the Paraclete it is clear that he is to be the effective agent of revelation within the Christian community. The Spirit "is the power within the Church which brings forth both knowledge and proclamation of the Word". Those who believe in Jesus have within them the Spirit of Truth who brings them into effective contact with Jesus and his word. Through this contact the disciples have both the gift of Jesus' word and his love. The life which they live comes from this source, and the witness which they bear to the world is to Jesus as God's saving activity of love, and their life in the world is a manifestation of that love. Through the mutual abiding the believers experience the love of God in their lives, and the love of God is manifest to the world in them. The mutual abiding indicates that fulfilled relationship towards which the love of God moves. Though God loves the world, there is no mutual abiding with the world, just as there is no mutual knowledge, and no faith. The breakdown comes from the failure of the world to know, 1:10; 14:17; or believe, 5:38; 5:44,47; 10:25,26,37,38; or love Jesus, 15:18, 23,24. There can only be a mutual abiding where there is (as far as the matter does not concern Jesus) faith in Jesus.

The background of the Johannine and Pauline ideas of mutual abiding may perhaps be related to mystical piety (Gnosticism) but though there may be a borrowing of mystical terms at this point, there is no borrowing of the thought which goes with these words in such documents as the Hermetica. As Professor Barrett has pointed out, in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is the only true mystic, and if there is borrowing from contemporary mystical thought it is at the Christological level that it is done (see Barrett: Gosp., p.73). But if he has borrowed, and modified mystical terminology to portray Christ, this terminology is being used in his descriptions of Christians, though it has undergone further modification, for their relationship to Jesus is modelled on his relationship to the Father. It is true that such a double modification would present the mystical approach with a challenge to its validity.

John's idea of revelation cuts across any mystical thought and has
modified the terminology of abiding if it was borrowed from any mystical source (source is not used here in the sense of a written source, but merely of the sphere of origin). This is clear in that the unity which we have in view is the unity which exists between persons, but is unity in that the believer finds the source of his life in God through Jesus. The stress on unity is aimed at bringing out the fact that God confronts the world through those who are one with him. But they are one with him only as they abide in him and he is consequently present in them. 10:16 which refers to one flock and one shepherd is not dealing with precisely the same point. There the point is that Jesus' unique position means that there can be but one people of God who owe allegiance to him. See Eph. 4:5/6.
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

The way of faith

Seeing and hearing are means by which men may come to believe, though the way of seeing has ceased to be an alternative since the ascension of Jesus. Those who did see, the apostles, stand in a special relationship to Jesus and to the believers who come after them and believe through them. Their witness depends both on the first hand relationship which they had with Jesus, and also the presence of the Paraclete whose coming marks the manifestation of authentic faith. Through their witness to Jesus the possibility of faith remains for those who hear and accept their witness.

The abiding of the disciples is the abiding of authentic faith. We have discussed the faith which arises out of seeing signs, and have concluded that it is only authentic faith when it is also a keeping faith, that is, the kind of faith which leads to keeping Jesus' word, to an abiding in his word. Authentic faith includes within itself what is elsewhere called 'the obedience of faith' (See Romans 1:5; 16:26. εἰς ἐκκοιλίαν πίστεως), and though the vocabulary of obedience is not used in the Gospel the thought is expressed in other ways, and is most important both for the understanding of Christology and the nature of Christian faith. (See 4:34; 5:30, 36; 6:13; 7:17; 6:27ff. 6:38-40; etc)

The relationship of believing and knowing will be dealt with more fully when we come to look at "knowledge", though it is inevitable that from time to time we will touch upon this matter as we analyse "believing". Only the verbal forms of believing and knowing are used in John, and they are used frequently. ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ is used 98 times in the Gospel, which is almost double the number of uses of both ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ and ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in the Synoptic Gospels where the noun is used almost as often as the verb. First John uses ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ nine times and ΠΙΣΤΙΣ once. Of the rest of the New Testament only Acts and Romans come near John's frequency of use with ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ, though Romans, Galatians, the Pastorals, Hebrews and James have a frequent use of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ. John's use of the verbs of knowing is also frequent. Γνωσται is used 56(57) times, ΕΓΕΝΑΙ is used 85(86) times. The noun for "knowledge" is never used (ΓΝΩΣΙΣ). It is said that John avoids ΓΝΩΣΙΣ because of Gnostic associations,
but there is no evidence that such is the case with ἀγνόησις. (1)

John's use of ἀληθεύω and γνῶσκέλευ (rather than the nouns) indicates a common motive for the use of the verbal forms, and the failure to find a Gnostic motive for the use of ἀληθεύω weakens the argument concerning the use of γνῶσκέλευ. Further, John does not stand alone in the New Testament in his preference for the verb rather than the noun to speak of "knowing." γνῶσκέλευ is used 41 times in the Synoptic Gospels while γνῶσις is used twice only (in Luke). ἔγνωκε is used 73 times in the Synoptic Gospels. In the New Testament verbs of knowing are used more frequently than the noun. Only in the Corinthian correspondence is there anything like an equal distribution (not counting 2 Peter, for instance, where there are only two or three uses of each). In the New Testament the verb γνῶσκέλευ is used about 200 times while γνῶσις is used only 29 times. Thus the argument that the use of the verbs of knowing rather than γνῶσις in John is an anti-Gnostic device loses its force. "Knowledge" is more prominent in John than elsewhere in the New Testament, but the use of verbs rather than the noun is to be explained by other means than an appeal to an anti-Gnostic device. John uses verbs to describe believing and knowing because verbs convey better than nouns the dynamic relationship he is seeking to portray, and in this he stands within the tradition of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament.

John's frequent use of verbs of knowledge does not stand on the same footing as the rest of the New Testament. Here he shows a closer relationship to the Wisdom literature and the Qumran Scrolls which have a preoccupation with knowledge. It may be that the central position of "knowledge" in John indicates a certain relationship to "Gnosticism", but this does not arise out of his use of verbs rather than nouns.

A. ἀληθεύω is used only once with Jesus as subject meaning 'to entrust' (John 2:24). (See Luke 16:11; This is not a specifically Christian usage). (2) He did not entrust himself to those who are said to have believed in him in 2:23. It is important to draw attention to the fact that Jesus is not said to believe in the Father, or his disciples, but it is said that he knows them. The verb ἀληθεύω is not used with the Father as subject at all, but it is said that he knows the Son,
10:15. This is the only reference which attributes knowledge to the Father. He is never said to know any but the Son. *πιστεύω* indicates the way man must approach God, and the evangelist has reserved the term almost exclusively for this subject. In dealing with the way of faith it will be necessary to look at the relationship of faith to sight, hearing, and knowledge, and also the different constructions used to express the idea of faith.

B. The evangelist uses several synonyms for believing. He speaks of "receiving" Jesus 1:12; 4:45; 5:43; 13:20; or "receiving" his words of witness 3:11,32. He also speaks of "following" Jesus 1:37; 6:12; 8:12; 13:36f.; of "coming" to Jesus 3:21 (who is the light cf.8:12); (4:40); 5:40; (6:15); 6:35,37,44,45,65; 7:37; and in 12:35 "walk" is in synonymous parallelism with "believe" in 12:36. "Receiving" Jesus is the same as "believing" in him, for those who "receive" him, those who "believe on his name" are given power to become children of God 1:12. Those who "come" to Jesus have life 5:40, as it is also said of those who "believe" 3:15f., and the parallelism of 6:35 is synonymous. The satisfaction of hunger and thirst is a single matter indicating the gift of life to those who come to Jesus, that is believe. The same parallelism is to be found in 7:37-39 where the Spirit is said to be given to those who "come" to Jesus, that is to the "believers". In 8:12 those who "follow" Jesus are said to have the light of life, which means much the same as those statements which say that those who "believe" will have life, and should also be compared with 12:35f. Just as "believing" in Jesus can have several levels of meaning, so can "following" and "receiving". Both of these words are used to describe the acceptance of Jesus by the crowd on the basis of his miracles or signs, 4:45 (received); and 6:2 (followed). These should be compared with 2:23 where it is said that many believed on his name, beholding his signs which he did. But the faith spoken of is immediately put in question by what follows in 2:24f. Jesus refuses to entrust himself to the so called believers. While the evangelist is prepared to talk of the faith of the crowds in such a way that it is clear that he means no more than a superficial attachment to Jesus, he also talks of faith in such a way to make clear that he regards it to be, at least in its authentic sense, the appropriate response to the
revelation of God in Christ. Believers have eternal life 3:15f., and the other metaphors which portray faith also are said to lead to life. In 10:9 εἰσέλθετε is used to indicate faith through which men have eternal life.

In 7:37 "believing", "coming" and "drinking" all mean the same thing. "Believing" quenches thirst 6:35; for Jesus gives to those who come to him to "drink", water that springs up to eternal life. "Drinking" is believing and by believing men have eternal life. In 7:37 the eternal life is shown to be related to the gift of the Spirit. This theme is treated in the discourse with Nicodemus. See John 3:1ff.

"Hearing" is also used to indicate belief in some instances, see 5:25; 6:60; 8:43,47; 18:37. But not all hearing is of this kind in that faith may be the result of hearing 5:24. Genuine hearing, which includes keeping and learning what is heard, see 6:45; 12:47; includes within itself the quality of faith. Those who cannot hear in this sense are not able to believe 8:43,45,47; 10:3,16,27; 18:37. But not all hearing is of this kind. The Jews who did not believe had heard in the purely physical sense.

When we come to deal with love we will show that the disciples love for Jesus is nothing other than faith, so that those descriptions also are to be dealt with under this heading, see 14:15,21,23f.,28; 16:27; 8:42. Cf. also 3:19; 12:43. The "asking" Jesus mentioned in 4:10 is "the asking of faith".

C. It has been suggested that the evangelist conveys the various shades of meaning concerning faith by the different construction he uses with Εἰσέλθετεν. The main points in favour of such a distinction are as follows:

1. Εἰσέλθετεν εἰς is a construction peculiar to the New Testament, being found neither in secular Greek nor the LXX. (Sirach 38:31 is no real parallel) It is used 47 times in the New Testament of which 36 instances are in the Fourth Gospel and 3 in 1 John.

2. In the Johannine literature this construction is used with a personal object with only one exception to this rule in 1 John 5:10 which speaks of believing in the witness which God bore concerning his Son. This usage marks the Epistle off from the Gospel, but it may be that God
who bears witness is in mind, and little can be made of this distinction as a consequence. Further John 6:29-30; 8:30-31 are possible examples in John. The development of the construction is said to have taken place in order to express this faith in a person which had become central for Christianity. The central position of Jesus in the thought of the New Testament Church may have forced writers and preachers to find a means of expressing their new faith. This argument would be convincing if it could be shown that κτιστεύειν εἰς was used by them in a way that other constructions were not used, but this does not seem to be the case.

Before looking into this we need to draw attention to the reference to having faith in the Teacher of Righteousness (1 QpHab VIII,2-3) which has been suggested as a parallel to the Johannine idea expressed by κτιστεύειν εἰς. It is feasible to suggest that κτιστεύειν εἰς may have been derived from the root \\ manhã following by Ἰ, which in the case of the Habakuk Pesher was used to describe the sectarian's relationship to the Teacher of Righteousness. But two things need to be recognized here. Firstly, this is an only reference in the Qumran Texts to faith in the Teacher of Righteousness whereas the references to faith in Jesus are common in the Fourth Gospel. Secondly, the reference in the Habakuk Pesher probably means acceptance of the special teaching of the Teacher of Righteousness (this is the accepted meaning of κτιστεύειν followed by the dative case in John), and therefore cannot be used as a precedent for personal trust in Jesus, which is supposedly the meaning of this new construction. There is therefore little evidence to support the claim that the evangelist is using a new expression of personal trust in someone based on the root \\ manhã followed by Ἰ. In the LXX this is represented by κτιστεύειν followed by the dative of the person or thing believed or trusted. See Gen. 15:6; 45:26; Ex. 4:11.

That κτιστεύειν εἰς means personal trust in contrast to 'giving credence to' or accepting certain teaching needs to be examined. Is κτιστεύειν εἰς followed by the Dative case to be contrasted with κτιστεύειν εἰς? Such a contrast will not stand scrutiny. John 3:36 both of these constructions may mean the same thing. "ὁ κτιστεύων εἰς τὸν ἑαυτὸν εἶκεν ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ὁ δὲ ἀκειμένως τῷ ἑαυτῷ οὐκ ἀφετεκτικόν..." Though κτιστεύειν is not used in the negative statement its
substitute expresses the opposite of "believing in" by using the dative case. The same point is made in a comparison of 5:24, πιστεύειν τῷ Κήρυγμα με and 12:44, ὁ πίστευε εἰς ἐμὲ ἀλα ἐγὼ τὸν Κήρυγμα με. (See also John 8:30f.; and 1 John 3:23 with 1 John 5:13 and John 2:23. See also 2 Tim. 1:12.)

Πιστεύειν with the dative case is found in the LXX and New Testament with the dative of the person (e.g. Gen. 15:16; see Rom. 4:9,22; Gal. 3:16; 2:16) or the object (e.g. λόγος, ἀμώσια etc. see Proverbs 14:15 etc.). It is used in this way also in John. Πιστεύειν is also used with ἐν in the LXX (see Psalm 105(106):12; 1 Samuel 27:12 etc.) and there are two instances where the Fourth Gospel may possibly use this construction, see 3:15; 20:31. John 3:15 most probably should be understood in this way because 3:16 takes up the same thought but with the variation of εἰς αὐτὸν. The textual variants using εἰς and εἰς indicate that the preposition was understood with the verb to believe rather than meaning 'in him' in the sense of 'being in him'. If the latter were the case one would expect "ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ· ἡμῖν οἰκίσκοντες ἔως τὴν ἁρμανίαν τῆς" or "...πίστευον εἰς ἡμῖν οἰκίσκοντες ἐν αὐτῷ·"

The textual variants are; (1) εἰς αὐτόν, P66 L. 1253 Theodoret. (2) εἰς αὐτόν ὁ χριστός, a host of minuscules, Lucifer, Chrysostom Cyrol (and Theodoret?); possibly Cyprian and families 1 and 13. P63 is also a probable witness to this reading. (3) εἰς αὐτόν, A 083 (4) ἐν αὐτό αὐτό P75 B W (but the original reading is missing) 0113 and Fulgentius. The ms of the Old Latin, Vulgate and Syriac are divided between this reading and εἰς αὐτόν.

Of these readings we may certainly exclude εἰς αὐτόν as a compromise variants 1 and 2. The second variant is to be excluded also as it seems more likely that the text would be changed to the characteristic Johannine construction Πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν than from it. The proximity of the same construction in 3:16 may also have had something to do with an accidental alteration. That such is probably the case is supported by the fact that some texts read μὴ ἐκκολίησί τινι ἀλλ' in verse 15 as well as 3:16. (It is included in the Koine text, Θ, some Old Latin and Vulgate ms, and in Sinaic Syriac. But the words are
omitted by \( \text{\textit{NB LW and fam.1, etc.}} \) The influence of the wording of verse 16 on verse 15 is clear and it is probable that \( \text{\textit{eis auton}} \) is secondary. This leaves us with the text \( \text{\textit{en autou}} \) and variant no.1. Neither of these constructions is common in John following \( \text{\textit{pisteuein}} \). In fact \( \text{\textit{pisteuein eis}} \) is not used at all and there is only one doubtful reference to \( \text{\textit{pisteuein ev}} \) in 20:31. Important as P66 is it cannot outweigh the evidence supporting the text reading \( \text{\textit{pisteuein ev}} \). Both \( \text{\textit{pisteuein ev}} \) and \( \text{\textit{pisteuein eis}} \) followed by dative or accusative are known constructions in Greek that has been influenced by Semitic usage. (See Mk. 1:15; Rom. 9:33; Rom. 4:5; etc.)(In LXX with \( \text{\textit{ev Ps. 77(78)122. Jer. 12:16; Dan. 6:23}} \). The fact that John does not elsewhere use \( \text{\textit{pisteuein ev}} \) is not a conclusive argument against taking it in this sense here in 3:15. The fact that \( \text{\textit{pisteuein ev}} \) is known to have been a legitimate construction in the New Testament period is sufficient for us to have to allow the possibility that the evangelist may use it, even if only once. (Mk. 1:15 is an only reference in Mark but is to be read nevertheless) With the tendency to vary his words without difference in meaning (NB. the verbs of seeing and as we shall see his use of \( \text{\textit{ivnokein, eidein and philein and ayxain.}} \)) it is suggested that \( \text{\textit{ev}} \) is simply a variation of \( \text{\textit{eis}} \) in 3:16. Further we are aware that \( \text{\textit{eis}} \) and \( \text{\textit{ev}} \) overlap in meaning in the New Testament. Thus \( \text{\textit{pisteuein with eis or ev, or simply followed by the dative may have no difference in meaning, though simply followed by the dative the point may be what is said rather than a person in whom one believes. But this distinction is determined by the context not by syntax. \text{\textit{pisteuein eis}} \) is capable of meaning belief in what is said also, though the evangelist does not use the construction in this way (see 1 John 5:10). (But see Jn.6:29/30; 8:30/31).

For the evangelist the distinction between believing in Jesus and believing his word is not vital, in fact both ultimately lead to the same point because Jesus' word is fundamentally witness to himself as the one the Father has sent. One of the evangelist's contributions was to bring out this unity between Jesus and his word. To receive Jesus' word (12:48; 17:8) is to receive him, (1:12; 5:43) to abide in his word
(8:31) is to abide in him, (15:4) to reject his word is to reject him.

From a theological point of view there is no difference between believing Jesus and believing in him. For this reason we also get ἀληθεύειν ὅτι indicating the content of belief. To believe Jesus is to believe that he is the Christ, and more particularly, the one the Father has sent into the world, for this is what Jesus says of himself. To believe these statements is to believe in him. But the evangelist does not consider that such belief can be mere intellectual assent to dogma. (The faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority. (faith and knowledge of the Fourth Gospel are not possession of a deposit of truth, thus the use of verbs rather than nouns) for to believe such is to admit and acknowledge Jesus' authority.

Believing Jesus' words is bound up with the Gospel situation to some extent, but in the apostolic witness his words are to be heard and believed and thus the demand continues to go out that men should believe in Jesus as the one sent from God. In the missionary situation of the church it is clearly this aspect of faith that would be most prominent. Bultmann has suggested that ἀληθεύειν ἐπί is an abbreviation of ἀληθεύειν ὅτι etc., which arose in the missionary situation. This seems to be a reasonable suggestion, and he also includes in this observation the absolute use of ἀληθεύειν which is interchangeable both with ἀληθεύειν ἐπί (see 3:18 and also 4:39, 41) and ἀληθεύειν ὅτι (see 11:40, 42, 16:30). ἀληθεύειν ἐπί is interchangeable with ἀληθεύειν ὅτι in 11:25-27, and with ἀληθεύειν ὅτι in 6:29-30; 8:30-31. Thus our treatment of faith cannot be based on these grammatical observations.

D. The background of the Johannine usage of ἀληθεύειν is the usage of the early Church. Here we find ἀληθεύειν ἐπί (see Gal. 2:16) or ἐπί (τίκ. 1:15) or ὅτι (Romans 10:9) or simply with the dative (Acts 16:34; 18:8). The Christian usage goes back to the Old Testament and LXX where ἀληθεύειν (and especially followed by the dative of the person or thing believed or trusted) is used to translate the root ἴνα (followed by ὅ and ἦ)(which has a great deal in common with the Classical Greek usage. But the Christian usage is not simply the reproduction of the Greek and
Hebrew ideas, important as the Old Testament ideas are for the development of the idea of Christian faith.

"To enter into communion with God is to enter into a movement, to participate in a history which is of God. Participation by man in God's plan is, first of all, faith; and it is not by chance that Isaiah, who is the prophet of God's plan, is also the prophet of faith. To believe is to share in the stability of God, to see things as God sees them with security and confidence. Faith has a threefold aspect in the Old Testament: it is knowledge, and the phrase knowledge of God expresses one of the essential features of Israelite religion; it is trust, and Isaiah defines it as an attitude of calmness (7:2; 30:15; 28:15) because it is submission to an all-powerful and good master; and finally, it is active obedience, for the believer, far from abandoning himself to fatalism, must struggle along with God for the fulfilling of his plan. This entering into God's plan is illustrated by the use of the same word or at least of the same root for both divine and human activity: 'emunah and 'emet denote at the same time the faithfulness and veracity of God and the faith of man."(7)

"The bond subjecting man to God and the freedom which gives him dominion over the world also give direction to the entire devotion of the faithful Israelite. The humility characterizing it is no blind submission, but a walking with God (Mic.6:8). The believer who has seen in history a manifestation of divine righteousness and chesed can only involve his own existence humbly in the wake of that history. Humility will be accompanied by fear, for nothing else is possible before a holy and sometimes terrible God; yet, important as fear is in Israelite religion, it does not occupy the central place, joy far outweighs it, joy belongs to God."(8)

The Christian usage differs from the Old Testament at three important points. Firstly, faith in the Old Testament is often regarded as a meritorious human act which God will reward. But when this has been said it must be added that the prophets often expressed the idea of faith without any connection with merit. Secondly, the missionary situation of the Church bought into the concept of faith a strong element of decision so that to believe can mean to be converted. To
be converted means to believe in Jesus and this means that faith in the New Testament becomes more central than it had ever been in the Old Testament. Thirdly, ἀποκτάω is restricted to man's response to God in the New Testament, whereas ἔλθος was also used to describe God's faithfulness. It is true that ἀποκτάω is used to describe the faithfulness of God (see 1 Jn. 1:9; 1 Cor. 10:13; 1:9; 2 Cor. 1:13). But ἀποκτάω (and ἔλθος outside the Fourth Gospel), when used in a religious sense refers to man's response to God. This excludes of course such passages as John 2:24 and 9:18. The important point is that ἀποκτάω and ἔλθος are not used of God's faithfulness.

The importance of the hiphil ἔλθος in expressing man's relationship to God has been well brought out by A. Weiser. It signifies the recognition and acknowledgement of "the relationship into which God enters with man, i.e. to put oneself into this relationship. Thus here too the reciprocal relationship between God and man is part of the essence of faith". (p. 11.) But "even in those cases in which faith indicates a human activity for which man can be made responsible (the demand for faith)— man is never the one to initiate this reciprocal relationship". (p. 12) God as the one who initiates the relationship gives commands and promises to which faith responds in obedience and acknowledgement of the power of God to perform his promise. Faith "suggests the meaning of to take God as God with complete seriousness, and thus includes as an essential factor the exclusiveness of the divine relationship". (10) Isaiah 43:10 is a most important reference bringing together "know", "believe", and "understand" followed by ὄνειρον; "that you may know and believe and understand that I am he; before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. (With Isaiah 43:10 (note μαρτυρία, γνῶτε, ἀποκτάω, συνάγω, ὄνειρον, εἰμί) compare John 8:18, 24, 28, 58 ) Faith, like knowledge (see Hos. 4:11) includes an aspect of will and thus indicates obedience "which embraces the whole man in every part of his outward behaviour and his inner life". (11) The development of the absolute use of "believe" goes back to Isaiah and his encounter with God (Is. 6:1ff.), where it is contrasted with dependence on human strength (30:15ff.) and indicates the special kind of existence of those dependent on God alone (Is. 7:19).
"If couched in positive terms the meaning of the saying would be: the people of God have their particular manner of being and are established through their faith."

The following points should be emphasized with regard to the idea of faith in the New Testament. Faith is the response of man to God's call or initiative. This point is stressed in John. Because God reveals himself as God, faith involves the total commitment of the whole man. Again this is clear in John. Faith has a content, a knowledge and understanding which is involved in the commitment of obedience, and it is indicated in Isaiah 43:10 by a ΟΤ clause similar to those found in the Fourth Gospel, see 6:69; etc. Finally, the faith and knowledge of Israel is verifiable in much the same way as the Fourth Gospel suggests. Faith and knowledge cannot be real, according to the Fourth Gospel, where there is no brotherly love. In Hosea 4:1ff; 6:6; it is clear that the failure to know God is pronounced in terms of the failure to have a care for other people. The essential relationship of religious faith and ethics is clear in the Old Testament prophets and is certainly important in John.

E. The Johannine idea of faith is not simply a repetition of that found in the early Church. The evangelist made this his starting point and went on to develop the necessary implications of that position, and at the same to resist the dangers inherent in it. The assessment of the Synoptic Gospels concerning Jesus is in terms of Messiahship, see Mark 8:29. The Fourth Gospel also acknowledges Jesus as the Messiah, see John 1:42,49; and especially in the statements using ΧΙΣΤΕΥΛΕΙΝ ΟΤ, 6:69; 11:27; 20:31. But such an assessment of Jesus was inadequate for the Church's faith which had yet to take fully into account the death and resurrection of the Son of Man, see Mark 9:30ff. The evangelist developed this aspect also using ΧΙΣΤΕΥΛΕΙΝ ΟΤ constructions to show the greater significance of Jesus. The coming into the world of the Messiah is here seen to mean more than at first meets the eye (11:27), for his coming is the incarnation of the Word (1:14), the sending of the Son who is one with the Father, John 11:42; 14:10,11; 16:27,30; 17:8,21. Though the evangelist started with the same kind of faith in Jesus as is expressed in the Synoptic Gospels, that is the
popular turning to him of the crowds who regard him as the Messiah
(see 2:23 etc.), and he does bring out the disciples' failure to know
and believe from time to time (see 2:22; 12:16; 16:31 etc.), that is
failure to believe in the post-Easter sense, the Jesus of the Fourth
Gospel speaks of faith in the authentic sense (see John 3:15ff.; 5:24ff.
etc.), and from time to time the post-Easter faith illuminates the events
of Jesus' life, see John 1:14; 2:17.

The Johannine development of the Synoptic view of faith is only
one side of the story. In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus appears as an
eschatological figure, whose coming marks the approach of the last day
when he would appear again in power to judge the world, see Mark 14:62.
There is on the other hand the kerygma of the Pauline mission. In
Paul's epistles there is scarcely any mention of the Jesus of history.
Apart from mention of his birth and lineage, his death and resurrection,
there is little else. So little does Paul say of this, that some
scholars have suggested that Paul was not interested in the Jesus of
history. Though this is palpably false, as the importance of the
death and resurrection of Jesus as real events according to Paul's
kerygma make clear, see 1 Cor. 15:17ff.; 15:1ff., there is a tendency to
think of the events of Jesus' life only in terms of the achievement of
the justification of sinners, and to concentrate attention on the
ascended Lord. The evangelist develops this idea of faith arising out
of the kerygma, see Romans 1:16, which is indeed faith in Jesus, and
which receives salvation at that, see Romans 10:6-15. But he shows more
clearly than Paul that the ascended Lord of the kerygma is the lowly
Jesus of Nazareth. It is not, as we have already said, that this is a
contradiction of the Pauline teaching, but it is a clarification in the
face of particular problems (which had become much clearer by the time
1 John was written). The fundamental problem is the denial that the Word
had really become flesh. See John 1:14; 1 John 4:2; 2 John 7.

In Romans 10:6-15 the objects of ΧΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ are two fold, to
believe that (ὁν) God raised Jesus from the dead, 10:9, and to believe
in Jesus, (εἰς Χ[ΙΣΤ]ΙΟ) 10:11. In Romans 10:9-11 these two statements
appear as equivalents, but such faith brings men into relationship with
the living Lord. The evangelist does not lose this vital insight, indeed
the manner in which he develops this theme in his teaching about the 'other Paraclete' is one of his real contributions to New Testament theology.

The Johannine idea of faith also meets another problem head on. Faith according to the evangelist was necessarily dogmatic in nature, but not merely dogmatic. The \( \text{πίστευε} \ \text{εἰς} \) statements indicate the Christological content of faith, but a correct Christology is not the entire content of faith. This observation arises out of the correct Christology which understands Jesus to be the one true Word of God in whom to believe is to obey, and thus there is to be both believing him and believing in him which together make up the obedience of faith.

F. An analysis of the idea of faith in the Fourth Gospel.

1. The Jews' refusal to believe placed them in the Johannine classification of the "world". The "world" is used in two senses in John. (1) The created order, and sometimes in a metaphorical way of people to emphasize a great crowd. In this sense Jesus as the Word was with the Father before the world was made 1:10, he made the world 1:10, and came into the world etc. (a) But the "world" is also the sphere of the power of evil 12:31, and the Jews, by their unbelief throw in their lot with him 8:44ff. Because the Gospel was written from the standpoint of the continuing mission of the Church, the rejection of Jesus by the Jews is indicated from the beginning, John 1:11. Not only does this rejection receive mention here, the universal scope of the gospel is indicated in the words 'as many as received him...' 1:12. Though the rejection of Jesus by the Jews is mentioned at the opening of the Gospel, the evangelist did not throw away the historical basis of the events he portrays. The theme of rejection once enunciated is worked out in detail again and again. In 1:11 the failure to believe in Jesus is expressed in terms of the failure to receive him (\( \text{μὴ πίστευο} \)) as also in 5:43-44. The refusal to believe is also expressed using \( \text{πίστευε} \ \text{εἰς} \), 7:5. Here the use of the imperfect tense may draw attention to the fact that unbelief was not the final condition, and that as events worked out Jesus' brethren come to believe in him. The \( \text{πίστευε} \ \text{εἰς} \) form is also used to express the unbelief of the Jews in 12:37, and if the imperfect tense is original we may not read too much into the
temporary nature of the unbelief indicated in 7:5. But P66 reads the aorist tense in 12:37, and is to be preferred (see 1:11) as it indicates the definitive rejection of Jesus by the Jews. The rejection of Jesus is also expressed by the absolute use of θειολογία 6:36, 64. This use arises out of the missionary situation where "to believe" indicated "conversion", see Acts 4:14; 11:21; 14:1; 15:7; 17:12; 19:18; 21:20, 25. In the missionary situation the refusal to believe the Gospel corresponds to the rejection of Jesus himself in the Gospel situation.

The basis of the Jews' rejection of Jesus is said to arise from a wrong standard of values, 5:43-44. They had set the "honour" at a human level above the "glory" of God. They had turned God's word into a human word and considered that in this word they possessed eternal life, and consequently they rejected the offer of eternal life in Jesus. The Scriptures read from the standpoint of the Jews were not God's word, for to be understood the Scriptures must be read from a Christological standpoint. To refuse faith in Christ was to invalidate Scripture, see 5:38-47. An example of the misunderstanding arising out of the Jews' interpretation of Scripture is 7:48ff. Their interpretation of Scripture was used to close their minds to the evidence of Jesus and his words 7:46. The argument used against regarding Jesus sympathetically is based on knowledge of the Law. Only those without knowledge believe. The Law is said to indicate that "the Prophet" does not arise out of Galilee (7:52 note P66). The definite article must be read as the comment clearly refers to the Messianic Prophet, see 1:41-49; especially 1:45ff.; 6:14; and note 7:41-42. To judge Jesus by these standards is to refuse the possibility of faith. There is also the irony of the knowledge which John presupposes of his readers, that Jesus' birth place was Bethlehem. This point was not raised in the Gospel because the argument would be misleading. Instead, through Nicodemus, it is shown that at a deeper level the Jews did not know the Law, did not obey the Law, for they judged Jesus without first hearing what he had to say for himself. The temporary unbelief of Jesus' brothers was also based on a false scale of values. Did Jesus perform miracles? Surely if he did he would not keep them secret? 7:4-5. Jesus' brothers could not conceive that he could have such power and not use it to impress the multitudes in
Jerusalem. They could not conceive of his glorification by way of the cross.

The unbelief of the Jews is brought to a head in 12:37ff. In spite of all the "signs" Jesus had performed the Jews did not believe. Their failure to believe can be accounted for to some extent by reference to the power of darkness 12:35f.; 12:40. But the unbelief of the Jews stands under the judgement of God and those who refuse the light are condemned to remain in the darkness, 12:46; 3:19-21; 8:12; 9:39ff. The epitome of the sin of the world is the rejection of Jesus 16:9. The work of convicting the world of sin is carried out by the Spirit in the believing community. This conviction is not aimed at the final condemnation but the conversion of the world just as the judgement brought about by the coming of Jesus was purposed to bring about the salvation of the world, 3:17ff.; 17:20ff. suggest that the opportunity for faith for the world is the result of this conviction. The work of the Spirit reveals to the world through believers that the rejection of Jesus is the definitive sin. This is an attack on the world's scale of values.

Seeing Jesus with the physical eye did not of necessity result in faith 6:36. (15) Thomas refused to believe that Jesus was risen on the basis of the Apostles' testimony 20:25. But although this passage has some points in common with 6:36 it is not complete rejection of Jesus. The rejection of Jesus was a decision which led the Jews to implacable opposition to Jesus, to determination to kill him, see 8:59; 7:1; 11:50-53. Because the Jews were unwilling to leave their old standpoint, the rejection of Jesus was inevitable. Jesus' statement to Nicodemus "You must be born from above (or anew)", indicates the need for radical change.

2. The rejection of Jesus involved the rejection of his word.
The Jews' rejection of Jesus was the consequence of their rejection of Jesus' words. Nicodemus appears as a representative of Judaism which refused Jesus' witness. Note the plural ἀρματίαν in 3:11. The evangelist has cast this saying in a form suitable for the situation of the Church's mission by speaking of "our witness" (ἡμῶν ἀρματίαν ἡμῶν), thus indicating that the Church's witness shares in the authority of Jesus' witness. The Jews refused to believe Jesus'
witness at the level of earthly things and consequently could not believe his witness to heavenly things 3:12. The earthly things referred to is the need for the new birth which Jesus had already spoken of in 3:3,5. The heavenly things concerned the descent and ascent of the Son of Man, his glorification, in which the love of God was revealed. But as long as the Jews considered that they had no need of radical change, as long as they considered that they already had life, his glorification would seem to be a humiliating defeat. Jesus' authority for witness is said to be based on his first hand knowledge of the heavenly realm, in other words the authority of the witness is rooted in God himself, 3:32. The statement that no one receives this witness must be regarded as hyperbole. By and large the Jews rejected Jesus' witness.

Although the Jews made their claims from what they considered to be the basis of Moses, believing Jesus is made the criterion of believing Moses and the Scriptures as is indicated by the unfulfilled conditional form of 5:46. The witness of the Scriptures is valid only from the standpoint of Jesus' witness. This statement was intended to shake the Jews' confidence in their own understanding.

The same intention of challenge is to be seen in 6:51ff. which was heard by many of Jesus' disciples who considered that Jesus, spoken a σκληρός λόγος, and asked "Who is able to hear him?" 6:60. To "hear" means more than the physical act as they had already heard in this sense. To "hear" means here to "obey". The consequence of the saying was the murmuring (γινομένου) of the disciples (6:61). Just as the Israelites had murmured in the desert (see 1 Cor. 10:10; Ex. 16:2; Num. 14:2,36; 17:6-15 LXX and John 6:41,43,61) against Moses and Aaron, but ultimately against God, so the disciples' murmuring indicated dissatisfaction in one who had not measured up to their expectations. Jesus indicated that he did not intend to fulfil these expectations with a direct confrontation of his way against theirs 6:26ff. What they wanted was more of the same kind of life that they already had. They wished to make their lives secure, but Jesus confronted them with the necessity of giving up this life that they may have eternal life. Their discontent arose from the discovery that Jesus did not offer what they
wanted. John 6:64 indicates that those who did not believe Jesus' word did not believe, and we are probably intended to understand this as "believing in Jesus". This incident marks the break with the popular following 6:66, and the affirmation of faith by the twelve through Peter 6:69ff. (This event is comparable to the confession at Caesarea Philippi in Mark 9:27ff.) The characteristic theme of division (σχίσμα) caused by Jesus' ministry comes out here.

The "many" who believed in Jesus (κολλών εἰς τοῦτον) 8:30, were challenged with the need for "abiding faith" and possibility of freedom. But because they considered that they were already free they could not accept this challenge nor could they understand Jesus' claim to have come from God 8:43. The refusal of Jesus' word was an indication that, although they thought that they were serving God, they were in the power of the devil 8:38-44. Consequently they considered Jesus to be demon possessed 8:48f. Faced with incredulity Jesus presented his ultimate claim to authority, his pre-existence 8:56-58. This claim was aimed at shattering their self-assurance, at removing their preconceived ideas about religion and life. Only when they had come to see that they were destitute of knowledge and life could they see the need of the Son from heaven. Because of this Jesus made an all out assault on the citadel of self-assurance which could keep them from God's gift of life. Their self-assurance had turned the truth upside down, and what they called truth was a lie, what they called life was death, and what they called religion was blasphemy, for truth, life, and God are to be found in Jesus. Consequently the result of Jesus' challenge was the attempt to stone him for blasphemy 8:59. They understood his claims in terms of a quest for his own glory and not as the glory which comes from God. See 5:43-44.

Attempts to kill Jesus are recorded also in 5:18; and 10:31ff., where the reasons given are that Jesus made himself equal to God (τὸν τὸν Θεόν) 5:18, and that he being a man made himself Θεόν 10:33. The statement in chapter 10 arises from the request that Jesus should say whether or not he is the Messiah 10:24. Jesus answered that he had told them but they would not believe him 10:25. The only direct acknowledgement of Messiahship by Jesus is 4:26, but time and again
attention had been drawn to the fact that God was active in him. But the Jews had rejected this claim as blasphemy, giving heed neither to his words or works 10:37f. Their system could not allow the possibility that God could be present in a man, that a man could be one with God without claiming independence of God. Consequently they refused to believe on the basis of Jesus' words and works. The refusal was an indication that they were not Jesus' sheep.

3. Faith as a first turning to Jesus. Not all faith in Jesus had taken account of Jesus' challenge to man's self-assurance. Faith which is no more than attraction to Jesus as a miracle worker or teacher has to meet the scandal involved in Jesus' claims about himself. The form of the statement in 2:23 indicates that the popular and superficial form of faith is in view. There are two characteristics in 2:23 which we note: (1) Πολλοί εἰς τὴν πίστιν or variations using Πολύς or Πλάνες (see 2:23; 4:39, 41; 6:2; 7:31; 8:30; 10:42; 11:45, 48; 12:11, 42.) Apart from 4:41; 6:2; 11:48; and 12:11 these passages use Πολλοί εἰς τὴν πίστιν, and of these only 6:2; 11:48; 12:11 do not use εἰς τὴν πίστιν. In 12:11 the imperfect tense is to be read in spite of the fact that 566 and ℏ read Εἰς τὴν πίστιν. But this is to be understood as a scribal alteration in favour of the characteristic aorist form. The imperfect tense is also used in 6:2 (ἐστιν ὑπερεύθεν). The imperfects in 6:2 and 12:11 anticipate the rejection of the challenge to believe at a deeper level, see 6:60-66; 12:34-43. In 11:48 the chief priests and Pharisees predicted that if Jesus was left alone all men would believe in him (Πάντες Χριστιανοί εἰς αὐτὸν). They envisaged a popular support of Jesus, probably as a Messianic figure which would incite rebellion against Rome and thus bring disaster upon the nation. Jesus confronted this superficial faith with the scandal of the departure of the Son of Man, see 12:34. In the other references where the aorist tense is used attention is drawn to the specific situation which attracted the crowds. Nothing is implied by the tense about the quality or duration of faith, but there is other evidence which suggests that this faith had yet to face the scandal of Jesus' claims about himself. In many instances such faith was to prove to be transitory, but there were those who went on to believe in the authentic sense. (Note the development traced through
in the case of Nicodemus.) (II) The faith which arose out of seeing Jesus' "signs" was a real turning to Jesus though the evangelist shows it to be inadequate and suspect, 2:23f.; 4:45, 48; 6:2, 14, 29-30; 7:31; (10:41f.); 11:45, 47ff.; 12:37. Jesus did not trust those who believed as a consequence of having seen his "signs" 2:24, because they sought in him the fulfilment of their own ends 6:15; 12:13ff. By announcing his imminent departure Jesus challenged them to real faith 12:31ff. His signs should have led them to real faith because they pointed to his relationship to the Father. The evangelist's verdict was that though many were impressed for a time, the Jews failed to believe as a consequence of Jesus' signs 12:37ff. Only a few exceptions may be allowed, including "the twelve" of whom one was a traitor 6:64ff. Following Jesus' glorification the misunderstanding of his signs was removed and the witness of the signs became the means by which men may come to authentic faith 20:30.

The theme of developing faith is taken up in several incidents. In 4:1-42 the Samaritan incident is narrated. Through Jesus' insight into her situation, the Samaritan woman confessed that he was a prophet 4:19. In response to a question Jesus called on the woman to believe his statement that the eschatological hour had come 4:21ff. These words did not seem to penetrate because the woman appealed to the coming of Messiah who would reveal all things. In response Jesus confessed that he was the Messiah 4:26. It is not clear that the woman accepted Jesus' self-witness as ἴνα ἤκουσίν 4:29. ἴνα introduces a tentative question and if anything a negative answer is suggested; see 8:22; 18:35; 21:5. From this hesitant testimony many of the Samaritans believed in Jesus 4:39. This faith is to be understood as superficial, but through it Jesus came to abide (ἐμαρτύνετο) with them 4:40 and out of this many more came to believe through the word Jesus himself spoke 4:41. Three points need to be mentioned.

(1) Jesus' abiding is probably to be understood symbolically in the sense of creating an authentic relationship. (2) Many more are said to believe (4:41), but when they speak, it is apparent that a progression from believing on the basis of the woman's testimony to believing on the basis of Jesus' word is in view. (3) The progression of faith noted in
4:42 can only be understood from the post-Easter situation of the Church.

The Galileans who received (ἐσέβησεν) Jesus on the basis of seeing his miracles (ὀφθαλμοὺς) provide the background for the coming of the Nobleman to see Jesus. His coming is to be understood as a preliminary act of faith on the basis of Jesus' miracles. Jesus expressed his dissatisfaction with such faith which treated him only as a miracle worker 4:48. The Nobleman was challenged to look beyond the miracles. He was challenged to believe Jesus' word and his power to heal at a distance 4:50. But even this is not yet authentic faith. Only when the Nobleman arrived home is it said that he believed and his whole house 4:53. This authentic faith is said to spring from the knowledge that the events of healing coincided with Jesus' word. In 4:53 the evangelist expressed this conversion in language proper to the Christian mission, see Acts 18:8.

In chapter 6, the popular faith of the crowd is expressed at first in terms of following (κολυμβήσετε) 6:2, and then in the confession that Jesus is "the Prophet who is coming into the world" 6:14. But the later events show that this faith could not meet the scandal of Jesus' self-witness 6:26,36,41,52,60-66. In 7:31 the faith which arose out of seeing Jesus' signs was faulty as is indicated by the comparison of Jesus with "The Christ", but compared with those who rejected Jesus this faulty faith cannot be disregarded as negligible.

The two constructions using κολυμβήσετε followed by ἐις or followed by the dative case are used without difference of meaning in 8:30-31. Faith in Jesus in this instance is said to have arisen out of Jesus' discourse. But this faith was superficial (see 8:27) as is indicated by Jesus' challenge to abide in his word. Two points were raised which these Jews needed to accept. (1) As yet they did not know the truth. (2) They were in bondage. It was the second point which antagonised them. They were children of Abraham and claimed that they had never been in bondage. This statement overlooked the exiles in Egypt and Babylon and in particular the situation of the Roman occupation. But it was the bondage to sin to which Jesus referred 8:34. Until the need for freedom was acknowledged Jesus' offer of freedom would be a scandal which they could not accept, and Jesus' attempt to shatter their
self-assurance produced their opposition in its definitive form. What Jesus claimed to be the truth they declared was the result of demon possession, and after his appeal to Abraham as an assertion of his eternal being they attempted to stone him.

When Jesus was asked if he was the Christ he answered that he had already given the answer to this question but it had not been accepted, 10:24f. He appealed to his works as an indication of his unity with the Father 10:30. His appeal was based on his works. If he did the works of God why did not the Jews believe him, that is believe his witness?10:37. If they could not accept his witness at least they should accept Jesus' works 10:38. The Jews wished to disregard the nature of Jesus' works but Jesus asserted that the acceptance of his works would lead to the acknowledgement of his relationship with the Father 10:38, because he performed the Father's works 10:25. The Jews rejected this assertion and sought to take Jesus captive, but he escaped from them.

A new episode commences in 10:40. The faith mentioned in 10:42 is not said to arise out of seeing signs, but it would seem to be the result of the correlation of the Baptist's witness and the works of Jesus. There is no indication as to the quality and permanence of this faith, but from Κολλοὶ ἔστωσαν it is probably right to conclude that this faith had not penetrated the mystery of Jesus' person and mission.

The purpose of the raising of Lazarus, as a "sign", was to evoke the faith of the disciples 11:15. In this "sign" Jesus is revealed, from the standpoint of his glorification, as "the resurrection and the life" 11:25f. The resurrection on the last day affirmed by Martha overlooked the significance of Jesus in the present time for those who believed in him 11:24. Jesus challenged her to accept his witness concerning his present significance 11:26, to which she responded affirming his Messiahship, but this affirmation is also to be understood in terms of the post-resurrection faith. The "sign" of raising Lazarus was performed with an indication that Jesus purposed that it should reveal his relationship with the Father 11:42. But the immediate consequence of this "sign" was the superficial faith of those who saw it and the
decision of the chief priests and Pharisees to kill Jesus 11:45,47f. and Lazarus also because his resurrection constituted Jesus' most notable sign to date, and through him many believed in Jesus (12:11), and many others believed also because of the witness of the crowd which had seen the raising of Lazarus 12:17f. The crowd "going out to meet Jesus" was an action of superficial faith 12:13. This faith had yet to be confronted with the fact that Jesus' kingdom was not of this world 18:36. By and large the Jews rejected Jesus 12:37, but there were those, even from among the rulers who believed in him. But their faith was superficial because they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God 12:42-43. Thus by the end of chapter 12 the evangelist has shown that in spite of Jesus words and works the Jews rejected Jesus, though there were those who turned to Jesus in superficial faith, and of these there were a few who after Jesus' glorification, came to authentic faith. The reader is reminded of this fact from time to time by the appearance of post-Easter confession of faith such as 1:14; 4:42,53; 6:69; 11:27.

4. The faith of the Apostles was not authentic before the resurrection of Jesus, but the evangelist has written from the perspective of the resurrection and was aware of those who truly believed. Just as "Following" Jesus can be used to describe the superficial faith of the crowd 6:2, or the beginning of faith for the Apostles 1:37ff.; or for authentic faith which receives eternal life 8:12. We note the faith of Apostles at the level of being a first turning to Jesus such as 1:50 where Nathaniel confessed that Jesus was the Messiah on the basis of a display of supernatural knowledge. This faith had yet to face the scandal of the glorification of the Son of Man.

The manifestation of Jesus' glory in the miracle at Cana of Galilee evoked the faith of his disciples 2:11. The historical manifestation of the miracle is understood at a deeper level from the perspective of the resurrection (see 1:14). But historically, the faith evoked cannot be considered authentic because in 2:22 the point is made that authentic faith came only after Jesus was risen from the dead, and then the disciples in the reflection of authentic faith understood what Jesus had said and the Scripture. Attention should be drawn
to the activity of the Paraclete in this context, see 14:26.

In 4:42 we note the absolute use of \( \text{Xistul\c{c}e\c{c}l\c{t}v} \) denoting authentic Christian belief on the basis of having heard. What is meant by believing is indicated by the \( \text{\c{d}ik\c{m}uv \'ti} \) statement, which could just as well have been a \( \text{Xistur\c{c}k\c{m}uv \'ti} \) statement as far as the meaning is concerned. The evangelist has put a fully developed confession of faith on the lips of the Samaritans. He wished to indicate that the faith of the Samaritans had gone as far as possible at this stage, and he was writing from the perspective of the successful Samaritan mission carried through by the early Christian preachers.

Peter's confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi is crucial in the Synoptic Gospels (see Mk.8:29) and the confession of Peter in John 6:68f is comparable. Both confessions follow a feeding miracle (Mk.8:1-10; John 6:1-13) and the seeking of a sign from heaven (Mk.8:11ff; John 6:30ff). The confession of faith in terms of Messiahship is fitting, but the evangelist has characteristically developed this confession from the standpoint of the resurrection. Jesus has the words which can give eternal life. The form of the statement which follows \( \text{Xistur\c{c}k\c{m}uv \'ti} \) is also a sign of the fully developed faith which has been read back into this situation. In this statement \( \text{\c{d}ik\c{m}uv} \) and \( \text{\c{d}ip\c{m}uv} \) are synonymous.

Believing in Jesus as the Son of Man (9:35-38) is a form which raises certain problems. Firstly, although in 12:34 the title Son of Man puzzled the crowd, the man Jesus had heard was willing to believe in the Son of Man if only he could identify him. Secondly, the response of the man to Jesus' identification of himself with the Son of Man was to declare his faith in him and to worship him. In other words the man accepted Jesus' self-witness, and his understanding of the title Son of Man led him to worship Jesus. We have already noted the development of the faith of the man healed by Jesus, and the conclusion we draw from the final confession is that it is formed from the perspective of the glorification of the Son of Man.

The text of John 10:38 is uncertain. Jesus asks his hearers to accept his works even if they cannot accept his words, \( \text{\'\text{\c{d}i} \c{p}\c{n} \c{m}v\c{a}r\c{t}e} \) ...

What follows is in doubt. (1) \( \text{\c{d}i} \c{p}\c{n} \c{m}v\c{a}r\c{t}e} \) may be followed by \( \text{\'\text{\c{d}i} \c{p}\c{n}} \)
... so D some MSS of the Old Latin, Sin Syr, Tertullian, Cyprian. (2) γνωτε may be followed by καὶ γινώσκετε (γινώσκετε so W X) ὅτι ..., so p 45, 66, 75, B L Θ fl, some miniscules, some MSS of the Old Latin, etc. (3) γνωτε may be followed by καὶ θυσευθήτω (θυσευθήτω, so N) ὅτι ..., so A ΚΑΠ .createFromX, a host of miniscules, etc. The omission of D is probably to be explained as a result of knowledge of the double use of γινώσκετε which appeared redundant. It would be that the text known used θυσευθήτω, but that the order of γινώσκετε followed by θυσευθήτω suggested that faith was a higher stage than knowledge, and this led to the omission. Although the double use of γινώσκετε is intelligible, the aorist indicating the beginning of knowledge, and the present tense indicating the continuous and progressive state of knowing, but nowhere else in the Gospel do we find a comparable double use of γινώσκετε, though we do find γινώσκετε and θυσευθήτω together in 6:19; (16:30); 17:8; see also 1 John 4:16, and in 6:19; 17:8; and 1 John 4:16 a ὅτι statement follows, and in 17:8; (16:30); 1 John 4:16 the order is "know" and "believe" as it would be in 10:38 if θυσευθήτω is correct. The reading of the second γινώσκετε is probably the result of Gnostic influence which made the order of "know" and "believe" seem intolerable as it seemed to suggest that faith was a higher stage than knowledge. The aorist subjunctive θυσευθήτω is to be adopted being better attested than the present subjunctive, and fits the parallelism with the aorist subjunctive γνωτε better than the present subjunctive would. This is in keeping with the Johannine style, and γνωτε and θυσευθήτω are to be understood as synonyms in this verse indicating full authentic faith which takes account of Jesus' relationship with the Father. We note that faith is demanded by God (6:28) and Jesus (8:31f, 10:37f) and knowledge is given to faith (8:32; 10:38), but the knowledge given to faith can also be understood as authentic faith which has taken account of this knowledge. The faith to which knowledge is promised is only that first turning to Jesus, not authentic faith which already possesses knowledge. The authentic faith is indicated in statements where γινώσκετε appears in parallelism with θυσευθήτω.

The confession of faith in 11:27 appears to be a declaration of
Jesus Messiahship and no more; but like the confession in 6:14, the addition "who comes into the world" marks the Johannine overtone which bears the mark of the post-Easter faith. In view of this it is probable that the words "the Son of God" are also to be taken in a more than Messianic sense, especially as Jesus as "the Son" is a special theme of the Gospel, see 1:14; 3:16ff., 35ff.; 5:17ff.

In chapter 13 there are two predictions concerning the possibility of authentic faith. The aorist subjunctive $\kappa\lambda\iota \tau \epsilon \iota \upsilon \omega \gamma \iota \tau$ is to be read and is attested by $\text{P66 NA D LT}^{\text{O}}$. $\kappa\lambda\iota \tau \epsilon \iota \upsilon \omega \gamma \iota \tau$ is attested by $\text{B C}$. The aorist indicates the commencement of authentic faith. That the disciples did not have faith in the authentic sense is also indicated in 13:36ff. Peter cannot follow Jesus at this juncture but will follow him later. It may be that the evangelist was aware of Peter's death as a martyr, but he is also using $\acute{\omega} \kappa \omega \lambda \varepsilon \nu \theta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ in the more pregnant sense suggest by 8:12, that is, in the sense of authentic faith. This sense is borne out by Peter's inability to follow Jesus in the event of Peter's denial; but authentic faith came later after Jesus' resurrection. Faith as following Jesus emphasizes the element of obedience in faith. The idea of obedience is also brought out in the statements to the effect that those who love Jesus keep his commandments (14:15, 21), his word (14:23), his words (14:24). Love is expressed in obedience, and this love for Jesus is nothing other than authentic faith, and this may also be expressed in terms of abiding 15:4-7.

Jesus' prediction in 13:19 is like that of 14:29 (which also uses the aorist subjunctive). Jesus foretold his passion, his departure to the Father, so that his disciples may not be driven to despair, but through recognition of Jesus' significance in the light of his glorification come to authentic faith 14:29. Authentic faith involved accepting Jesus as $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\delta\iota$ 13:19, see 8:24. Only by believing in Jesus as $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\delta\iota$ could men be saved.

The Farewell discourses are written from the perspective of Jesus' glorification, but with points of contact with the pre-resurrection situation (see 13:36ff.). This is true of the whole Gospel, but the post-resurrection faith has influenced the form of these discourses more strongly. The declaration that the disciples have truly loved
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and believed in Jesus (16:27) must be understood at two levels. Compared
with the crowds the twelve were the true believers, but as yet they did
not truly believe (16:31) as Jesus' question "do you now believe..." indicates. The disciples were about to be scattered, leaving Jesus alone.
Thus it is made clear that the disciples' knowledge and faith (16:30),
though expressed in a form applicable to authentic faith, had yet to face
the crisis of Jesus' departure before it would be authentic. In 16:30
the parallelism is synonymous. To know that Jesus knows all things is
to believe that he had come from God. The same parallelism is to be
noted in 17:8, which is also to be understood from the perspective of
Jesus' glorification. The parallelism is synonymous. To know that Jesus
had come from the Father is to believe that the Father had sent him.
This knowledge and faith came through receiving the Father's words which
Jesus had given to them. Thus we note, as in 8:30ff., that knowledge
(or authentic faith) is given to those who receive Jesus' words, who
abide in them. In the obedience of faith there is knowledge of who
Jesus is. The aorist tenses of 17:8 indicate the commencement of
authentic faith.

Authentic faith involved believing in the risen Jesus who had
overcome the power of death, and who declared himself to be the resur-
rection and the life 11:25f. The faith of "the beloved disciple" as
a consequence of having seen the empty tomb emphasizes this point 20:8.
The fact that Peter is not said to have believed under the same circum-
stances may be intended to answer claims concerning Peter's superiority.
But even so, the faith of "the beloved disciple" had not yet taken
account of the predictions in Scripture concerning Jesus' resurrection.
This understanding of Scripture awaited the activity of the Paraclete,
see 14:26; and 2:22. Thomas' refusal to believe the Apostolic testimony
to the risen Lord emphasizes the fact that authentic faith awaited the
glorification of Jesus. Having satisfied his own terms of reference
Thomas declared his faith in Jesus in fully developed terms as his Lord
and God. To believe (the absolute use of ΧΙΣΤΕΪΤΙΝ in 20:29) means
full Christian faith which, in this context, must include belief in the
risen Lord, and this is crucial for authentic faith. An important point
is then made. Having illustrated the possibility of authentic faith for
those who saw the risen Lord, a blessing is pronounced on those who believe without having seen him. In understanding the meaning of ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ we have noted the emphasis on decision in turning to Jesus, on obedience in following Jesus, and understanding his mission in terms of his death and resurrection.

5. Authentic Christian faith has recognized that in Jesus the Father is active in the world, that in him the Father is known, so that to believe in him is to believe in the Father and to reject him is to reject the Father who sent him, see 5:37-38; 12:44-45; 13:20; 14:1,10-11. Behind these claims lies the Johannine understanding of the incarnation 1:14,18, the descent of the Son of Man 3:13. Because of his relationship to the Father, those who would believe in the Father must believe in him 14:16. Consequently believing in Jesus has also to be understood in terms of believing Jesus' witness to himself, and this involves believing certain things about Jesus. Attention is drawn to this aspect by means of the statements using ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ followed by ΟΗ. Authentic Christian faith involved believing that Jesus is "the holy one of God" 6:69. This text has been corrupted, possibly by the influence of the Synoptic accounts of the confession at Caesarea Philippi (see Matt.16:16; Mk.8:29; Luke 9:20), or by the wording of John 11:27 where Martha confessed that she believed that Jesus was "the Christ the Son of God who comes into the world". The confession of Jesus Messiahship is given added dimension by the words "who comes into the world". Thus it is also to be believed that Jesus has come from the Father, that the Father has sent him, 11:42; 16:27,30; 17:8,21. In this Mission Jesus abides in the Father by performing his will and the Father abides in him by granting him power and authority to perform the works given to him to perform. Authentic faith believes that the Father is in Jesus and Jesus is in the Father 10:38; 14:10,11, and this means believing that Jesus is ΕΥΘΕΑ ΕΙΜΙ 8:24; 13:19. An aspect of authentic faith is recognition, acknowledgment, understanding, and consequently ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΟΗ statements are often made alongside ΥΙΝΕΙΔΕΙΔΕΙΣ statements when believing and knowing have no difference in meaning, see 6:69; 10:38; 17:8; 17:21 and 23. On two occasions ΟΘΕΝΕΙΟΝ statements are made to the same effect, 4:142; 16:30. In 4:42 the Samaritans confessed that Jesus was the
Savior of the world. Believing in Jesus involves believing in the Father who sent his Son to save the world 3:16. The use of these constructions using ὅτε indicates the Christological content of faith.

6. The possibility of believing on a basis other than having seen Jesus is stated early in the Gospel. The witness borne by the Baptist was for the purpose that all men may come to believe through him 1:7. The witness of the Baptist is an important theme in the early part of the Gospel. The Samaritans believed in the first instance on the basis of the woman's testimony to Jesus 4:42, those who believe the testimony of Moses believe in Jesus 5:46-47, but more important is the reference to those who would believe on the basis of the words of the eyewitnesses 17:20. Thus the possibility of faith continues in the world from which Jesus has departed 17:21. This faith is manifest in love for the brethren (15:12) and witness to the world 15:26f. Thus in the abiding of Jesus' word and the activity of the Paraclete the community is united to Jesus and the Father, through faith, and the possibility of faith continues in a more widespread way than was possible before Jesus' glorification 14:12. In 20:29 it is made clear that the faith of those who had not seen Jesus is not second rate. It is faith of the same class as those who had seen Jesus, for only when he had departed did they truly believe.

There are two problem passages, 19:35; 20:31. 19:35 is omitted by a few mss., and it has been suggested that this verse was added later to give the Gospel authority among the orthodox, but the evidence is too slight and we will treat it as part of the original text. The attestation of 19:35 probably only refers to the events surrounding the crucifixion. The evangelist regarded it to be important to assure his readers that Jesus really died, that they may come to believe in the authentic sense. (We should note that the witness of 19:35 is probably "the beloved disciple", but only in 21:24, which is to be regarded as an appendix, is the beloved disciple said to be the author of the Gospel, though it is possible that the meaning is that he wrote part of chapter 21.)

In both 19:35 and 20:31 there is some doubt as to whether ἀκούσαντες or ἀκούσατε is the correct reading. We adopt the aorist subjunctive in both cases as the better attested reading. The
United Bible Societies Greek New Testament adopts the aorist subjunctive for 19:35 and prints no variant, but for 20:31 the aorist subjunctive is given only a 

\[ \varepsilon \] rating. The main difference in evidence appears to be the support of \[ \varepsilon \] and possibly P66 for the present subjunctive in 20:31 over and above \[ \varepsilon \] and B which also read the present subjunctive. The addition of \[ \varepsilon \] cannot bear the weight of this change of emphasis and the evidence of P66 which is fragmentary beyond reconstruction at 19:35, and fragmentary to the extent that the basis for thinking that P66 supports the present subjunctive in 20:31 is apparently a guess at the number of letters that will fit in a space from which the letters are missing. To make the problem more difficult, P66 appears to be written in a fairly uneven hand. The evidence for the aorist subjunctive for 20:31 is \[ \varepsilon \] ACDKLMNOPQRSTUVWXY 0100 f1 f13, a host of miniscules, Byz., Lect., Syr S,p,h,pal. Cyril. The distinction between the aorist and the present subjunctive is not to be understood as "believing for the first time" and "growing in faith". The sense of the aorist in these verses is to indicate the development of authentic faith, and it makes no difference whether the evangelist had in mind unbelievers, or Christians whose faith was not properly grounded. He wrote so that they may come to believe in the fully authentic sense of the word 20:31. The written Gospel, like the witness of the Apostles, had Christology at the heart of its message because only the recognition of the incarnation of the Word, the life, death and resurrection of Jesus as the incarnate Son of God could receive the possibility of eternal life which he had brought about.

To believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, in the Johannine sense, is the same as believing in Jesus' name, see 1:12; 20:31. Believing in Jesus' name is expressed using \[ \varepsilon \] (20:31) as a variation for \[ \varepsilon \] (1:12). We have already argued that \[ \varepsilon \] is used as a variation for \[ \varepsilon \] in 3:15, and as the evangelist often speaks of having eternal life through believing in Jesus or his name 1:12; 3:15,16, 36; 6:35,40; 11:25f., but never of having life in Jesus' name, we conclude that the sense is "and that believing in his name you may have life". Authentic faith has a Christological content and a soteriological consequence.
Believing is, according to the evangelist, along with knowing, the way to receive eternal life. (Eternal life is a description of salvation, see Acts 13:48; 15:11.) (For knowledge in this sense, see 17:3.) When believing is used in this way it may be simply said to believe without stating the object of faith, though of course it is authentic Christian faith that is meant, see 6:47 and also 3:18 where the same point is made by the inference which may be drawn from the negative statement, those who do not believe are condemned already. Such faith has Jesus as its object as is made clear by the mention that those who believe in him, or his name (κρίνειν εἰς) 1:12; 3:16, 18, 36; 6:29, 35, 40; 7:38f.; 11:25f.; 12:36, 46; or κρίνειν ἐν, 3:15; and 20:31; have eternal life. In 3:36 κρίνειν followed by the dative case evidently means to believe in Jesus, but here it is used with a negative. Those who do not believe in Jesus will not see, that is experience or have, life. The only other instance where κρίνειν followed by the dative is related to having eternal life is 5:24. Here it is not faith in Jesus that is required, but faith in the Father who sent him. But this is simply another way of speaking of believing in Jesus as the one who has come from the Father and does his will. In this verse there are not two ways of receiving eternal life mentioned as the ἴδω indicates. Hearing Jesus' word, if it is to lead to eternal life, must be joined to believing in the Father as the one who sent Jesus. The same point is made in 14:1 where faith in God is made the co-ordinate of faith in Jesus, and in 14:6 it becomes clear that Jesus is the Way to the Father so that we do not have two objects of faith, but one, for faith in the Father is directed to Jesus. This is a fundamental aspect of the Gospel, that the Father is revealed in Jesus, and that the only way to believe in the Father is through him. To believe in him is to come to the Father.

"Receiving" Jesus (1:12) or "following" Jesus (8:12) are descriptions of the faith which receives eternal life. The eternal life is not only a new quality of life but a permanent mode of existence, for those who believe "shall never perish" 10:28. "Coming" to Jesus (3:21; 14:6) and "entering" by him are also metaphors for the faith through which salvation is received.

Faith is only possible to those who are drawn by the Father 6:44f.;
6:65; but the Father draws men through the lifting up of the Son of Man, 12:31. There are those who cannot believe in Jesus because they have heard, accepted, and obeyed the word of the devil, and because they accept his word as the truth they cannot accept Jesus' word, see 8:38ff. Because their standards are contrary to Jesus they cannot believe in him 5:44. The refusal to believe indicates that they are not Jesus' sheep 10:26, and the fault for this is not to be laid on Jesus or the Gospel because it is the darkness (the power of darkness and the devil) that has blinded their eyes so that they could not believe 12:39, but those who are of the truth hear, that is believe and obey, his voice.

The Gospel does not allow us to imagine that there are two kinds of men, (The Gospel is anti-Gnostic at this point.) those who by nature believe and those who by nature cannot believe. The Gospel makes clear that all men before they believed were in the darkness, but through believing they are removed from the darkness 12:46. There are no children of God by nature, but those who receive Jesus may become such 1:12. The same is true of the sons of light 12:35.

All men need the gift of eternal life which they may have through faith in Jesus, see 3:15f. Those who fail to believe have been overcome by the darkness 12:35, through which their eyes have been blinded 12:40, and they have been overcome by the darkness because they did not take the opportunity of walking in the light while the possibility existed, 12:35.

9. Faith means the renunciation of the world and its standards, and John emphasizes this point strongly in his treatment of the theme of light and darkness, 1:5; 3:19-21; 8:12; 9:5; 12:35f.; 12:46. In believing the darkness is left behind in coming to the light, in fact in becoming sons of the light. But the Gospel makes it abundantly clear that the believers are not taken out of the world 17:15. They are to live their lives in the world as those who have been freed from the power of the evil one whose ways are the ways of falsehood 8:44ff., and hatred 3:20; 7:7; 15:18ff.; 17:14. They have been freed by the word of God 8:31f.; 17:17. Through faith the believers abide in the word and are freed from the evil power of the prince of this world. Through
faith "the people of God have their particular manner of being and are established". (17)

Here the evangelist is developing an idea which we noted in the Old Testament with particular reference to the prophet Isaiah. There is also a superficial contact with Gnosticism at this point (18). But whereas the Gnostic renunciation of the world was a "writing off" of the value of the material order, for the evangelist it was a renunciation of the standards, or more precisely the standpoint from which the whole of existence was seen, for which the world stood.

10. Faith is expressed in, or through love. Love for Jesus is nothing other than the obedience of faith, and the outward manifestation of this obedience is the love for the brethren (15:12) through which the world recognizes Jesus' disciples, because it is the love which has its pattern in Jesus (13:35), and is manifest in the believers because their life comes from him.
The nouns denoting knowledge are never used in John, but the verbs *γνῶστην* and *εἰδέναι* are used just over one hundred and forty times, just over the total number of uses in the Synoptic Gospels. John stands with the New Testament as a whole with his preference for verbs rather than nouns describing knowledge, but knowledge is a more prominent feature in John than elsewhere in the New Testament. The use of the verbs of believing and knowing emphasizes the active nature of the relationships described, and is not to be explained as an anti-Gnostic device. If the evangelist consciously attempted to refute Gnosticism in some form, it would seem that his method was to take and use their vocabulary for his own purpose. His use of the verbs is to be explained rather by the Hebraic background of the terminology. The increased emphasis on knowledge can be traced through later Judaism in the Wisdom and Apocalyptic literature of the second and first century B.C., and especially the Qumran Texts. We have noted with the developing emphasis on knowledge, a growing tendency towards dualistic thought. Thus there was already a tendency towards Gnosticism in pre-Christian Judaism, and we have noted a similar tendency or development in the Hermetica. The thought of the Gospel is not unrelated to Gnosticism, though to some extent it may be that it is a contributor to the form of Gnosticism which we meet in the second century A.D., and we must be careful not to assume that the precise form of Gnosticism we meet in the second century A.D. anti-dates the Fourth Gospel. But from the Qumran Texts, and to some extent from the Hermetica, it is possible to show that the Gnostic division of men into various groups according to their natures is a pre-Christian (and what is more a non-Christian) form of materialistic dualism. At this point John does have a specifically anti-Gnostic direction. Although the Farewell discourses have a Gnostic kind of secretive setting, and seem to be in fact the impartation of esoteric knowledge to the initiated, it is soon made clear that the whole point of it all is that the world may know the deepest secret 17:23, and this knowledge is saving knowledge as is shown by the link with believing in 17:21, and that as well as knowing of Jesus' mission
the world is to know of God's love for the world 17:23.

It is commonly recognized that the verbs 'to know' are used at various levels of meaning in the Fourth Gospel. The recognition of this point raises the question as to whether εἰδέναι and γνωρίζειν are to be distinguished in the Fourth Gospel.

1. The relationship of γνωρίζειν and εἰδέναι in the Fourth Gospel.

Bultmann is undoubtedly right when he says that these two verbs 'can be used as full equivalents.' He cites John 8:55 with 7:28; 8:19; and 7:27; 14:7; 21:17; 1 Jn. 2:29 as examples. But to say that they can be used as full equivalents does not necessarily mean that they cover exactly the same semantic area, or are capable of doing so. This does in fact seem to be the case, though we shall see, there is some variety of choice in the use of these verbs, but no clear pattern of distinction has emerged, and the most probable conclusion seems to be that we have another instance of the evangelist's use of a pair of words simply for variety without intending any difference of meaning.

Before going further with this point we note that the evangelist has a preference for εἰδέναι, at least as far as word frequency is concerned. He uses εἰδέναι 85 or 86 times and γνωρίζειν 55, 56, or 57 times. This preference follows a trend discernable in the Synoptic Gospels as a whole, though Luke uses γνωρίζειν slightly more frequently than εἰδέναι. εἰδέναι is used 25 times in Matt., 23 times in Mark., 25 times in Luke, and γνωρίζειν is used 20 times in Matt., 13 times in Mark, and 28 times in Luke. The evangelist's preference for εἰδέναι is evidently for use in narrative contexts, because both verbs are used 35 or 36 times in discourse or conversation, but whereas γνωρίζειν is used 21 times in narrative passages εἰδέναι is used 50 times. This fact would seem to indicate that εἰδέναι was more suitable for use in describing everyday knowledge, though the evangelist does use γνωρίζειν in this way also. The fact that εἰδέναι could be used often in an untheological sense must not be allowed to hide the fact that the evangelist could use this word to convey an idea of knowledge charged with theological meaning.

Further, Professor Dodd has drawn attention to the fact that these two verbs were used in the LXX in such a way that there seems to be no
significant difference between them. Both verbs are used to translate the Hebrew ידע (5) This usage is decisive for the Johannine development. It is clear that we must be wary of attributing different meanings to these words in the Fourth Gospel when the whole trend in their use seems to have been in the direction of synonymous alternatives, of which the evangelist is so fond. The distinction made by older commentators that ידוע indicates the human means through which knowledge is gained, and ידעם expresses the fact of knowledge absolutely, or describes knowledge as vision as an intuitive or immediate occurrence, cannot be maintained, at least as far as the Fourth Gospel is concerned.

Gnosticism, as the name suggests, is preoccupied with knowledge, ידוע, and to a lesser extent ידוע כיוון is also used, but ידעם does not have any particularly Gnostic associations. If the evangelist used ידוע כיוון and ידעם interchangeably, this would seem to indicate an association with the development represented by the LXX rather than a borrowing from the Gnostic tradition. This is not to say that there is no relationship with Gnosticism, but that there is no direct borrowing at this point as the Johannine development can be better explained when it is seen to have its roots in the LXX and New Testament tradition. The preoccupation with knowledge in the Fourth Gospel is also to be found in the Wisdom literature as well as in Gnosticism. (A relationship between Gnosticism and the Wisdom tradition in Israel must of course be recognized.) See also pp. 233 ff. above.

That the words are used without distinction of meaning is shown in 7:27, 8:55, 13:17, 14:7, 21:15-17 where, in each passage the evangelist uses first one and then the other verb. There is no reason to suppose that a different kind of knowledge is in view, on the contrary the reverse is true. Thus Peter can declare that Jesus knows of his (Peter's) love using first ידעם and then ידוע כיוון. Knowing the Father in Jesus can be described by both verbs, and Jesus told Peter that although he did not understand the meaning of the foot washing at that time, he would understand later, using first ידעם and then ידוע כיוון. Whereas Jesus told the Jews that they did not know God (ידיוע כיוון), he declared that he himself does know God (ידיעם). The Jews claimed to know Jesus' origin (ידיעם), but
future realization of knowledge is in view, 7:17; 8:28,32; 10:38; 13:7,35; 14:20,31; 17:3,23. But this is merely the matter of the appropriateness of this grammatical form. The evidence seems to point to a synonymous meaning in the use of the two verbs of knowing in the Fourth Gospel. (7)

2. The Father is never said to know any one except the Son, and this is said only once (using γινώσκειν) in 10:15, where the Son's knowledge of the Father is also spoken of, and in the preceding verse the same pattern of "mutual knowledge" is described concerning the relationship which exists between Jesus and "his own". "The present passage, which stresses the mutual knowledge of God and the believer, raises acutely the problem of the origin of John's conception of knowledge". (8) Bultmann claims that the origin of this conception is to be found in mysticism, and in particular in the Gnostic literature. (9) He acknowledges that the evangelist does not understand this formular in the mystical sense where the knower and the known lose their identity in the resultant unity. In the context of the Johannine idea of revelation the relation expressed in these terms does not lose the quality of address and challenge. In John the meaning of this formular is that each of the persons described in terms of mutual relationship realizes his being in this relationship with the other person, that his life is in fact determined by the other person. But the difference from the Gnostic sense is so radical that it must be doubted that this is the real source of the Johannine idea. It may well be that some form of mystical piety influenced the Johannine form in John 10:14-15, but this is the only place where knowledge is expressed in terms of the mutual relationship, and it seems doubtful that this form should be regarded as central to the Johannine use. (Even in 10:14f.27, the meaning is closer to the idea of knowledge in its varied Old Testament use).

In support of the mystical background to the use of γινώσκειν Bultmann indicates that the meaning is the same as ἐναυ ἐν in the Johannine usage (John 15:1ff.; 17:21). (10) But the meaning of 'being in' or 'abiding in' in the Fourth Gospel is not to be understood in the mystical sense any more than γινώσκειν. Jesus' abiding in the
Father is the keeping of his commands, and the Father's abiding in Jesus is his commission, or sending of Jesus. The ideas expressed here have their foundation in the Old Testament, though the form of the statements may perhaps have been influenced by some form of mysticism. Professor Dodd has recognized the fundamental contribution of the Old Testament to the Johannine idea of knowledge. "It has direct analogy with the idea of mutual 'knowledge' between God and man which is part of the Hebrew prophetic consciousness." He indicates that the sense of εἰδέω in these passages, even when translated by γινώσκειν in the LXX, differs from the purely Hellenistic sense of the term, but passes into the so called "Gnostic" sense which meets us in the Hermetica. He claims that the development of this Gnostic sense is due to the development of the Hellenistic sense under the influence of Judaism, and that "Consequently, the contrast between 'Old Testament' and 'Gnostic' conceptions of γινώσκειν must not be too sharply drawn."

But while we agree with Professor Dodd concerning the Old Testament background of the Johannine idea of knowledge, it should be recognized that the Old Testament idea differs significantly from the mystical and Gnostic idea where knower and known cease to be distinguished from each other. The influence of the Old Testament in its Greek dress upon such writings as the Hermetica is clear, but it remains true that the resultant idea of knowledge is far removed from the thought of the Old Testament.

John 10:15 raises the question concerning the origin of the idea of knowledge expressed in terms of the Father's knowledge of Jesus. Professor Dodd takes this as an example of the Old Testament idea of God's knowledge of man. But though there is a connection between the relationship of Jesus to the Father in the Fourth Gospel and the relationship of God and man in the Old Testament, the former is not an example of the latter. That the connection is different is shown by 10:14-15 where Jesus' relationship with the Father is shown to be primary and his relationship with his own is secondary, and based on his relationship with the Father. The Father knows the Son (the Son is implied by the use of "the Father"), and this is not to be understood in the sense of the Father's knowledge of a man in the Old
As this is the only reference to the Father's knowledge, the common theme in the Old Testament of God's knowledge of man does not appear at all in the Fourth Gospel. But this statement needs to be modified to some extent because in the Fourth Gospel Jesus as the Son of God confronts men as the incarnate Word and displays the kind of knowledge which is attributed to God in the Old Testament, see 1:48; 2:24f.; 10:14, 27; 13:11; 16:19; 6:64.

The meaning of the Father's knowledge of the Son, which is the pattern of Jesus' knowledge of his own (note the ἴδου in 10:15,) can be discovered from the meaning of Jesus' knowledge of his own, because this is more fully described in terms of knowledge. Of course this meaning can be confirmed from what is said in other contexts concerning Jesus' relationship with the Father. In 10:27 the theme of 10:14 is taken up with additional terms to explain the meaning of mutual knowledge. The knowledge which "his own" have of him is described in terms of hearing and following, that is the obedience of faith. Jesus' knowledge of his own is described in terms of his initiative in speaking, or calling to his own to follow, and also in terms of giving them eternal life. Both of these points can be found in terms of Jesus' relationship with the Father. The Father has given him the commandment, 10:18, which involves the mission for which he came into the world, and also the means to effectively perform it. This interpretation is also confirmed by Jesus' stress on his continual obedience to the Father, 4:34, and it is also clear that this knowledge is the means by which the love of the Father for the Son is made effectual in giving all things into his hands and in revealing all things to him, in giving the same life to him which the Father himself has, 3:35; 5:20, 26, and this life is also life-giving, 5:21. Thus in knowing the Son the Father gives him of his own life and authority, and in this the Father lays down the pattern for his life. The Father's knowledge of the Son is the effective sending of him into the world. This is related to the idea of election which we meet in the Old Testament, but is better described, when applied to Jesus, in terms of
commissioning.

3. **The Son's knowledge is spoken of frequently.**

   i. **The Son's knowledge of the Father.** (Both verbs are used to express this theme but ἐπιστήμη is used also of the Father's knowledge of the Son, and therefore of mutual knowledge). These references are all in statements made by Jesus where he claims to know the Father himself. As Professor Dodd has indicated, there is no reference in the Old Testament where 'a prophet expressly says that he knows God.' But Israel is expected to know God, and the pious Israelite is said to know God, Psalm 35 (36):10. Nevertheless, Jesus' claims to know God are unique because he claims this for himself with the same certainty with which he denies it concerning the Jews. The prophets did the latter, see Isaiah 1:3 etc., but never made the affirmation for themselves. Perhaps this observation should not be greatly stressed because it is understood that the prophets knew God, having stood in his secret council. But it is never said in the Gospel that Jesus believes in the Father. His knowledge arises out of a direct relationship with the Father, and all other knowledge of the Father is mediated through him to those who believe. The stress on Jesus' knowledge of the Father indicates his significance as God's act for, and Word to, the world. The Jews' ignorance of the Father was indicated by their rejection of him who alone could give them life. Consequently in 7:29; 8:55; 17:25; Jesus' knowledge of the Father is affirmed in the context of the denial of the Jews' (and the world's) knowledge of the Father. Jesus' knowledge of the Father is rooted in his eternal relationship with the Father 17:26. This relationship is the basis of Jesus' mission into the world and consequently those who reject him indicate thereby that they do not know the Father who sent Jesus. Jesus' knowledge is manifest in performing the Father's will, and consequently the Father is to be known in Jesus. (17:3) in the recognition that as the one sent by the Father, Jesus reveals the Father and does his will, 17:25; (and note 10:15, 17f.).

   ii. **Jesus' knowledge of the Father is expressed also in his awareness of his relationship with the Father.** (Only εἰς τὸν is used to express this theme). Jesus asserted his complete dependence on the
Father to the extent of claiming that the Father's works were accomplished in and through him, 5:17-30. Self-witness which asserted his independence of the Father would be manifestly false 5:31, but as Jesus did his Father's will he knew that the Father's witness to him was true, 5:32,36. The Father's witness to Jesus is not something apart from Jesus and the works which the Father had given him to perform. The Father's witness and the witness of the works are to be understood as a single witness. The Father's witness in the works of Jesus indicated that Jesus had been sent by the Father and performed his works. In his obedience to the Father Jesus knew that the witness was in accord with the facts, the witness was true. But this witness cannot verify Jesus' claim to be sent by God. It becomes the means by which Jesus' claims are presented more forcefully, and at the same time indicates that "the truth of God in Jesus is self-authenticating in the experience of the believer;"(16) and that ultimately no external form of verification is possible.

The self-witness Jesus bore to himself was valid because this witness asserted his dependence on the Father. He knew that the Father had sent him, that is he knew his origin, and he knew his destination, that is he affirmed the Father's will for him 8:14. Self-testimony here is ultimately to be understood as Jesus' witness to the Father, and in his witness it is the Father who bears witness to Jesus 8:18. That Jesus knows where he is going indicates that he is not to be taken by surprise by the approaching events, see 6:61,64; 13:1,11,18; 16:30; 18:4; 19:28. He even knows who is to betray him 6:64; 13:11,18. Jesus, knowing his origin, understands himself truly, and knowing his destination, understands his purpose in the world correctly. His testimony is on a different plane from all other human testimony.

Jesus' relationship with the Father was experienced consciously. It is asserted not only that the Father always heard Jesus, but that Jesus knew that the Father always heard him 11:42. Jesus knew this on the basis of his relationship with the Father in which he always performed the Father's will. He knew that the Father willed that the world may have eternal life 12:50. Consequently Jesus has the words of eternal life 6:68. Jesus knowledge of the Father's will is the
basis of his activity in the world 3:16 etc. Jesus mediates the Father's will to the world. His knowledge of the Father's will is active in bringing that will into actuality. This activity is related to the evangelist's understanding of Jesus as the Logos who performs the Father's will. The Father's gift of all things to the Son is to be understood in terms of independence from the Father. The gift is to be understood in terms of Jesus' mission from the Father in performing his will. This point is made by reference to Jesus' coming from and return to the Father. But in stating that the Father had given all things into Jesus' hand the point is made that Jesus performs the Father's will with absolute freedom. Not only is this to be regarded as freedom, but "knowing that the Father had given all things..." but conscious freedom in obedience to the Father.

Four of these five references (5:32; 8:14; 11:42; 12:50; 13:3) uses the έδειξαν Θεόν (8:14 is the exception) construction, and all five express Jesus' self-awareness in terms of his relationship with the Father in terms of his life and mission in the world. This knowledge arises out of his direct relationship with the Father, through which he mediates knowledge of God to men.

iii. On two occasions Jesus joins himself with others who are also said to have knowledge 3:11; 4:22. In 3:11 we assume that Jesus has joined with himself the disciples, and speaking to Nicodemus in the plural joins with him the Jews who were said to have believed on the basis of "signs" 2:23ff. The need for, and possibility of the new birth is the substance of the testimony which was not received. But prior to Jesus' glorification the disciples had not understood this point either. Thus the form of this verse bears the marks of the post-resurrection situation when the disciples faced the implacable opposition of the Jews as had himself.

Unlike 3:11; 4:22 fits naturally into the context of Jesus' ministry. Jesus made clear to the Samaritan woman that he as a Jew, in contrast to the Samaritans, knew God. But there is also an overtone of the Samaritan mission. Worship was to be offered to God on the basis of the revelation in Jesus, and in the power of the Spirit, given to those who believe in him, see 4:23ff.; 7:39etc. The mission situation is also reflected in
4:35ff., and this would seem to confirm our opinion that the mission situation should also be understood in 4:22.

iv. In the course of events Jesus displayed a means of knowing which set him apart from other men, knowledge such as is normally only attributed to God. He knows what men are secretly thinking, their innermost secret thoughts, 2:24f. See Psalm 139(138). Jesus had access to knowledge apart from the use of the five senses, and consequently it is difficult to know whether knowledge of the kind which was accessible to the senses was in fact acquired through sensory perception or not. For this reason we will consider knowledge which was apparently acquired by sensory perception, knowledge about which there is some doubt as to its nature, and knowledge is clearly not dependent on sensory perception.

From the evidence of the Jews' failure to believe in him, and the motive of their self seeking, Jesus drew the conclusion that the love of God was not in them 5:42. (See John 5:26; 6:53; 1 John 3:15 and compare John 5:42. To have eternal life is to have God's love.) This love is expressed in faith in Jesus and concern for men. Thus in the failure to believe in Jesus and in their lack of concern for the man Jesus had healed the Jews gave Jesus the evidence from which his conclusion was drawn (see 14:15; 15:10; 14:1, etc.)

Jesus' knowledge that the Jews were descendants of Abraham (8:37), and the knowledge that Pilate suggested Jesus would have concerning Pilate's power (19:10) are to be regarded as common knowledge, though Jesus' knowledge of Pilate's authority went beyond Pilate's suggestion. There are four instances where, if the text had said "Jesus heard" instead of "Jesus knew" the knowledge spoken of would clearly be such as is acquired through the senses, 4:1; 6:15,61; 16:19. In 4:1; 6:15; 16:19 the most natural interpretation would seem to suggest that Jesus acquired this knowledge through the senses. But it is not said how Jesus knew that the Pharisees had heard (4:1); or how he knew that the crowd was about to make him king (6:15); or how he knew that the disciples were about to ask him a question (16:19). It seems reasonable to suggest that the intent of the crowd was apparent in the situation, and that the questioning of the disciples had been overheard (16:17-18)
by Jesus. But against this interpretation of 4:1; 6:15; 16:19 we must note 6:61. It may be suggested that Jesus overheard the murmuring of the disciples. The evangelist did not say this. Rather it is said that Jesus knew ἐν εαυτῷ, "in himself". Knowledge apart from normal sensory perception is indicated.

Jesus justified his statement about Nathaniel, which indicated knowledge of him, by saying that he had seen him under the fig tree 1:48. But Nathaniel's response indicates that Jesus had not been in a position to have seen this incident. Sight indicates, in this situation, something other than physical sight, first hand knowledge of Nathaniel and is an illustration of Jesus' knowledge of all men (γινώσκειν ἔχως ἔτοιμος); see 16:30; 21:17 οἶδας ἔτοιμος. Knowing all men includes the most searching scrutiny of their innermost being, see Psalm 139(138). Jesus' knowledge of the Paralytic (5:6) was prior to seeing him. When he saw him, he knew he had been there a long time already. It could be suggested that Jesus drew the conclusion that the man had been at the pool a long time from something that he saw. But there is nothing to suggest this in the text.

Though 7:15 could mean "How can this man read...?" the correct interpretation is "How did this man acquire such knowledge (to carry on a learned disputation) without formal education?" Such knowledge could have been learned from a teacher, but Jesus claimed that his knowledge was derived from his relationship with the Father. Those who do the Father's will, that is, believe in Jesus will know that Jesus' teaching is one with the Father's will, 7:17; 6:28-29. Jesus' knowledge has a certainty which enables him to ask a question knowing already what he would do 6:6. This certainty arose from his understanding of the situation and from his awareness of his own ability to meet this situation. His knowledge of his own ability was rooted in his knowledge of his origin and destination. He knew that he was to return to the Father by way of the cross through the betrayal of Judas 6:64; 13:1,11, 18. He also knew who did not truly believe in him 6:64. Nothing took Jesus by surprise 18:14. He was the master of his fate, and calmly proceeded to his appointed goal. He knew when that goal had been reached 19:28; and fulfilment is emphasized by reference to Psalm 22(21):16.
Jesus is said to know all men 2:24, and the disciples acknowledge that Jesus knows all things 16:30; 21:17. The affirmation in 16:30 is based on an affirmation that Jesus had come from God, in other words, it is a Christological affirmation. The same is really true of 21:17 also. As Jesus knows all things he is said to know of Peter's love for him, 21:15-17. This knowledge does not arise from the observation of Peter's behaviour. The threefold denial, foretold in 13:38 would indicate that he did not love him. But Peter did not appeal to his own behaviour as proof of his love, he appealed to Jesus' omniscience. Thus Jesus is said to know, in spite of the events of the recent past, of Peter's love for him.

In this section the two verbs of knowing are used without distinction and the distribution is proportionate. \( \psi \nu \omega \delta \kappa \varepsilon \iota \nu \) is used in 1:48; 2:24; 4:1; 5:6, 42; 6:15; 16:19; 21:17; and \( \epsilon \iota \beta \varepsilon \omega \alpha \iota \) in 6:16, 61, 64; 7:15; 8:37; 13:1, 11, 19; 16:30; 18:4; 19:10, 28; 21:15, 16, 27. The most important conclusion concerns the fact that the evangelist's understanding of Jesus' ability to know is rooted in his understanding of Christology. Because Jesus is the heavenly Son of Man he possesses supernatural knowledge and faced the events of the future as master of the situation and moved into the future with the certainty of one who knows he is fulfilling the divine will.

Just as it is said that the Father knows Jesus and that Jesus knows him, so it is also said that Jesus knows "his own" and "his own" know him, 10:14, 27. Jesus' knowledge of "his own" is to be understood in terms of calling them to follow him (believe), and giving them eternal life. His own know him in that they hear and follow. Though only \( \psi \nu \omega \delta \kappa \varepsilon \iota \nu \) is used to describe this relationship \( \epsilon \iota \beta \varepsilon \omega \alpha \iota \) is used of Jesus' knowledge of the Father, and Jesus' knowledge of "his own" is connected to the knowledge the Father has of him as is indicated by \( \kappa \alpha \delta \omega \) 10:14-15.

There are certain references to "knowing" which are not theologically important. See 2:9; (3:8); 9:12, 20, 21, 25; 11:49; 12:35; 15:15; 18:2, 21; 20:2, 13; where \( \epsilon \iota \beta \varepsilon \omega \alpha \iota \) is used, and in 7:51; (10:4, 5); 11:57; 12:9; 13:28; 19:14; where \( \psi \nu \omega \delta \kappa \varepsilon \iota \nu \) is used. Speaking of the use of the \( \psi \nu \omega \delta \kappa \varepsilon \iota \nu \) construction in John Franz Mussner (17) says, "In these
sentences 'only Jesus appears as the object of the cognition and that in his quality as divinely-sent redeemer'..."(18) He continues, "In short statements of a Christological kind are the object of the cognition in \(\ddot{o}t\) sentences."(19) But this is misleading. The evangelist does not use the \(\gamma\nu\nu\delta\varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\nu\ \ddot{o}t\) construction exclusively for this purpose, see 4:53; 12:9; 19:14; and the content of Jesus' knowledge is also expressed using this construction; see 4:1; 5:6, 42; 6:15; 16:19; 21:17. Mussner is also mistaken in quoting 4:22 as an illustration of this point as \(\gamma\nu\nu\delta\varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\nu\ \ddot{o}t\) is not used in this verse though \(\epsilon\iota\sigma\varepsilon\nu\alpha\kappa\iota\) is, but without \(\ddot{o}t\). It may be that 4:42 is in mind, but this is an instance where \(\epsilon\iota\sigma\varepsilon\nu\alpha\kappa\iota\ \ddot{o}t\) is used. Mussner is also mistaken in quoting 7:17 as an illustration of this usage.(20)

There are several occasions when it said that Jesus was not known, meaning only that he had not yet become a public figure. The Baptist spoke of Jesus as one whom he had not known himself, and indicated that his own work was to make Jesus known to Israel, see 1:26, 31, 33. Jesus was made known to the Baptist through an appointed sign, but it was through witness that all men should come to believe (1:7), and in this way Jesus was to be made known. In 5:13 we are told that a man healed by Jesus did not know him. We are probably right in concluding that this saying reflects the period prior to Jesus' popularity.

5. The "World" did not know God in Jesus.

1. The world did not have knowledge of the true God, but the Jews had received the special revelation in the Old Testament 4:22. The Samaritans represented "the world" although they possessed part of the Old Testament, but through perversion of this they were cut off from the sphere of revealed religion. "The world" was closed to God's original revelation, but the special revelation had been given to the Jews, and consequently it is said that they worshipped according to knowledge. Correct knowledge or theology is to be recognized, and is sometimes expected in the people Jesus met. This knowledge is to be understood as derived from the revelation in the Old Testament.

Nicodemus as "the teacher of Israel" (the article gives Nicodemus a preeminent position) should have known about the "new birth" (see Ezek.37:1-14) in that the Old Testament gave a basis for understanding.
this statement. The Samaritan woman expressed the opinion that when
the Messiah came he would reveal all things 4:25. This belief seems to
be based on the identification of the eschatological Prophet of
Deut.18:15ff. with the Messiah, an identification which met with Jesus' approval as his self-revelation indicates 4:26. The woman's theology
was right because it was based on the Old Testament, and consequently
at this point the statement represents the faith of Judaism.

By the Pharisaic standard a crowd of common people are said to be
accursed because they do not know the Law, 7:49. This saying reflects
the bad feeling which existed between "the people of the land" and the
educated class. "Knowing the Law" is to be understood in terms of
education and formal religion. The educated class regarded "the people
of the land" as being outside the pale of true religion, and therefore
accursed.

That God had spoken to Moses was a basic belief of Judaism 9:29;
and the idea that God did not hear sinners, (9:31) was justifiable from
the Old Testament point of view (see Isaiah 59:2). Martha's confession
that she knew that Lazarus would rise on the last day (11:24) was
orthodox Pharisaic belief (see Dan.12:2), and justifiable from the
Old Testament. We see therefore that the possession of the Old Testament
meant that the Jews could have a correct knowledge of theology. This
theology should have led the Jews to believe in Jesus, 5:39-46. But
failing this consequence the time of the theological advantage of the
Jews was brought to an end by the coming of Jesus, through which all
men were called on to believe in him and receive the Spirit 4:23.

11. The "world" has not known God, the Word, or the Spirit. This
failure of knowledge is to be understood as a failure to comprehend and
obey. It is stated categorically that the world did not know God 17:25;
and the Jews, in spite of their possession of the Old Testament failed
to know God because their standard of truth had been perverted by the
devil 8:55. This perversion prevented the witness of the Old Testament
from leading them to God, but led them instead to the devil whom they
called their father, and thinking him to be God, they served him. They
had not understood the character of God, nor known his will, and con­
sequently they had not obeyed him.
The failure to know God was manifest in the rejection of Jesus who was sent by the Father 7:28; and the rejection of those whom Jesus sent in his name 15:21. The failure to recognize the activity of God at this level is an indication that his character and will have not been known. Because the Father is revealed in Jesus, the failure to know Jesus is the failure to know the Father 16:3; and this is indicated by the dual object of οὐκ ἐγνώκετο. By rejecting Jesus the world has rejected the knowledge of God, and in the situation of the Church's mission, by rejecting the Church's witness the world rejects in Jesus, the knowledge of God.

Two problems need to be raised; (1) Concerning the Gnostic and Johannine use of "the world" and; (2) The relationship of the unbelieving Jews and "the world". "The world" that did not know the Λόγος, though it was made by him, stands openly condemned 1:10. This is the force of the statement, "the world was made by him". In Gnostic circles it was only to be expected that "the world" would not know the Λόγος, but the idea that the Λόγος had made "the world" shatters the Gnostic framework as does the statement that "his own" did not receive him 1:11. The evangelist may have been aware of a tendency to divide men into groups, in one of which the Λόγος was active whereas the men of flesh who belonged to "the world" were beyond his sphere of activity. But by stating that the Λόγος was responsible for the being of the whole created order this point of view was denied, and by drawing attention to the world's failure to know the Λόγος he indicated the unfulfilled possibility of revelation given in creation. But from this point onwards to be of "the world" is the description of those who reject Jesus, of whom the Jews are the typical example. Thus Jesus can say that "the world" has hated him 15:19; and that he chose his disciples (and the twelve were Jews) out of "the world" 15:19, so that they no longer belong to "the world". In 1:11 it is indicated that by the rejection of the Λόγος the Jews cast in their lot with "the world".

Because "the world" has rejected Jesus it cannot receive the Spirit who is given to those who believe in Jesus 7:39. Only by faith in Jesus can the Spirit be received and recognized at work in those who believe, in their life and witness through which the possibility of faith con-
tinues for the world; see 15:26ff.; 17:21ff.

Consequently, though there are statements which seem to indicate that there are those who are predisposed to believe (see 8:43ff.; 10:26), this approach is excluded (see 1:10ff.) in that all men, even the Apostles, belonged to the world before they believed in Jesus 15:18, and the offer of salvation is made without restriction to all men 3:16; 8:31ff.; 10:37ff. Jesus' coming into the world created a new possibility through which the world which was headed for disaster in the grip of falsehood and death came under judgement and the new possibility of life came into being 12:31ff. The apparent determinism has been used to indicate that the world cannot free itself from the power which holds it in darkness, falsehood and death. But the coming of Jesus has brought about, miraculously, this new possibility of life, see 12:35, 46, etc. The world cannot receive this possibility as long as it refuses to give up its own point of view. The truth of the revelation is open only to faith. How then can "the world" come to believe if only by believing it can know the truth of the revelation. Logically the position looks impossible, but the evangelist believed in the miraculous power of the revelation to break through and overcome the world. In the revelation event the impossible becomes possible, the world may come to believe.

iii. Those who failed to believe in Jesus failed to understand Jesus' ultimate origin. Because Jesus was assessed in purely human terms they failed to see that the Father was revealed in him. Because they considered it impossible that God should be revealed in a man they regarded Jesus' claim to be blasphemy, see 10:33. Anything which did not meet their pre-determined standard of judgement was rejected. Jesus performed good works on the Sabbath, and by their standard this proved that he did not come from God, see 5:9ff.; 7:23ff.; 9:14ff., and they supposed him to be from Galilee which, in their view, excluded him from any eschatological importance, see 7:41ff., 52. The Jews had built a dogmatic system by which they determined what God may do and say, thinking that by doing this they had made life secure when in reality they had thrown away the possibility of life.

The Jews rejected Jesus' claims because they said that they knew
his earthly origin 6:42; 7:27f. The "Jews" knew Jesus' father and mother, and could not accept his claim to a heavenly origin. By their own definition earthly parentage excluded the possibility of a heavenly significance. It is at this point that they made their mistake. But it is possible that the evangelist had in mind the probability that his readers were aware of the Synoptic tradition of the virgin birth and expected the response "But they did not know his father." The idea that Jesus was the Messiah was disqualified on the ground that Jesus was known to come from Galilee, but it was said that the origin of the Messiah was unknown 7:27f. In both 7:27f and 6:42 the Jews took no account of Jesus' claim that the Father had sent him. The unknown origin of Messiah (7:27) is contradicted in 7:42 where it is said that the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem, and in 7:52 the proof texts of Scripture are said to prove that (the) prophet does not come from Galilee. The contradiction of argument is complicated further by 9:29ff. where the Jews said that they knew God had spoken to Moses, but they did not know from whence Jesus had come. In this way Jesus' claim to have come from God was denied, but they did not wish to deal with the question of the origin of Jesus' authority, and the man who had been blind saw the irony of the situation 9:30. Only those who had closed their minds to the truth could turn away from the question of the origin of Jesus' authority. Jesus' unique authority was dependent on his origin and destination 8:14ff. He was sent by the Father and his life was given in fulfilment of the Father's will. The Jews' rejection of Jesus' claim was based on judgement KATA TIN 

SARKA. Their knowledge of his human origin disqualified his divine claims, as far as they were concerned. They failed to ask if God had sent Jesus, or if Jesus did the Father's will. By their refusal to recognize Jesus' claim, the Jews failed to know the Father in Jesus 8:19. They failed to understand that he was referring to the Father when he spoke of the one who sent him 8:26-27, because they could not hear (in faith) Jesus' word 8:43. Because they could not believe they could not know. Jesus went to claim the ultimate authority of giving eternal life to those who kept his word. This claim brought the affirmation from the Jews "Now we know that you have a devil", 8:52.
This conclusion was based on their opinion that Jesus was not greater than Abraham. The μη suggests that a negative answer was expected to the question in 8:53. Jesus affirmed that he was greater than Abraham (8:58) and this was not impossible because God's eschatological purpose was not fulfilled in Abraham, as the Jews should well have known (note 8:56). Jesus' words were a warning to the Jews against limiting God's act in the present and future by what he had done in the past. If such a limitation was made they would never be able to see God's greatest act in the Word made flesh. But because the past was determinative for them they declared that he was demon possessed and would have stoned him 8:59.

The Jews also affirmed "we know that this man is a sinner," 9:24f. This opinion was based on their understanding of the law concerning the Sabbath. Because Jesus worked on the Sabbath he is classed as a sinner, see also 9:16. But in drawing this conclusion four major points were overlooked which, if considered, would have brought a different conclusion. (1) The nature of the work was overlooked. This was the starting point for the man Jesus had healed who, on the basis of this work refused to commit himself as to whether Jesus was technically a sinner 9:25. But instead he kept the fact that he had been blind but could now see in view 9:25. The miraculous nature of the work is further stressed in 9:32. The conclusion which he drew from this datum was that Jesus had come from God 9:33. It was not just the miraculous nature of the work that was stressed, for it was a transparently good act that Jesus had done. This point is brought out in 7:23, where in making a man whole on the Sabbath Jesus indicated that his act was a good work 7:21. (2) The man Jesus had healed pointed out that God does not heed sinners, but those who worship him 9:31. (See Isaiah 59:2 etc.) But in asserting the primacy of the law the Jews had already excluded this evidence. (3) In an earlier discussion about works on the Sabbath Jesus had pointed out that the Sabbath law was waived when it clashed with the law of circumcision 7:23. Jesus asked the Jews to see his works as perfecting man as circumcision perfected man, and was justified as a permissible work. (23) (4) But the key point was made in 5:17, "My Father works until now, and I work". God's continuous
activity was recognized by Philo and the Rabbis. God continued his creative work. But when Jesus claimed that he does what God does, the Jews took offence. They considered that Jesus had made himself equal to God. (See 10:33). This claim to equality was understood by the Jews to mean independence from God when in reality Jesus' equality was manifest in his complete dependence on the Father.

But the Jews were unable to understand this kind of equality and consequently they dismissed Jesus' claim to reveal the Father.

6. **Faith and Knowledge.**

1. "Knowledge", like "faith" is used to express a partial recognition of Jesus' significance. Nicodemus' confession "We know that you are a teacher come from God..." 3:21 represents the faith of those mentioned in 2:23ff as is indicated by the fact that "signs" are the basis of faith, ἀσημένιον links 2:25 and 3:1; and the representative nature of the confession is indicated by the use of the plural "we" 3:2. The confession indicates a reasonable openness to Jesus, and is the conclusion which was drawn on the basis of the tradition and history of Israel. But just as 2:24f made clear that a reasonable openness to Jesus was not enough, so Jesus' demand of the new birth was an indication that the fabric of Judaism was not able to contain Jesus' significance.

The fact that although Jesus' arrest had been ordered, he appeared openly raised the tentative question as to whether the rulers may possibly have come to know that Jesus was the Messiah 7:26. But the rulers had not changed their minds. Martha's confession that she knew that God always heard Jesus (11:22) may mean no more than that she believed Jesus to be man who worshipped God and did his will 9:31.

11. **Knowledge is sometimes said to open the way to authentic faith.** Jesus told the Samaritan woman that had she known the gift of God and who it was who asked her for a drink she would have asked and been given living water 4:10. The living water indicates "eternal life" related to the gift of the Spirit 7:37ff. To recognize this gift and Jesus as the giver opens the way to the asking of authentic faith. Of course, to separate the knowledge, which we have described as recognition, from the asking of faith is artificial because the asking is bound up with
The nobleman, having believed Jesus’ word progressed to authentic faith through the knowledge that his son had been healed at the time Jesus had spoken the words of healing 4:33. The wording indicates conversion (see Acts 18:8), and is probably to be understood as an indication of the influence of the Church’s mission on this narrative.

iii. If knowledge is sometimes said to open the way to authentic faith, faith is also said to open the way to authentic knowledge. Jesus declared that God was the origin of his teaching, and that the Jews would know this if they willed to do God’s will 7:17. There are probably two levels of meaning in this statement. God’s will was revealed in the law given by Moses, but the Jews refused to keep this 7:19; they were closed to God’s will and unwilling to change their ways. If they would obey Moses’ law they would come to believe in Jesus 5:39f., 46f. Secondly, those who do God’s will are those who believe in Jesus 6:29. Thus there is no avoiding the scandal of coming to believe in Jesus if the origin of his teaching is to be known.

The "believers" mentioned in 8:30-31 do not represent two groups, but one group described by two different constructions. They had turned to Jesus in superficial faith and were challenged to enter into an authentic relationship with Jesus through abiding in faith 8:31-32. Jesus had yet to confront these Jews with their need for freedom from sin 8:34, that is salvation. Unless they came to accept their need for "freedom" they would not recognize that in Jesus this freedom had become possible. If they would believe what Jesus had to say about their bondage they would know the truth and be freed from sin by the Son 8:32,36. "Knowing the truth" means knowing Jesus as the giver of eternal life and the way to the Father (14:6) and involves knowing the true human situation of the need of salvation. Knowing in this sense is not to be understood theoretically, but involves commitment to Jesus as the one in whom eternal life is given to men. This knowledge (see also 17:3) which is life-giving is to be compared with authentic faith to which eternal life is promised 3:15ff.

Jesus’ claim to be the Son of God was regarded as blasphemy by the Jews (see 10:30-33). Jesus’ justification from the Old Testament
(10:34,35) was only a bridge towards his claim, not a full justification of it (10:36). The question is taken up in Jesus' appeal to his works 10:32,37f. The works which he did should be attributed to the Father who sent him. Recognition of his works as "good works" was at least a starting point. Though the Jews could not accept Jesus' claim to be one with the Father if they would accept his works as "commissioned by the Father" they would come to know and believe (27) that Jesus and the Father were one, that the Father had sent Jesus, and that Jesus obeyed the Father 10:38. The claim of Jesus could not be avoided, but if the claim proved to be an initial stumbling block, Jesus was willing for men to start with reference to his works rather than that they should reject his claim out of hand. In the clause ἐν γνώσει καὶ ἔργοι knowledge and faith are identical as is marked by the use of the clause to provide the content of knowledge and faith. Knowledge and faith are joined together to indicate that such knowledge is only possible to those who believe. The faith in view here is authentic faith in contrast with the superficial faith in Jesus' works to which knowledge and authentic faith are given.

7. Authentic knowledge and Jesus' glorification.

1. That the disciples failed to have authentic knowledge prior to Jesus' glorification is brought out by indicating from time to time their failure to understand Jesus and his relationship to the Father. The disciples failed to know Jesus' relationship to the Father, doing his will 4:32. They failed to understand the parable of the Good Shepherd 10:16; (28) they failed to understand the significance of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem until he had risen from the dead 12:16. Peter was told that although he did not understand the "footwashing" he would understand later 13:7. The point is taken up again in 13:17 where the use of ποιεῖν is to be understood in terms of the footwashing. The reference to "doing" as well as "knowing" in this verse seems to be spurious. Reference to "doing" is omitted in ε and sin has the reference to "doing" in a different order. The idea of "doing" may have been suggested by such passages as Matt.7:21,24-27, and John 12:47f., where "hearing" and "doing" are associated. But the evangelist never suggested (if 13:17 is not authentic) that "knowing" needed to be
supplemented by "doing". Knowing "these things" involved obedience to Jesus' commands given in word and example. The disciples would be blessed later when they knew what the footwashing symbolised.

The disciples' failure to truly know Jesus is brought out in chapter 14. When Jesus said that the disciples knew both his destination and route (14:4) Thomas replied in terms which indicate that they did not know either of these things 14:5. The unfulfilled conditional clause in 14:7 confirms our conclusion that the disciples had not truly known Jesus, and therefore had not known the Father through him. Although Jesus said "from now on you have seen him and known him" 14:7; Philip's request makes clear that they have not (14:8) and although they have been with Jesus for some time the answer to Jesus' question in 14:9 is that as yet they have not known him. Consequently Jesus went on to challenge the disciples to believe that he was one with the Father, and turned their attention to the question of his works (14:10-11) just as he did with the unbelieving Jews in 10:37ff.

Finally we draw attention to the fact that the disciples did not know that Jesus was to rise again from the dead 20:9; and because of this lack of knowledge Mary Magdalene failed to recognize (know) the risen Jesus because she was looking for a body 20:14. In chapter 21 we have two references, one that the disciples in the boat did not recognize (know) Jesus who was standing on the beach 21:4; and in 21:12 it is said that the disciples recognized (knew) Jesus through the course of events. All of these references draw attention to the fact that the disciples failed to know that Jesus was to rise from the dead (21:4,12 may be excepted). The same failure to understand the purpose of Jesus' death and resurrection is brought out in 16:18. The disciples failed to understand when the events took place although Jesus had forewarned them.

ii. Knowledge was promised to those who believed. The promise of knowledge for those who believe is made generally, that is to all who would hear in 8:31ff.; 10:38. But Jesus spoke more certainly of the knowledge the twelve would have as those who continued with him. The disciples' failure to know would be overcome after the resurrection
(2:22; 12:16), and this fact is to be related to the coming of the Paraclete, see 7:39; 14:26; 16:13. Consequently the disciples were promised (through Peter) that they would know the significance of Jesus' footwashing μετὰ ταύτα; that is after Jesus' act of service had been carried to completion in his death and resurrection. The knowledge that the disciples would then have is to be understood as faith in his saving act and obedience to the example which he had given.

Jesus promised that the disciples would know his unity with the Father and their unity with him when he had risen from the dead 14:20. "On that day" refers to the resurrection 14:19. To know Jesus' unity with the Father is to be united to Jesus because knowledge includes obedience as well as intellectual awareness. Such knowledge is open only to faith, even after the resurrection as is shown by 17:8, 21ff. Knowledge can be used both to describe the relationship itself, and also awareness of being in that relationship.

Finally we turn our attention to 15:18 where it is said that if the world hated the disciples they would know that it hated Jesus first. That is, the disciples would understand themselves in their unity with Jesus. This knowledge had the special purpose of preparing the believer for discipleship in the world.

iii. Affirmations of knowledge are made prior to the resurrection, in terms of the post-resurrection faith. The Samaritans confessed that they knew that Jesus was the Saviour of the world 4:42. The form of this confession is the product of the Church's mission for which the narrative has not prepared us. The evangelist was aware that such a confession could be made prior to Jesus' resurrection even by the twelve, see 16:31ff. Peter's confession in 6:69(29) is given a post-resurrection form. Jesus is said to have the words of eternal life, and the confession which follows using the perfect tenses Χριστοῦκερκαν καὶ γυνακεῖν followed by ὁ δὲ is a Johannine formula which is marked by a post-resurrection understanding. Peter's confession is viewed proleptically from the post-resurrection situation. Even so Jesus' words which follow (6:70f.) are enough to shed doubt on the historical placing of these words.

Jesus spoke of his relationship to "his own" in terms of mutual
knowledge 10:14. Knowing him in this context is interpreted in terms of recognition, the hearing of faith and following, see 10:4,5,27. But the twelve had not recognized Jesus prior to the resurrection (14:9) nor had they truly followed him 13:36ff. The evangelist expressed this relationship in terms of the post-resurrection experience. Jesus also spoke of the disciples' relationship to the Spirit from the perspective of his glorification 14:17. The disciples know the Spirit who is in them and abides with them. (We have already justified reading μετ' and τούτων.) But the Spirit was not given until Jesus was glorified 7:39; 16:7. Knowing the Spirit is to be understood in terms of awareness of his presence and obedience to his leading, and the saying is to be understood from the perspective of Jesus' glorification.

The confession that the disciples knew that Jesus knew all things and believed that he had come from God (16:8) is to be understood as two statements in synonymous parallelism. To know that Jesus knew all things was another way of saying that they believed that he came from God. Jesus' knowledge is not to be regarded as the basis of belief (as Jesus' knowledge is in 1:48f.; 4:19,29), for the confession that they know Jesus knows all things is itself a confession of faith arising out of Jesus' statements about his relationship with the Father 16:25ff. As a result of these words the disciples confessed that Jesus knew all things, that he had come from God. If anything, the knowledge that Jesus knew all things was the result of their acceptance (belief) of Jesus' claim to have come from God. But knowing and believing are spoken of in parallelism. 16:31 comes as a reminder that such faith was not expressed before Jesus had been glorified.

In chapter 17 Jesus speaks of the disciples in terms of the post-resurrection situation. Knowledge and faith are in synonymous parallelism in 17:8. Jesus speaks of the disciples as those who have truly received his words and known and believed in him, but the events spoken of in 16:31ff. had yet to take place. Before Jesus' resurrection the disciples had believed that Jesus had been sent by God, which the world refused to accept, 17:25; but not in the sense which they became
aware of when Jesus was risen from the dead. There was a continuity in their knowledge, but in this continuity there was a marked development through Jesus' glorification and the coming of the Paraclete. Knowing that the Father had sent Jesus involved the response of the obedience of faith.

8. The knowledge of the eye-witnesses is presented as the foundation of faith.

i. The events which had been seen during Jesus' life and work took on true significance in the light of Jesus' glorification and the coming of the Spirit. The evangelist was aware that the possibility of faith for future generations depended on the knowledge of those who had believed and had seen the events of the gospel history. Future faith depended on the witness to the gospel events from the standpoint of authentic faith. The evangelist was particularly concerned that the crucifixion of Jesus should be established as a well attested event, 19:35. The witness (probably the beloved disciple) is said to know that his witness is true. Apparently the crucifixion and death of Jesus was doubted by some, a doubt which undermined belief in Jesus' resurrection. Two alternatives may have been offered. (1) Jesus was not crucified, but by mistake Simon of Cyrene died in his place, a teaching which Irenaeus attributed to Basilides. (2) Jesus died but the heavenly Christ had left Jesus and soared back from him, as Irenaeus claimed Cerinthus taught. The Gospel does not really answer the argument attributed to Cerinthus, and this seems to indicate that the problem was not yet fully developed, though questions concerning the reality of Jesus' death seem to be in mind.

In 21:24, which is part of the appendix to the Gospel, as is indicated by the "we know", the Christian community in which the Gospel was written attests the truth of the witness of the evangelist in the Gospel. Here the beloved disciple is identified with the author by those who wrote the appendix. As the Gospel did not circulate without the appendix as far as we know, the testimony to the author and the validity of his witness to Jesus is significant. The validity of the witness to Jesus is a crucial point in the Gospel.
The opportunity for the world to come to authentic knowledge and life continues through the lifting up of the Son of Man 8:28, through which the world has the opportunity of knowing Jesus as Ἠισ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (see also 13:19). This act has a universal appeal (3:15ff.) and scope (12:33ff.).

The effect of Jesus' glorification through the coming of the Spirit (7:39) is to be seen in the love the believers have for each other through which they are known as Jesus' disciples 13:35, because their love is like his 13:15. His love was expressed in service to them and obedience to the Father. His obedience was to be the means by which the world could recognize (know) his love for the Father 14:31.

Knowing God in Jesus (see 14:7; 20:31), along with believing (3:15ff.) is said to be the way to eternal life 17:3. It is no more true to say that knowledge is eternal life than believing is eternal life. The eternal life includes authentic faith and knowledge but encompasses also love and joy, in fact the life of the believer for eternity.

Jesus passed on his mission (in its continuing form) to his disciples 20:21f. Being kept from the power of the evil one by the word Jesus had given the believers are united with him, and through the Apostles, and those who believed through their witness which is inspired by the Spirit (15:26f.) and would seem to include the love manifest in the community 13:35; 17:26 the opportunity of knowing (believing is spoken of in the same sense in 17:21) Jesus' true relationship with the Father and having eternal life continues for the world 17:23. This knowledge includes recognition of this relationship and the obedience of faith.
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Knowledge in "witness" and "love".

I. The function of "witness" in the Fourth Gospel.

The background of the Johannine use of μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία can be seen in the use of the Hebrew יְהִי (YHWH, תָּהִי). In John 8:17 μαρτυρία is used with reference to Deuteronomy 17:6 where דְּבָרָי is used in the Hebrew. The meaning of the Greek words themselves corresponds quite closely to the Johannine use also. The evangelist had in mind the legal setting of a trial as a setting for the theme of witness. In the Old Testament God is a witness (see Jer.29:23), and his people are charged to be his witnesses (see Isaiah 43:10,12; 44:8; 55:4). Both of these themes are important in the Fourth Gospel.

The trial portrayed is two sided. The world had Jesus on trial, but was unable to produce any valid witnesses. Jesus' witnesses not only cleared him of all charges, but in their witness the world is brought under judgement. The majority of references to witness concern the witness borne to Jesus, but there are some references which do not fit into this category.

Jesus had no need that any one should bear witness to him concerning man because of his knowledge of all men 2:25. This reference emphasizes Jesus' supernatural knowledge. The Baptist called on his hearers to bear witness, that is produce evidence, to the effect that he had denied that he was the Messiah 3:28 (see l:19ff.). Jesus called on his hearers to bear witness to any evil words that he had spoken 18:23. But no evidence of evil words was produced. Behind the antagonism of the Jewish leaders was the fact that he appeared to be a Messianic pretender (see 12:12ff). Against Jesus' Messianic claims they produced certain conflicting arguments (see 7:27,41ff.; 9:29). Before Pilate no evidence of evil doing by Jesus was produced (see 18:30; 19:4). Eventually the claim that Jesus was a Messianic pretender forced Pilate's hand, see 18:33ff.; 19:12. One of the points which produced opposition from the rulers was that Jesus did not keep the Sabbath. Further his claim to be one with the Father was regarded as blasphemy (see 5:18; 10:33ff.; 19:17). Had they been willing to hear other evidence the Jews may have come to another conclusion. The main section
of the theme of witness deals with the witness borne to Jesus.

1. The witness of the Baptist to Jesus. The Baptist is described in terms of one who belongs to the prophetic line 1:6. His work is defined as witness to Jesus (the light), and the purpose of this witness was that all men may believe in Jesus 1:7-8, for it was through the Baptist's witness that Jesus' public ministry was inaugurated. His witness to Jesus was based on the revelation that Jesus was the one who would baptize with the Spirit (1:32ff.), that Jesus had priority because he was in the beginning (see 1:15 Πρωτός μου Ἰησοῦς and note 1:1.). Having come to the knowledge of who Jesus was, the Baptist bore witness to him, (see also 3:26). The Baptist witnessed to the truth 5:33. This statement is two sided. It includes the negative answers to the questions in 1:19ff., and the positive witness to Jesus who is the truth (14:6). But important as the theme of the witness of the Baptist to Jesus is, it is only of secondary importance. In a way the Baptist represents the old covenant, and with the Baptist the Scriptures bear witness to Jesus 5:39 (see also 5:46; 8:56ff.), they were appealed to by Jesus as the accepted authority.

11. The Father bore witness to Jesus in the works he had given him to perform. Jesus was not dependent on human witness to himself (5:34) for the witness of the Father to him in his works was the "greater witness" than the Baptist to which Jesus appealed and Jesus added his own word to this "I know that his testimony is true" 5:32,36f. (For God's testimony to Jesus in his works see also Acts 2:22). Jesus did not bear witness to his own importance (5:31), but to the Father's activity in him. In this sense Jesus did bear witness to himself 8:14, but in the context of his discussion about being sent by God and doing his will (knowing his origin and destination). Consequently there are two fundamental witnesses, Jesus' self-witness, and the Father's witness to him in his works 10:14ff. The dual witness is reflected in Jesus' appeals to believe him or if this was not possible to believe in the works, see 10:25,38; 14:11. Jesus' works are the Father's witness to him as is shown by 8:17 where Jesus indicates that there are two witnesses. If the works had been independent of the Father's witness he could have appealed to a third witness which would have been an
advantage (see Deut. 19:15 which seems to be in mind).

iii. Jesus' self-witness, and his witness against the world. Jesus' self-witness occurs frequently in passages which do not use μαρτυρίαν or μαρτυρία, for instance in the ἐν ἐμί sayings. We will restrict the discussion to passages which speak of "witness". That Jesus does bear witness to himself is clearly stated 8:14ff. But it is not the normal kind of self-witness which is pronounced invalid in the Mishnah (1) and by Jesus himself 5:31. But Jesus' self-witness differs from that of all other men because he knew his origin and destination 8:14. He knew that God had sent him and his life was given in obedience to the Father. This is the truth to which Jesus bore witness as did also the works which he performed.

Jesus bore witness against the world. He bore witness to earthly things, that is the need for the new birth 3:11. (2) Only by a radical change could Nicodemus, a Jew, a representative of the world, enter the Kingdom of God. We are to understand this as part of Jesus' witness against the world (7:7). Those who rejected this witness responded in hatred. If the Jews can represent the world, even the Apostles come under Jesus' witness of judgement 13:21. This witness was intended to show the world up in its true light in need of eternal life so that they may see their need of Jesus. Jesus also bore witness of heavenly things (see 3:11ff.) 3:31ff. The heavenly things concern the Son of Man, his origin with the Father, his descent and glorification. The witness in view here is basically self-witness, but would also involve witness to the heavenly mysteries which, through his first hand knowledge, he was in a position to give. Jesus was in a position to make the Father known 1:18; 5:17ff.; etc. Jesus' witness to himself is to be understood as the witness to the fact that the Father had sent him and was revealed in him, see 14:9. Jesus' witness to the truth (18:37) is the witness to himself in this sense (14:6).

iv. The witness of believers to Jesus. The theme of witness to Jesus is stated early in the Gospel (1:7) and recurs. Through the witness of the Samaritan woman (4:39) many believed in Jesus. Through the witness of the crowd which had seen the raising of Lazarus (12:17) the multitude responded in superficial faith 12:18. Faith on the basis
of witness to Jesus stated in the Gospel narrative is promised in the farewell discourses. As a result of the coming of the Paraclete believers would present an inspired witness to the world 15:26f. Through believers the Spirit convicts the world of sin, righteousness and judgement 16:8-11. In the work of witness the Apostles have a special place. Note ὁ δὲ ἀρχηγὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ εστε. The verb ἐστε cannot be given the sense of an eternal present as Hoskyns and Bultmann suggest but refers to those present with Jesus during the time of his ministry. After Jesus' glorification and the coming of the Paraclete the Apostles were able to bear witness to Jesus in his true significance. It should be noted that in 17:20ff the word "witness" is not used. It may be that this terminology belongs to the eye witness situation. But those who came to believe through the Apostles' testimony to Jesus are means through which the world may yet come to believe. The historical nature of the "witness" embodied in the Gospel is emphasized in 19:35 and 21:24. 19:35 refers only to the crucifixion but 21:24 (part of the appendix) refers to the witness of the Gospel. The validity of the witness claimed has reference to the historical events in the light of Jesus' glorification and the coming of the Paraclete. It is claimed that the Gospel is inspired Apostolic witness to Jesus.

II. The Place of Love in the Fourth Gospel.

The Johannine understanding of love is developed on the basis of the Old Testament and primitive Christian understanding. In the Old Testament it is a fundamental belief that God loved Israel, and in Deuteronomy and Hosea his love for Israel is seen to be the basis for Israel's love for God. Further, the Israelites were to show loving kindness to each other because this is the way God himself acts. When this loving kindness in action to fellow Israelites is absent it is concluded that there has been a break down of the relationship between God and Israel. (See Deuteronomy 6:4ff.; 7:8ff.; Hosea 2:19; 3:1; 4:1ff.; 11:1ff.) The covenant setting of these references is clear and most important for the Old Testament understanding. God's love initiated the covenant, and Israel's response in entering into covenant with him was to love God with their whole being. Keeping his commandments of course was fundamental, thus in the New Testament we find that the Law
(Israel's response) could be summed up in two points, 1. To love God completely, and 2. To love one's neighbour as one's self. (See Mark 12: 28-33. & parrs.)

But there are certain developments which we need to notice in the New Testament and perhaps nowhere more clearly than in the Fourth Gospel. Whereas in the Old Testament God's love was more or less restricted to Israel, his people, and the love of one's neighbour was understood in terms of loving one's fellow Israelite, the New Testament, and the Fourth Gospel in particular recognizes God's love for the world, see John 3:16. It seems fairly clear that such a universal love was not attributed to God in the New Testament period by the Jews. (See 1QS 1,3ff.; and also John 7:49 where the Pharisees make clear that they did not believe that God loved the unlearned multitudes. The Jewish attitude to the Samaritans in this period is also reflected in such verses as 8:48.) Nor were they ready to understand the love of one's neighbour in such wide terms, see Luke 10:25-37. In the New Testament love breaks through the boundary of legalism and asserts the priority of God's love for the whole world, and the possibility that all men should be saved. Further, whereas God's love was focussed on the Exodus event, as the election of Israel, see Hosea 11:1, in the Fourth Gospel the love of God is the motive of, as well as manifested in the giving up of the Son to the death of the cross so that the world may be saved, see 3:16.

The Fourth Gospel presents God's love for the world as the power which initiates God's saving action, and in developing the idea of God's love goes a long way towards the statement which we find in 1 John 4:8, 'God is love'. The meaning of this love is carefully safeguarded from misunderstanding because it is defined by Jesus' act of self-giving. But the nature of the self-giving is not properly known until it is believed that he is the Son of God who has willingly come into the world so that the world may be saved. (For this reason faith is a precondition of knowledge, only through faith can the love of God revealed in Jesus be known.)

The question has been raised, especially with the Qumran Texts in view (see 1 QS 1,3ff. etc.), as to whether the command of Jesus to his
disciples in the Farewell Discourse, 'love one another', see John 13:34f. 15:12,17, is to be understood in restricted terms, that is as not including love for those who are not believers. It is claimed that John 3:16 should not be allowed to determine the meaning of love in the Farewell Discourses where the theme is love for the brethren. Three points need to be made here. (1) One purpose of the love of the brethren is said to be that the world may recognize the disciples of Jesus. Thus those who are not yet believers are not completely overlooked, see 13:35. (2) It is not said that the believers are to love one another and hate the unbelievers. The love of God, which he has for Jesus, see 17:23,26, and which he has for the world, see (17:23); 3:16, is to be in Jesus' disciples, see 17:26. Surely this implies their love for unbelievers as well as for one another. (3) The mutual love of the disciples for each other is featured in the Farewell Discourse because it is this mutual love which reveals the relationship of Jesus to the Father, because their love for each other is based on Jesus' love for them, see 15:12; and his love for them is based on his Father's love for him, see 15:9.

The Johannine usage of ἠγαπάω, ἠγάπη, and φιλεῖν has been a somewhat controversial question, but the evidence would seem to indicate that the evangelist did not consider there was any significant difference of meaning between the two verbs. We may not assume that ἠγαπάω has an exalted and specifically Christian meaning simply because there is virtually no precedent for its use prior to the New Testament apart from the LXX, if as we suggest, the evangelist uses this word in the same way as he uses φιλεῖν. (1) Both are used in the LXX to translate see Prov.8:17. (2) ἠγαπάω is used by the evangelist to refer to the fact that men love the darkness rather than the light, 3:19. Here the sense is to 'prefer'. It is also used of man's preference (love) for human praise (glory) rather than which comes from God, 12:43. φιλεῖν can also be used in a similar way. The Semitic background is apparent in the contrast of love and hate in 12:25; 15:19. The meaning is something like 'prefer' or 'choose' as in Malachi 1:2. (See Romans 9:13.) The person who loves (prefers or chooses) his life will lose it, on the other hand the person who hates (that is does not prefer or choose i.e. to renounce) his life in this world shall guard
it for eternal life, 12:25. (3) There seems to be no distinction in
what we may call the theological exposition of love in the Fourth Gospel:

i. The Father loves men because they love Jesus, a. 14:23; compare also
3:16; 17:23. b. 16:27. ii. The Father loves the Son, a. 3:35; 10:17;
iv. A certain disciple is described as being loved by Jesus, a. 13:23;
v. The love of men for each other. a. 13:34, (35); 15:12, (13), 17.
b. 15:19. But there is a difference as here reference is made to the
world's love of its own whereas the other references are made to the
disciples' love for each other. The difference of meaning does not lie
in the different words but in the different communities, the Church and
the world. vi. Men love Jesus. a. 8:42; 14:15, 21, 23, 24, 28; and especially
Peter's love in 21:15, 16. b. 16:27; and especially Peter's love in
21:15, 16, 17; cf. above. (4) There is only one real distinction, the
love of Jesus for the Father is spoken of only using λύων, 14:31.
But as this is an only reference, little weight can be given to this
fact, and we conclude that both words are used with the same meaning
in the Fourth Gospel.

1. The perversion of love in the world. Love, as such, is not a peculiar
characteristic of the Christian community. The evangelist talks of the
world's love for "its own" 15:19. Men who belong to the world love the
darkness rather than the light 3:19; they love the glory of men rather
than the glory of God 12:43; they love their lives in this world and
lose the possibility of eternal life 12:25. This love is to be under-
stood in terms of preference and choice and is expressed by λύων
(3:19; and 12:43) and φιλείν (in 12:25; and 15:19; both of which
present the contrast of φιλείν with μικρείν). The love which the
world has is perverted, but is love none the less. The world in its
love prefers that which can only lead to death, for it seeks to hold
on to what it thinks it has with the consequence that the opportunity
for eternal life is passed by. Such love indicates that the love of
the Father is not in them. (See also 1 John 2:15 for the perversion of
love).
2. The authentic meaning of love.

i. The love of the Father. (a) The Father's love for the Son is the original love out of which all authentic love springs. The Father's love for the Son is to be understood in terms of their eternal relationship 17:24. This love is expressed in the Father's giving all things into the hand of the Son (3:35) and showing him all that he does (5:20). Consequently the Son is empowered to perform the Father's works of judging and life-giving. With the authority, Jesus was given works to perform and the Father's love is expressed in giving the possibility for the Son to share in his life and work. To reject the work would be to reject the Father's love 10:17f., 15:10. The Father is not said to love Jesus as a consequence of his obedience, for this love is eternal 17:24, but it is effective in Jesus as a consequence of his obedience. It is expressed in the laying down of Jesus' life as the Father's love for the world 3:16. The love is not only revealed in Jesus' life and work, it is made effective in the lives of his disciples 17:26. The love which the Father revealed in Jesus becomes his love for Jesus' disciples so that it is said that the Father loved them \( \kappa \alpha \theta \omega \varsigma \) he loved Jesus 17:23; or that \( \kappa \alpha \theta \omega \varsigma \) the Father loved Jesus, Jesus loved his disciples 15:9-10. We are not to think of the disciples being loved twice, rather the Father's love for them is effective for them in Jesus. That is why 17:23 and 15:9-10 are expressed using \( \kappa \alpha \theta \omega \varsigma \) to join both statements.

b. The Father's love for the world is clearly spoken of in 3:16. This love is not said to be \( \kappa \alpha \theta \omega \varsigma \) the Father loved the Son because the world does not abide in the Father's love. But the Father's act of love for the world cannot be overlooked, for it is this act which opens up the possibility of eternal life for the world. We may not think of God's love for the world merely as an act of the past. The fact that the existence of those who believe in Jesus is to be orientated towards bringing the world to believe and know that Jesus had been sent by the Father, and that God's love was effective in those who believe, sufficiently indicates that God has not ceased loving the world in keeping the possibility of eternal life open 17:21-26.

c. The Father's love for believers is patterned on his love for
Jesus (17:23) and becomes effective through Jesus' love for his disciples 15:9-10. Just as the Father in love gave Jesus authority and responsibility, so the believers are given authority and responsibility to carry on God's work of love in the world. Faith and knowledge open the way for the love with which the Father loved Jesus to be present and effective in Jesus' disciples, in fact to believe and know is also to love 17:26.

Before the disciples believed they were in the world 15:19, but through their response to Jesus the Father's love for them became effective 14:21,23; 16:27. The Father's love for the world opened a possibility and his love continues to keep that possibility open, but the love which he has for believers is effective as is his love for the Son.

d. To have the Father's love is to have eternal life. Though the world is loved by God (3:16) those who do not believe do not have the love of God in them (5:42) just as they do not have eternal life in them, 6:53 cf. also 5:26. But believers do have life 3:15f., and the love which the Father has for Jesus is in them as Jesus is in them 17:26. Through his Spirit and his word which abide in believers, Jesus is present and the believers receive the gift of life which is manifest in love. (6)

11. The love of the Son.

a. The Son's love for the Father. The love of the Father for the Son is met with a response of love by the Son for the Father. And as the Father's love for the Son involves the giving of the authority to have life in himself even as the Father has life in himself, 5:26, and the giving of authority to do the Father's works of life-giving and judging, this is what the Father commands the Son to do, so the Son's love for the Father is expressed in doing precisely what the Father commands, 14:31. Through the Son's perfect obedience to the Father the world has the possibility of knowing that the Son loves the Father. The Son's love for the Father, just as his knowledge of the Father, is expressed in his obedience to the Father. Through his obedience he abides in the Father's love, see 15:9-10. The Father's love for the Son does not indicate an unrealised possibility because the Son also loves the Father. This indicates the realised relationship. But we should recognise that Jesus' love for the Father is not
frequently spoken of in the Gospel. More frequently we read of Jesus' love for "his own", thus emphasizing the descending nature of love.

b. *Jesus' love for his disciples.* Amongst Jesus' contemporaries there were those who were said to have been loved by Jesus in a manner which probably ought to be distinguished from his love for "his own". He loved Lazarus, 11:3,5 (& Martha), 36; and one of the disciples is singled out by the description "the disciple whom Jesus loved", 13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7,20. No doubt this love includes what we shall have to say about his love for the disciples in general, but it also signifies an affection for certain individuals shown by Jesus during his earthly life.

Secondly, it is said that Jesus loved "his own", that is his disciples, he loved them during his earthly life, and he loved them completely, see 13:1. The reference to the completeness of his love looks forward to the giving of his life, or rather, the evangelist who comments here is looking back from the other side of this event. The completeness of his love is to be understood in this way as 15:13 as an analogy makes clear. Jesus gave his life for his friends, that is, the effect of the giving of his life has benefit for them, though in another sense he gave his life for the world, see 3:16. But the world through unbelief has failed to benefit from his act of love. The disciples as believers, or "friends" understood this act of love not simply as something done by a man, but as God's great act of love for the salvation of the world. Thus 15:13 is to be understood as an analogy. At the human level no greater act of love could be conceived, but this was God's love for them. The divine example of Jesus was to hold good for the disciples, because Jesus commanded them to love one another as he had loved them. His love for them was to be their example, their rule, 13:34.

Jesus' love opened the possibility for man's relationship to him, but as long as Jesus' love was not met with the response of love from man it could only signify the unfulfilled possibility. Jesus' love for "his own", like his Father's love for him, indicated the giving of life and mission. The life was given in the mission, and only by obedience to the mission could the life be received, and for this reason Jesus
could exhort his disciples to abide in his love (see 15:9-10, 12), that is to believe and to keep his commandment of loving one another as he had loved them. Those who love Jesus in this way are effectively loved by the Father and the Son, and the power of Jesus' life is made effective in them, see 14:21. In this relationship with Jesus the believers have eternal life which is manifest as love in the community.

iii. The love of the disciples.

a. The disciples' love for Jesus. Love for Jesus, in as much as it refers to the relationship between Jesus and the disciple might just as well have been described as faith. For instance in 8:42 Jesus indicated that the Jews to whom he was speaking could not rightly call God their Father because they did not love Jesus, that is they did not believe that the Father had sent him, and consequently they rejected him and his claims.

But the disciples, viewed from the post-resurrection situation, are those who have believed in Jesus. Such belief, or love, is only valid if they keep his commandments. We are referring here to the obedience of faith, see 14:15; 14:1; 13:34; and also 1 John 3:23. The believers have the presence of the Paraclete with them as the effective working of the love of the Father and Son in their lives (14:16, 21), and in this way Jesus continues his presence with the believers. It is made abundantly clear here that love for Jesus is to be understood in terms of obedience, 14:23, 24. But it is the obedience which arises out of believing in his mission from, and return to the Father, 14:28. Loving him, or believing in him in this way enables them to rejoice at his departure.

Though 21:15-17 is probably part of the appendix it gives a clear idea of what the disciples' love for Jesus means by using Peter's love for Jesus as an example. Jesus indicated to Peter that Peter's love for him was to be expressed in feeding Jesus' sheep or lambs. Jesus himself had occupied himself with this task, see John 10. Previously Peter had thought that he could show his devotion for Jesus by giving his life for him (see 13:37), but he had misunderstood his relationship to Jesus and had thought of him simply as another man, and not as "the saviour of the world". Love for Jesus was to be expressed in
keeping his commands, to believe and to love one another, that is in 
the obedience of faith.

b. The disciples' love for one another. Jesus commanded his 
disciples to love one another 13:34,35; 15:12,17. This love was to be 
modelled on his love for them, and thus the analogy of 15:13 and Jesus' 
example in washing the disciples' feet (13:14f.) and supremely his love 
for them even to death indicate the nature of the love they were to show 
to each other. Through this love in the community Jesus' disciples 
would be known because the love revealed in them was his love. But 
this love is realised only in those who know themselves to be loved by 
God in Jesus. Abiding in Jesus' love includes abiding in the awareness 
of Jesus' love and continuing in loving action for one another. Faith 
in Jesus and love for the brethren are inseparably linked.


The main emphasis in the theme of love falls on the Father's love 
for the Son, the Son's love for the disciples, and the disciples love 
for one another. Love in these instances indicates the self-giving 
which characterises the nature of God. We should add in this context 
the Father's love for the world, but with the difference that here, the 
love of the Father does not meet with the response of love, but it does 
describe the self-giving of the Father which makes the world's response 
of love a possibility. Thus we may say that love, in the contexts we 
are discussing here, indicates the movement of God, in condescension 
and humility, towards the world creating the possibility of relationship 
with him. This possibility comes about through the relationship 
which the Son has with the Father, and the relationship which believers 
have with the Father and the Son. The self-giving is a giving of life 
and mission in such a way that the life is only received in the performance 
of the mission.

Love has another sense also where the love of Jesus for the Father, 
and the love of the disciple for Jesus is spoken of. Here the basic 
meaning is obedience, but in the case of the disciples it also carries 
the qualification that it is the obedience of faith.

Faith on the other hand describes only the relationship of the 
disciples to God in Jesus. It is thus indicated that the relationship
is indirect, and dependent on the revelation. Authentic faith, though rooted in the events of the historic life of Jesus only became a reality after he had departed and the Paraclete had come and led the disciples into the truth. Those who came to this authentic faith, which was a possibility because of God's love for the world, are also said to know. To a certain extent this knowledge, and this believing, which is also a loving, on the part of the disciples, means their obedience to Jesus based on their recognition and acceptance of him as the one who had come from the Father. Particularly, knowledge and faith can be used to indicate the appreciation of the person of Jesus in terms of his relationship with the Father. That knowledge is always qualified by faith indicates that the nature of this knowledge is not based solely on data acquired through the senses. In other words it could not be proved that Jesus had come from the Father, but faith accepted his claim, faith acknowledged him as the Son of God.

Knowledge like love can describe the relationship between the Father and Jesus, and Jesus and the disciples, but unlike love, knowledge never expresses the unfulfilled possibility of relationship made possible by the Father's knowledge. Love describes that which makes relationship with the Father possible from his side, while knowledge describes the actual relationship. When the possible is also the actual, love and knowledge more or less cover the same area of meaning, for example, the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son, and the mutual love of the Father and the Son. But where God's love for the world meets with rejection, there is no mutual knowledge, love indicates the possibility of which mutual knowledge could be the fulfilment. The giving of life and mission is contained in God's love, but the world can abide in that love only by believing in Jesus, in knowing him, and being known by him.

We note also that with regard to "knowledge" and "love" the Father is in relation to Jesus as Jesus is to his disciples and the disciples are in relation to Jesus as he is to the Father. Note the use of ἐγνώσω in 10:14-15; and 15:10. But with regard to love it can also be said that the Father loved the disciples ἐγνώσω he loved Jesus 17:23. This indicates that the love effected for believers in Jesus is the Father's
love. In using this form of expression it is indicated that "mutual" love and "mutual" knowledge, if used of the Johannine ideas of love and knowledge cannot mean that in the relationship of love and knowledge love and knowledge mean the same thing from both sides of the relationship. The meaning takes into account both the subject and object of action. Thus on one side the meaning concerns the giving of life and mission and on the other it means obedience.
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

The Johannine Epistles.

The problem of the relationship of the Epistles to the Gospel remains unresolved. Professor Dodd has argued for the independent authorship of the Epistles, but W.F. Howard has shown that, whatever the validity of these arguments, they are not as conclusive as they may at first appear. Leaving aside the stylistic arguments, which are inconclusive, and outside the scope of our study, we turn briefly to the supposed differences of thought pointed out by Professor Dodd.

The differences are not as great as Professor Dodd has supposed. The eschatology of the Gospel does not overlook the future emphasis, see 3:15; 5:21ff.; 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 12:48; 14:3; 17:24, and although the evangelist does not use the word ἐλασμός concerning the work of Christ, he does record the saying in John 1:29 'Behold the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world', which should also be compared with 1 John 3:5 'You know that he was manifested to take away sins'. To avoid the conclusion that the Gospel expresses the same thought as is expressed in the word ἐλασμός, Professor Dodd has to resort to a rather forced interpretation of John 1:29. The teaching concerning the Paraclete in the Gospel is not repeated in the Epistles. But this does not necessarily mean that the teaching concerning the Spirit is different in the Epistles. In the Gospel the Spirit is called the Paraclete, but it is implied that this title is also used of Jesus, see 14:16. In the Epistles Jesus is called the Paraclete, he is our Paraclete (advocate) with the Father, 1 John 2:1, whereas in the Gospel the Spirit is the Paraclete of the Father and the Son with us. But there is nothing in what is said of the Spirit in the Epistles that is out of keeping with what is said in the Gospel.

The arguments concerning the closer relationship of the Epistles to Gnosticism are at first persuasive, but when investigated the various issues do not carry the weight which at first it seemed they would. The language may be more closely related to Gnosticism, but the thought is certainly closely related to the Fourth Gospel. "Chri$t" and "seed" refer to the word of God, which with the Spirit is the means by which men may have "eternal life" according to the Evangelist. But
if the author of the Epistles is using the weapons of the heretics against them, the use of Gnostic language does not disprove the common authorship of the Gospel and Epistles, especially when the theology expressed appears to be the same as that which is expressed in the Gospel. The same can be said for the claims which heretics made "we know him" etc. The statements 'God is love', 'God is light' present a greater difficulty, though "God is love" may be but the logical development of John 3:16 in 1 John 2:2; 4:8f. The love of God is to be seen in the giving of the Son as in the Gospel. "God is light" may be thought to be a conclusion drawn from the fact that Jesus is said to be "the light of the world" 8:12; 9:5, but the meaning of light seems to be somewhat different in 1 John 1:5ff. It is possible that ethical problems could call forth this kind of development.

The evidence, while it is not sufficient to sustain the argument for separate authorship of Gospel and Epistles, does justify a separate treatment of our subject in the Epistles. (7)

Professor Bultmann has suggested a similar process in the composition of 1 John to the source and redaction theory which he postulated concerning the Gospel (8) and Dr. J.C. O'Neill has suggested that the basis of 1 John is to be found in several Jewish sectarian hymns similar to those found in the Hymn scroll of Qumran. (9) Bultmann's source and redaction theory runs into the same problems in dealing with 1 John as when dealing with the Gospel, and all that Dr. O'Neill really succeeds in proving is that the language and thought of 1 John are akin to the Qumran texts in some respects. It may be that the author has used sources, but neither Bultmann nor O'Neill have succeeded in locating those sources.

As with the Gospel we will treat the Epistle as it has come down to us, unless it proves to be unintelligible in this form, or unless there is evidence that this was not the form in which it originally circulated.

The second and third Epistles of John add little to the first as far as our study is concerned, and because the question of common authorship remains unsettled, (10) it seems best to use their evidence only to corroborate our findings concerning the first Epistle. The
The idea of revelation is strong in the Epistle as it is in the Gospel, but in the Epistle the emphasis is made more directly. Five times in the Epistle it is said that Jesus (or some alternative identification of him) was revealed (ἐφανερώθη) 1:2, 2:3, 5:8, 4:9. The revelation of Jesus, the Son of God, in history is the key event in the work of salvation 3:5, 8, and in his coming the love of God is revealed 4:9. But though so much lies in the past he is yet to be revealed in the future, and it would seem that the writer is here thinking of the Parousia 2:28; 3:2. The content of the revelation can be summed up as Christology. All else derives its meaning from Christ. This is a fundamental thesis of the Epistle. We turn now to the content of the revelation in terms of Christology.

The Epistle does not clearly describe Jesus as the Word as does the Gospel. Καὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ژωῆς may be regarded as a variation of this theme, or it may refer to the Gospel message, not to Jesus himself. Even so the Gospel referred to here is nothing other than the Apostolic witness to Jesus, 1:1. The Gospel as the message of salvation through which men may have eternal life through faith in Jesus, is concerned with the revelation of the life which was with the Father, 1:2. The Epistle is reminiscent of John 1:1-5 at this point. There the evangelist speaks of the Word who was with God, in whom was life, and that life was the light of men. In the Gospel we also read that the Father has given the Son the authority to have life in himself even as the Father has life in himself; John 5:26. The evangelist also believed that the life had been revealed in Jesus, and that life was the life of God. The life of God is revealed as love in the sending of the only begotten Son that believers may have life through him. (12)

The Epistle shares with the Gospel the teaching that Jesus is the unique Son of the Father (μονογενὴς) 4:9; sent by the Father into the world. On the sending of the Son by the Father see 4:9, 10, 14. Like the Gospel the Epistle insists on the necessity of believing that Jesus is the Son of God 5:5, 10, 11, 12, 13. See also 1:3, 7; 3:8, 23; 4:15; 5(1),20. The unique relationship of the Son to the Father is indicated...
by the description ὁνομαζόμενος, 419, but in the Epistle the "mutual" love and knowledge of the Father and the Son is not mentioned. Perhaps the reason for this absence is to be explained by the fact that the Epistle is preoccupied with the question of the believer's relationship to God rather than Jesus' relationship to the Father.

Just as the Epistle indicates that it is necessary to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, see 4115; 515ff., so it also teaches the necessity of believing that Jesus is the Christ 511. (Compare John 20:31). But this cannot be taken simply to mean that Jesus is the Messiah because it is also said that it is necessary to believe that Jesus Christ came in the flesh 412. It would seem that the heretics against whom the author argues rejected the idea of the incarnation. Irenaeus reports that Cerinthus, the heretic with whom the Apostle John reputedly came in conflict, taught that a higher power came on Jesus at his baptism and left him before his passion and would not allow that the Christ should be identified with the earthly Jesus. (13) In contradiction to such teaching the Epistle declares that Jesus is the Christ, 511, and that he has come in the flesh, 412, not in the water of baptism only, but in water and blood, that is baptism and death, 516. Jesus Christ came in water and blood, a real birth, as a single person, who died, shedding his blood. Baptism and death refer to the same person, not by water only but water and blood. There can be no distinction between Jesus and Christ or Jesus and the Son of God, in fact the writer several times speaks of Jesus Christ his (the Father's) Son, 1:3, 7; 3:23.

The meaning of "Christ" in the Epistle differs from the Gospel, but this is to be explained as a characteristic of the heretics rather than a special meaning of the author of the Epistle. (In the Gospel "Christ" means Messiah, see John 1:41).

The work of Christ is described from five points of view, all of which can be found in the Gospel also. Firstly, his blood is said to cleanse those who walk in the light from all sin, 1:7. (See John 1:29, 36; 13:1ff. and also 11:50, 52). The same point is in view where it is said that he is the ἐλάσσομαι for our sin, 2:1f.; 4:10. The Advocate we have with the Father is Jesus Christ the righteous who through his
own death removed the stain of sin, and that in his death the sin "was, so to speak, neutralized, and its corruption sterilized, by the love and power of God."(14) Good works are powerless advocates with God in the face of transgressions, but the Advocate believers have with the Father is himself righteous and has removed the defilement of believers. Contrast Pirque Aboth 4:13. (15) Secondly, the purpose of Jesus' mission is said to be the destruction of the works of the devil, 3:8 (See 3:12; 5:15f., 18f.)(In the Gospel it is said that Jesus has come for the purpose of judgement, 9:39; see also 3:19ff.; 5:22 etc. In the act of judgement the prince of this world is cast out and his works destroyed through men being drawn to Jesus, 12:31f.) Jesus' coming was to break the hold that the devil had on men and to bring them to God. This he did through the revelation of the love of God in himself, see 4:9-10. The destruction of the works of the devil is to be understood at least in terms of the manifest falsehood of them in the presence of the revelation in Jesus, and the possibility of a new beginning through his cleansing work. Because the devil's way is shown in its true light as falsehood, and the new way of eternal life has been opened up by Jesus, the devil's hold on the world has been destroyed. Though the whole world as yet lies in the grip of the devil one 5:19, the fact that the Son of God has come means that the power of that grip has been broken for all those who will believe, see 5:4f. Thirdly, the fact that "God is love" is revealed in his act of love in sending his only begotten Son into the world that we should live through him, 4:8, 9. (See John 3:16, etc.) The coming of Jesus is here set in the context of cause and purpose. The cause of his coming was the love of the Father, and the purpose makes the nature of that love clear. The purpose was to give life to the world. (See John 3:15f.; 6:53, 58; 14:19) The means by which this was done is spoken of as through the sending of the Son to expiate sin 4:10. (The evangelist relates the giving of life to the world to the giving of Jesus' life, John 6:58, and to his resurrection, 14:19) The writer of the epistle relates the possibility of having life through Jesus to his work of expiating sin, which was done through the shedding of his blood, that is in his death, 1 John 1:7. The work of giving life to the world is therefore to be seen as closely
related to the first aspect of Jesus' work, that of dealing with the problem of sin. **Fourthly,** Jesus is described as the Saviour of the world, 4:14. (See John 4:42.) As in the Fourth Gospel, the Epistle depicts the work of Jesus in its universal purpose of offering salvation to the world, (see John 3:16; 4:42.) **Fifthly,** Jesus' work is described in terms of revelation. "We know that the Son of God has come, and has given us understanding that we should know him who is true; and we are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." 1 John 5:20. The perfect tenses indicate the achievement of the Son's mission. He has made knowledge of God possible because as the Son he could make the Father known (See John 1:18) whereas no one else had ever seen God 4:12. The knowledge of God that the Son has brought is related to the revelation of the love of God in his (Jesus') mission, 4:8ff.

The interpretation of Christ and his work in the Epistle is compatible with the thought of the Fourth Gospel, though the emphasis differs in some respects. Second and third John add nothing, in fact only in second John is there any Christological material. 2 John 3,7, confirm what is taught in first John, that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Father, and that he has come in the flesh, see 1 John 4:2; 1:7; 2:1.

The teaching of 1 John seems to have been given at a particular time of crisis when the Church (at least the specific congregation to which the letter was addressed) was threatened by heretics who had cut themselves off from the authority and teaching of the Apostles, see 2:19; 4:6. The writer appeals to the evidence of the schism as that which reveals the heretics for what they are, 2:19. It would seem that the heresy consisted both in what was denied and what was affirmed. The heretics denied that Jesus was the Christ, 2:22f., and this appears to have been at the same time the denial that Jesus was the Son of God. To deny this was to reject the Father who had sent him, see 4:15 and 5:1 also. Involved in this was the denial that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh, 4:2, see 5:6 also, and this was the denial of the incarnation.

The affirmations of the heretics are indicated by a threefold
and a threefold ὑλή, and a single instance of ἐκκαθάρισθεν.

1. "If we say (ἐὰν εἴκωμεν) we have fellowship with him..." 1:6. The heretics evidently claimed to have fellowship with God. Direct experience of God was thought to lift a person beyond the level of normal human existence, and it would seem that it was claimed to lift those who were thus privileged above the necessity of ethical conduct. But the author of 1 John declared that those who do not behave according to the ethical standards which are rooted in the nature of God himself are liars if they claim to have fellowship with God. To live in the light does not mean to be enlightened, but to live according to God's revelation of himself as the foundation of our fellowship with one another, which involved the command to love one another, and it involves being cleansed from sin through the death of Jesus Christ, the Father's Son, through faith in Jesus. To walk in the light is to love one another, and to believe in Jesus Christ. Elsewhere the matter is put in the reverse order, 3:23. There is no mystical fellowship with God in this, for the fellowship is with the brethren in love like God's love, while the relationship to God is expressed in faith in Jesus. That fellowship with the Father is through the Son is the point of 1:3 also. "Our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ". There is no way to the Father apart from the Son.

II. "If we say (ἐὰν εἴκωμεν) that we have no sin..." 1:8. Those who claimed to have mystical fellowship with God also claimed that they were now sinless and, a consequence of this claim would be the assertion that they had passed beyond the need for Christ's redemptive work. The perfect have no need to be cleansed from sin. Our author asserts that those who claim to have no sin are only deceiving themselves, and that the only way to deal with sin is to confess it and to be cleansed through Jesus' saving death. See 2:lf. also.

III. "If we say (ἐὰν εἴκωμεν) that we have not sinned..." 1:10. This assertion goes further than 1:8 in that 1:8 allows the possibility that the person may have been a sinner once, but has now ceased to be such. But 1:10 asserts (in the mouth of those our author refutes)
that 'we have not (ever) sinned'. The heretics asserted that there are some people who by nature are beyond the possibility of sin. Such an assertion is a denial of the relevance of Jesus' saving death, and though he may be honoured in some way as a revealer, even as such he would be dispensable if men were saved by virtue of their sinless natures. It is possible that those who claimed such sinless natures for themselves allowed that there were others who would need Jesus' saving work. But our author indicates that these people make God a liar and reveal that his word is not in them when they claim that they have never sinned. He assumes in what God has revealed that all men have sinned and need God's saving work, and assumes that those who have experienced that saving work through receiving God's word will know and confess their own need.

iv. "He who says (διδωμι) I know him,..." 1 John 2:4. The heretics claimed to have private and individual knowledge of Christ in a mystical sense. But the writer of the Epistle maintains that knowledge of Jesus Christ can only be attained through the witness of the Apostles to the revelation in history. In that historical revelation a commandment is laid upon those who would know Jesus, it is the double sided commandment to believe and love (see 3:23). Those who obey this commandment truly know him but those who claim to know him and do not keep this commandment are liars. (Note: the commandments (plural) can be reduced to one commandment, see 3:22,23.)

v. "He who says (διδωμι) I abide in him..." 2:16. There is no difference between abiding in or being in Jesus as 2:5 shows. (It is also a synonym for "I know him"). To abide in him is to keep his word, and those who keep his word, that is, who believe in him and love one another, receive the realization of God's saving work initiated by his love. In this sense God's love is brought to a completion in them. But there is a further sense also in which God's love is perfected in them. Just as salvation can be spoken of as life, so also that life can be spoken of in terms of love. In those who keep Jesus' word God's love becomes the effective force of their lives. But those who do not believe in Jesus, and love as God loves, do not abide in Jesus, as the fact that they do not live as he lived reveals.
vi. "He who says (Ὁ λευμόν) I am in the light..." 2:9. The heretics probably meant that they had been illuminated by supernatural knowledge through a mystical experience, but the author of this epistle understands light in a predominantly ethical sense (see 1:5ff.). The light of God's love (it is God's love which motivates his revealing activity) is contrasted with the hate of the world through which it shuts itself up in the darkness. The test of being in the light is the test of love for the brethren.

vii. "If any one says (ἐὰν τίς εἰκη) I love God;..." 4:20. Just as the heretics claimed to know God, so they claimed to love God, and evidently overlooked the need to love the brethren. The repeated command to love the brethren indicates that authentic Christianity was threatened at the ethical level, and this was related to the correct understanding of God's act in Christ. The fundamental question is raised here as elsewhere as to the proper relationship of man to God. Can man know God directly in mystical experience and so dispense with the material world in giving himself up in love for God? Should the lover in this case be all absorbed in his love for the beloved so that all else counts for nothing? Nowhere does the writer suggest that God asks for anything but a total commitment to himself, but it is not the commitment of the lover for the beloved, it is the commitment of obedience to the revelation in Jesus which calls men to faith in him and love for the brethren. The writer does not question the validity of making a statement about loving God (though it would seem that this is the heretic's claim rather than his own), but he does insist on giving this statement a meaning that cuts across what the heretics were in fact claiming. To love God is to keep his commandments, and his commandments can be reduced to this, to believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and to love one another, 3:22f.

The heretics, as we see them from these statements, were people who were seemingly converted to Christianity, but continued to hold beliefs which were not compatible with the Christian faith. Eventually there was a schism, with the heretics leaving the Christian community. The beliefs of the heretics place them fairly clearly in the category of those we describe as Gnostics. Their belief is characterised by
the division of mankind into certain groups, of which the Gnostics were the preeminent group of those who by nature were able to know God, who by nature were saved. For such men Christ could have little significance.

1. God is light.

In the Epistle the discussion about the light is taken a stage further back than it is in the Gospel. In the Gospel Jesus is said to be the light of the world through which the world comes under judgement, and has the opportunity of life. In the Epistle it is said that God is light, that is, God's nature is essentially directed towards revelation. The ethical content of that revelation is prominent in the Epistle. To walk in the light, as the author understands this, is to keep the commandments, to believe in the Son and to love the brethren, 1:5-7; see 3:22-23.

To say that the true light (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν) is already shining, 2:8, is to say that the effect of God's act of salvation in Jesus can already be seen taking effect in the world. In John 1:9 the evangelist speaks of the entry of τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν into the world. The author of 1 John insists that as a consequence of this event the true light already shines and that the darkness is passing away because the darkness could not overcome the light. See John 1:5. What was revealed in Jesus was the love of God 4:9, and it is this love which both offers salvation to the world and judges the world because it remains in the darkness where hatred characterises action rather than love, 2:9.

The author has seen that God's revealing activity is rooted in his nature and has made this clear by his statement that God is light. But he has done more than this. He has related God's will to reveal himself to the theme of love. Love is the test of those who claim to be living in the light of the revelation, because the light of the revelation reveals that God is love, 4:7ff.

2. God is Love. 1 John 4:8-16,19.

Unlike the Gospel the Epistles do not use φιλεῖν, but the frequency of use of ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη is greatly increased, when the difference of length between Gospel and Epistles has been taken into
account. In fact love takes over in 1 John the predominant position of faith in the Gospel. It is noticeable too that the theme of "glory" does not appear in the Epistles. In the Epistle the whole discussion of love is based on the fact that God is love. His character, which determines his actions, is described as loving. When he acts, he acts lovingly. There is no doubt about the meaning of love here because the author goes on to define love. God’s love is revealed in his act of giving life to the world through the sending of his Son to be the expiation of sin 4:9. The life that God gives through his act of love is life like his in the sense that it is life characterised by love 4:7. God’s act of love revealed that love is not simply an emotion, nor is it made real by declaration of love in words, nor in the mystical experience of speaking in tongues, but love is active in deeds and as such is true love, see 3:18. The statement that "God is love" is not based on any philosophical speculation, but on the belief that the Father had sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world. This kind of activity the writer of 1 John (together with the evangelist, if it is right to distinguish them) says is the revelation of love, God’s love.

3. Life, the eternal life.

Life and eternal life are not to be distinguished in 1 John. In this 1 John is in agreement with the Fourth Gospel. The life that was revealed was the eternal life, 1:2. Those who love the brethren consequently know that they have passed from death to life, but the person who hates his brother is a murderer and does not have eternal life abiding in him, 3:14f. It is said that the witness is that God has given us eternal life and this life is in his Son, 5:11. To have the Son is to have "life", 5:12, and the Epistle was written that those who believe in the name of the Son of God may know that they have eternal life, 5:13. There can be no doubt that our author uses life and eternal life without any intended distinction.

"Concerning the Word of life" 1:1. The understanding of ὁ υἱὸς as a title for the incarnate Son is suggested by the development of the ideas of the Prologue of the Gospel in the opening verses of 1 John. The distinction is not crucial because the meaning differs little whether ὁ υἱὸς refers to Jesus or the Gospel. The meaning of the
genitive ἡς ὁμης is also ambiguous. If λόγος refers to the Gospel (as 1 John 2:25 perhaps suggests) the meaning may be either "the Gospel which has life as its subject", or "the Gospel which gives life". If λόγος refers to Jesus the meaning may be "the living Word" and would certainly include the sense of having the power to give life, see 4:9. It may well be that the author has in mind the need to show the relation of the Apostolic witness to Jesus himself, and has done this by using the ambiguity of ἁπη του λόγου ἡς ὁμης so that the genitive is to be understood in both senses and of both subjects. In any case ὁμη is to be understood primarily of the life of the Son who was with the Father and was revealed 1:2, and the question about the meaning of λόγος does not alter this. The testimony is phrased in such a way that it is clear that the revelation of the eternal life took place in the historical Jesus who was seen by the physical eyes, and touched by the hands of the Apostles, who consequently vouched that he was a real man, but none the less the one in whom the eternal life which was with the Father had been revealed.

Just as it was said that life was revealed, so it is also said that God revealed his love 4:9. The revelation is made through the sending of the Son into the world. When life is revealed love is revealed because the life has the character of love. In this way it is shown that the revelation of the life arises from the nature of God who is love, and this love can be described in terms of God's will that the world may have life. This will is active in sending the Son into the world. Bound up in the mission of the Son into the world is the promise of eternal life 2:25. But eternal life is inextricably bound up with his Son so that those who believe in the Son, which means the same thing as "having the Son", have life 5:11ff. Both the life that was revealed, and the life that was given have the character of love so that loving the brethren could be claimed as a test for those who thought that they had eternal life 3:14f.

4. The revelation of the 'truth'.

Truth in the Johannine Epistles stands over against falsehood (See ψεύδος, ψευδης etc.) and 'error' (ἐλάχιστο), and consequently the true God stands over against idols, 1 John 5:20. In this regard
the Epistles are at one with the Gospel. But there are some differences which need to be noted. Firstly, it is not said that Jesus is the truth, but it is said that the Spirit is the truth 1 John 5:6. This may be only the amplification of "the Spirit of Truth" see John 14:17 etc., but it is a development which the evangelist does not make. By saying that the Spirit is the truth a rivalry between the Spirit and Jesus seems to have been created. But this is not intended. What is meant is that the Spirit is a completely authentic witness to Jesus through whom revelation continues to take place. "The Spirit of Truth" in the 1st Epistle has been presented in a more dualistic context than in the Gospel. In the Gospel the Spirit of Truth is said to be the one who leads believers into the truth 16:13. But in 1 John 4:6 the Spirit of Truth stands over against the Spirit of Error. The Spirit of Error is no doubt responsible for the activity of the false prophets 1 John 4:1ff. The Spirit of Truth is active in true believers as is apparent from their confession that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh. The dualism of truth and error gives the Epistle a more Gnostic appearance than in the Gospel, and this is in keeping with what we have suggested about the specifically anti-Gnostic nature of 1 John. Such a development from the theme in the Gospel to that in the Epistle would be explicable against the background of the Gnostic problem which we have suggested our author faced.

When the Epistles speak of knowing the truth 1 John 2:21; 2 John 1, the Gospel message enshrined in the Apostolic witness is in view rather than Jesus himself as in John 8:32. It is thus a way of speaking of those who have accepted the Apostolic witness. This is not a real break with the meaning intended by the evangelist as the development of the λόγος theology in the Prologue shows, for it is Jesus who is known in the Gospel. 3 John 3,8,12 are also probably to be understood of the Gospel.

The 'true light' 1 John 2:9, though a formal parallel to John 1:9 is more dualistic in that the contrast is not between the ultimate light and other lights which are also valid as in the Gospel, but between the light and that which claims to be the light but in fact is nothing but darkness. In the same way the 'true God' 1 John 5:20 stands over against
all that make pretensions of divinity, that is over against idols.

5. **The place of the Spirit in 1 John.**

The Spirit in 1 John is the Spirit of prophecy who enables the true confession that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh 4:1ff. (See CD XII:2-3) This confession is the test of those who have the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Truth, 4:2,6, who is the authentic witness to Jesus 5:6,8. (See John 15:26,27 where the dual witness of the Spirit and the Apostles is spoken of in such a way as to show that the Spirit’s witness is carried on through the Apostles, there is in fact only one witness, the inspired witness of the Apostles.) The Spirit is given by Jesus 1 John 3:24; 4:13; (See John 15:26 and also 14:16 etc.) But the contrast between the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error is not found in the Gospel, see 1 John 4:6. The different situation could explain this development. In the new situation there were those who claimed inspiration by the Spirit, but refused to confess that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh. No doubt the ecstasy that accompanied inspiration made clear that it could not be said that they were not inspired. But it could be said that the agent of the inspiration was some Spirit other than the Spirit of Truth. In the Gospel situation it would appear that the Church at large was not properly aware of the presence of the Spirit. This was not the case by the time 1 John was written. The problem faced in 1 John is "how do we recognize the Spirit of God when there are so many other spirits abroad?"

The question remains concerning the use of Χρίσμα in 1 John 2:20-27. In this discussion the following verses will also be relevant; 2:14,24; 3:9; 5:18. Firstly, it seems certain that Χρίσμα relates to baptism in some way. In the Old Testament prophets, priests and kings were anointed as a sign of their consecration to the Lord, and in particular the figure through whom God’s purposes would be fulfilled was given the title 'the Anointed One’, ὁ Χριστός. The anointing of prophets, priests and kings was a rite carried out with oil, and it was no doubt thought that the "Messiah" would also be anointed with oil. But in the Old Testament the anointing is associated with the giving of Spirit. Isaiah 61:1, 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach...’ In Luke 4:18 these words were
spoken by Jesus of himself, and the reference to his anointing by the Holy Spirit looks back to his baptism Luke 3:21ff. This is confirmed by Acts 10:37ff where, having referred to the baptism by John, it is said, "Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power!" Further, in 2 Cor. 1:21ff, Paul speaks of God who anointed us and sealed us, giving us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. When we come to 1 John 2:20, "And you have the anointing from the Holy One," it seems straightforward to accept this as meaning the anointing by the Holy Spirit which Christians receive at baptism. But there are several objections to this interpretation. The Spirit is nowhere referred to as the Holy Spirit in 1 John, and the Holy One may not refer to him but to Jesus or the Father. The discussion of **Χρισμα** does not appear in the sections which clearly deal with teaching about the Spirit, e.g. 4:1ff. Further what is said of the **Χρισμα** is also said of the word. The **Χρισμα** abiding in Christians teaches them all things 2:27. The word of God abides also 2:14, which is referred to in 2:24 as that which they have heard from the beginning, and is to abide in them. Though it is not said that the word teaches them, this may safely be assumed, as the word is the vehicle of knowledge. The word of God which was received formally at the beginning of their Christian lives in baptism, received by all Christians without distinction, teaches them all that they need to know. Thus Professor Dodd argues that the **Χρισμα** refers not to the anointing by the Spirit, but is a technical description for the "rule of faith" confessed at baptism. If the heretics claimed to have been anointed with secret knowledge, the author of 1 John replies that all Christians have been anointed with the Word of God and consequently "**all know**" 2:20. **Καιτις** is preferred, though **Καιτικα** is read by some Mss, and would have the support of **Καιτιον** in 2:27. (19) The interpretation suggested is confirmed by 3:9; "Every one who is born of God does not sin because his **οικεμα** (God's) abides in him..." There are Gnostic parallels to this saying concerning the abiding of the Divine seed in some men, but the association of this idea with the abiding of the Word of God 2:14,24 (see also James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23-25; Luke 8:11; 1 Cor. 4:15); indicates the association of this idea with the Christian usage. **(Οικεμα** could
refer to Christ, see Gal. 3:16, but the idea of begetting suggests the idea of the semen which is a symbol for the Word). In 5:18 it is said that καὶ ὁ γεννήθης εἰς τὸν θεόν, διὰ οὗ εἰμι καταφέρεις, ἐὰν ὁ γεννήθης εἰς τὸν θεόν τηρῇ αὐτὸν.... The exact meaning of the verse is not clear. It rather depends on whether αὐτὸν or ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ is read. If αὐτὸν is read the meaning is that the person born of God keeps himself, but if ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ is read a distinction between the present participle and aorist participle is to be understood as the person being born of God does not sin because Jesus who had been begotten of God keeps him. See the Patristic variant of John 1:13 and John 18:37, Psalm 2:7; Luke 3:22. There is also the parallelism between 1 John 3:9 and 5:18 which suggests that the Ἰδρύμα (the Word) was in mind. There is good precedent in the Gospel for the idea of Jesus and the Word keeping the disciples from the evil one, John 17:11-19. But the time of Jesus keeping the disciples is thought to have come to an end. They were henceforth to be kept by the Word 17:17, but it is difficult to see how ὁ γεννήθης can refer to the Ἰδρυμα unless the verb can indicate the production of the semen.

We take Ἰδρυμα as a symbol for the Word of God, "the rule of faith" confessed in baptism. But to exclude the activity of the Spirit in this context would be a mistake because such a confession is a manifestation of the activity of the Spirit of Truth, 1 John 3:24; 4:1ff. John 17 does not mention the Spirit but Jesus and the Word keep the disciples. But the Gospel presupposes that the authentic meaning of Jesus and the Word is brought out by the activity of the Spirit, John 14:26; 16:13-15. The Apostolic witness was made on the basis of having been with Jesus and because of the witness of the Spirit, John 15:26-27. In 1 John the confession in baptism was made possible through the Word handed down from the Apostles and also the activity of the Spirit who brings about the inward recognition and acceptance of that authentic word. (21) (On 1 John 4:1 see C.D. XIII:2-3). In rejecting the interpretation of Ἰδρυμα as relating to the Spirit Dodd does not do justice to 1 John 2:20, in fact his discussion of this subject is left until 2:27. It is 2:20 which draws attention to the Spirit's relationship to Ἰδρυμα. Although there is no precedent for
referring to the Spirit as Θεός ἀγίου, and the Spirit is not called "the Holy Spirit" in 1 John, no alternative is satisfactory. (22)

Generation from God is rarely spoken of in the Old Testament (but see Psalm 2:7; Prov.8:25; Sirach 24:3) but the use in the Mysteries and Gnosticism may have influenced the New Testament development. The usage in 1 John is closer to the Gnostic use than the Gospel (see John 1:12ff; 3:3ff.) and this is especially true of 1 John 3:9; see Corp.Herm. XIII:1-2; Poimandres Tractate 1:12-15, 24-26 etc. (23) But there is good precedent for this usage in the New Testament (See James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23-25; Luke 8:11; 1 Cor.4:15.) and although the usage in 1 John is closer to the Gnostic usage it is clear that this language is being used with a different meaning to refute the heretical schismatics. The abiding of the Spirit (3:24) and the confession of the "rule of faith" are inseparably linked (4:1ff) in such a way as to exclude the heretics.

6. The revelation and man's sin.

Though Jesus' coming was to take away the sin of the world, it also revealed that sin. The claim to be sinless is a lie (1:8ff.) and those who make the claim have refused God's forgiveness. Jesus' coming to deal with sin (3:5,8) was not an encouragement for loose morality though through his coming the sinner could be forgiven 2:1f. His coming was not only to destroy the consequence of sin, that is death, but to destroy sin itself 3:5,8. Consequently the lives of men were to be changed through abiding in him (3:6; 4:13) and his abiding in them through his word and the Spirit 2:14; 3:9,24; 4:13; (4:15f.); 5:18. As a result of this abiding in which Jesus gives himself through the Word and Spirit, the Christian, through the obedience of faith no longer lives in the power of sin (3:9; 5:18), though he may fall to temptation and actually sin (5:16-17). But there is forgiveness for those who confess their sin 2:1f.


Unlike the Gospel the Epistles do not deal with the "mutual" abiding of the Father and the Son. But this fact is only an indication of the different purpose of the Epistle. It is not Jesus' relationship to the Father, but the believers relationship to God that is in question
in the Epistle. This theme is present in the Gospel and is dealt with in much the same way as it is in the Epistle. (See Note 16 above)

Strong emphasis is laid on the need to abide in Jesus (2:6, 24, 27, 28; 3:16, 24; 4:13), and in this abiding to follow Jesus' example of life (2:6), receive his teaching (2:24, 27; and 2 John 9), not just as hearers, but as those who obey and forsake sin (3:16) through keeping his commandments. 3:24. To abide in him is to abide in his commands and the fundamental commands are to believe in Jesus Christ and to love one another 3:23. The confirmation of abiding in him is the abiding presence of the Spirit (4:13), and the Spirit's presence is manifested in the acknowledgement that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh 4:1ff. Those who abide in Jesus, through abiding in his word and abiding in love consequently abide in God (2:24; 4:15, 16) because God is love 4:16. In the same way it is said that he who loves his brother abides in the light 2:10, that is, abides in the revelation that God has made of himself in his Son. To so abide is to remain within the sphere where God's revelation is effective.

The same point can be made by talking about the presence of the revelation with those who abide in the Son. The Word of God abides in them (2:14, 24) as does the truth (2 John 2), the ἀπόκρυπτα (2:27), the ἀποκάλυψε (3:9), eternal life (3:15), the love of God (3:17), Jesus (3:24; 4:13), God 4:15, 16. To abide within the sphere where God's work of salvation operates is to have this at work within one's own life. God reveals his life and love in his Son, not simply as an exhibition of what he is, but also as the possibility which he had opened up to the world. To abide in this revelation is to have the reality of the revelation abiding within one's self (5:11ff.), that is eternal life, to abide for ever 2:17.

Those who do not abide in the revelation have closed themselves to the possibility of life and consequently are yet in the darkness (2:9, 11) and abide in death 3:14. The new life of love for the brethren ought to mean that schisms do take place. To break off from the fellowship was a sign of not belonging to it in reality 2:19.

Two important verses 4:13, 15 indicate that the mutual abiding of the believer in God and God in the believer has two criteria; the
possession of the Spirit, and the confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. But there is in fact only one criterion because the confession is inspired by the Spirit 41ff., and the Spirit's activity does not take place apart from the Apostolic testimony 2:14, 24.

8. **Knowledge through sight.**

The verbs ἀπαθεία (2 John 8); ἰδεία (1 John 5:16, 3 John 14); ἔκπλησις (1 John 3:17); are used exclusively in the sense of observing with the physical eye, and ἰδεία is used metaphorically in 1 John 3:1. Both ὅραν (1 John 4:20) and ἔλεασθε (1 John 4:12) are used to indicate that no one has seen God; compare John 1:18 where ὅραν is used. This statement had the general support of Judaism, and refers to sight with the physical eye.

Both ὅραν and ἔλεασθε are used to indicate the Apostles' eyewitness experience of the Gospel events 1 John 1:1ff. (Compare 1 John 4:14). (24) This is made clear by reference to "our eyes" and "our hands" which indicate that the author is speaking about the sensory perception of a physical object. Bultmann (25) recognizes the force of these words but because he considers that most of the eyewitnesses would have been dead by the time the Epistle was written rejects the most obvious interpretation. Instead he suggests that all believers, who have accepted the Apostolic witness, have seen in this sense. The sense is to be understood historically and eschatologically, that is, the event which is the object of sight recurs through the μαρτυρία of believers. But it is our opinion that Bultmann has not given sufficient reason for rejecting the interpretation of this verse in terms of the original eyewitnesses. Even if most of the eyewitnesses were dead one living could write in this manner. (26)

There are several other references to sight using ὅραν (οἶδα) in the Epistles which do not seem to refer to physical sight. The meaning of 1 John 3:2 depends to some extent on the subject of ἐμφάνισθη. It has been suggested that the subject is "what we shall be" but it is more likely that the subject is Jesus whose manifestation at the Parousia is in view, see John 14:1. ἐμφάνισθη is used of Jesus' mission in 3:5, and in Hebrews 9:28 ὅφθασα is used with the Parousia in view, and in a similar context to that of 1 John 3:2.
The sight in view is the physical vision of Jesus at his parousia. But there are two questions yet to be answered. **Firstly**, what is the relationship between seeing Jesus and becoming like him? **Secondly**, what is the origin of this idea of seeing?

Is there a causal relationship between seeing and being? The idea of transforming vision is common in Hellenistic religions. But see Matthew 5:8; Hebrews 12:14; and John 17:24. The origin of this idea is bound up with the Jewish idea of "the eschaton". But the heretics against whom 1 John was written would not have had this sense in mind. 1 John 3:2 would seem to be related to John 17:24 where Jesus asked that his disciples may see his glory, that is share in it. It would seem that only those who had been transformed would enter this experience. Similarly, only those who had been transformed would see Jesus as he is at his coming. The transformation cannot be the result of seeing because the transformation is already taking place (see 1 John 2:8) but the sight is spoken of as future. When Paul wrote of transforming vision in 2 Cor. 3:12-18 he spoke of the transformation taking place at that present time 2 Cor. 3:18. But the fact that sight in 1 John 3:2 remains in the future indicates a different theme. Just as the world failed to recognize Christ's sonship (3:1), so it scorned the claim to be children of God which Christians made in their present humble state. Where was the proof for such an unlikely claim? Jesus' own claim seemed to be just as unlikely, but the Christians were convinced of his Sonship and his present reign in glory. The believers' answer to the world's ridicule may be put in this way; "You were wrong once about Jesus because you judged by appearance, you will be proved wrong again when he comes because he has promised us a share in his glory". This hope of sharing in Jesus' glory is expressed as a motive for holy living 1 John 3:3. When Jesus comes their partial experience of salvation will be fully realised.

In 1 John 3:6 the present tense ἀμαρτάνω, and present participle ἀμαρτάνων denote one who continues to live in sin and is not to be understood as an assertion of sinlessness. Further, abiding in Jesus, the δότι in 3:6 refers back to verse 5 where ἐκτινος and σπέρμα refer to him. (28) is apparently synonymous with seeing and knowing him. The
heretics claimed the mystical experience of abiding, seeing and knowing, but the failure to forsake sin gave evidence of the falsity of this claim. Against the claims of secret manifestations of Jesus made by the heretics our author set the eyewitness testimony of the Apostles which was able to release men from sin, see 1 John 1:3,6-7, etc. Thus we are to understand 3:6 in terms of the heretics' claim to mystical knowledge of Jesus which was shown to be false. 3 John 11 like 1 John 3:6 uses the ethical criterion to test the claim of mystical vision, but here to vision of God. He speaks of sight in 1 John 3:6 and 3 John 11 only in the negative, in other words, only to deny the claim of the heretics. No one had ever seen God, 1 John 4:12; see John 1:18. The only positive statements of sight concern the apostolic eyewitness experience of Jesus.


\(\alpha νο\varepsilon\nu\) refers to the physical act of hearing and sometimes includes doing what has been heard. The readers of 1 John have heard that Antichrist is to come (2:18; 4:3) and are prepared for this event. The writer of 3 John heard that "his children" walked in the truth, 3 John 4. As in John 9:31, 1 John 5:14-15 the principle that God hears the godly is asserted (See Isaiah 59:12). God's hearing includes the granting of the requests.

1 John 1:1,3,5 are of special importance, and as we have seen, refers to the Apostolic eyewitness experience in which the teaching of Jesus, the pre-existent Word, was heard. This point is made by emphasizing that sensory perception is in view and by distinguishing so clearly the two groups "we" and "you". The writer recalled the believers in the local community to what they heard at the beginning of their Christian lives, 2:7,14,24; 3:11; 2 John 6. Note \(\alpha νο\varepsilon\nu\) differs from 1 John 1:1 (\(\delta\) \(\eta\nu\ \alpha ν\varepsilon\nu\)\(\alpha\varepsilon\nu\)\(\gamma\nu\)) and indicates the occasion when, through hearing the Apostolic witness, the readers had become believers. The heretics claimed that ethical living was not necessary for the enlightened, but the author of 1 John recalled his readers to the ethical command which they had heard when they first believed and indicates that to depart from this command is to depart from Christ. Thus the bearers of the Apostolic witness to Jesus asserted that those
who were of God would hear them, 1 John 4:6. Whereas the author indicates that his readers are of God (and thus will heed him) 1 John 4:4, the rejection of the Apostolic witness by the heretics (1 John 2:19) revealed that they were not of God but of the world, and the world heard them, 1 John 4:5. Our author indicates that Christianity may not go beyond the revelation in history, and that there can be no valid religious experience which ignores the dominical command to love the brethren which is rooted in the original gospel.

10. Faith and knowledge.

\[\textit{πίστευω} \text{ and } \textit{πίστις} \] (\textit{πίστις} is used only in 1 John 5:4; and not at all in the Gospel) are used only in 1 John in the Johannine epistles. Faith, which is the main theme of the Gospel, is displaced by love in 1 John. The appearance of the heretical teachers could explain this change of emphasis. In other ways the use of \textit{πίστευω} in 1 John does not differ from the use in the Gospel. \textit{πίστευω} can be followed by \textit{ἐὰς} with the accusative or simply by the dative without any difference being intended; compare 3:23 and 5:13 (but see 4:1; 5:10 where the dative indicates believing what was said); or can be followed by the accusative 4:16. The content of faith can be expressed by a \textit{ὅν} -clause 5:1,5; and \textit{πίστευω} can be used in synonymous parallelism with \textit{γενομένη} 4:16; compare John 6:69.

To believe what someone has said is to accept this as the truth and to act in the light of that truth. In 4:1 the readers are told not to believe every Spirit, that is, they cannot accept all inspired utterance as truth. Inspired utterance has to be tested by the Gospel truth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh. Inspired utterance which complies with this test is the work of the Spirit of God and is to be accepted as the truth.

In 1 John 5:10b and c the object of belief is the witness that God has borne to his Son. To fail to believe God is to make out that he is a liar, that is to declare that his witness is false. The witness borne to his Son is probably the descent and abiding of the Spirit who is referred to in 5:10 as the witness within those who believe in the Son; See John 1:29ff. In 5:10 believing God is expressed with the dative, believing his witness with \textit{ἐὰς} + the accusative. There is no difference
in the sense of believing, as in both cases what we note is the failure to believe in the witness which God bore to his Son, that is the failure to believe God.

To believe in the name of the Son is expressed with the dative 3:23 and with εἰσίν + the accusative 5:13, which is the same as believing in the Son of God 5:10. To believe in him means to believe that he is the Christ 5:1; the Son of God 5:5. To believe that Jesus is the Son of God is to believe and know the love which God has for us (4:16) because to believe and know that the Son of God gives his life for the world is to believe and know the nature of God's love. To believe means to recognize Jesus in his true significance and in his unique work; to recognize and to thankfully accept the new opportunity of life which he has brought about, the eternal life 5:13. To believe in the Son, is to have the Son and to have the Son is to have life 5:10-12. To have the witness within is to have the life giving Spirit through whom men are made children of God and this all comes about through believing in the Son of God 5:1,10. The Gospel concerning the Son, and the Spirit, Jesus' gift to those who believe in him, witness to and create the possibility of eternal life within those who believe in Jesus.

The world lies in the power of the evil one (5:19), but those who love are born of God (4:7), which means that they also believe that Jesus is the Christ 5:1, and those who love have passed from death to life, but those who do not love abide in death 3:14. The world is in death, it passes away, but those who do God's will abide for ever 2:17. Jesus overcame the world, conquered its hatred, broke the power of death, and those who believe in him also overcome the world 5:4,5. Victory over the world is the triumph of life over death, of love over hate, and faith over unbelief.


The big difference from the Gospel that we note is that "knowledge" is not used in the development of Christology. The mutual knowledge of the Father and Son is never spoken of in the Epistles. But the purpose of the Epistle could explain this. The definitions which are arrived at in the Gospel are the starting and concluding points for the Christology of the Epistle; "Jesus is the Christ the Son of God", see

Jesus' knowledge of "his own" is not spoken of in the Epistles either, but this does not mean that the idea of knowledge is different, simply that Jesus has departed to become our advocate with the Father. The Epistle is not written from his point of view as a Gospel is, to some extent at least.

A further difference between Epistles and Gospel is that although γνῶσκειν and εἰςεῖν are used more or less as synonyms (we did note that in the Gospel the greater frequency of εἰςεῖν was explained by its more frequent use in narrative passages, while in discourses both verbs were used with a similar frequency), there are some notable differences of use in 1 John. Firstly, the construction ἐν τούτῳ γνῶσκομεν which is used frequently has no parallel using εἰςεῖν. But as this construction is not used in the Gospel at all, the need to provide the description for testing the authenticity of claims which the situation of the Epistles brought about may in itself be a sufficient explanation. John 13:35 does have ἐν τούτῳ γνῶσονται and this probably means that γνῶσκειν was used for this sort of formula by the author of Gospel and Epistle. Knowledge in these cases is drawn from observable events. We may not conclude from this that γνῶσκειν denotes knowledge acquired through the senses while εἰςεῖν denotes intuitive knowledge. The distinction may be no more than a grammatical preference.

γνῶσκειν is used of knowing the Father 2:13, the Son 2:3 and the Spirit 4:2, but εἰςεῖν is never used with a personal object. Eleven of the fifteen (12 of the 16 counting 3 John) uses of εἰςεῖν are followed by ὅτι-clauses which give the rational content of knowledge. (See 1 John 2:29; 3:2,5,14,15; 5:13,15,15,18,19,20; 3 John 12). The remaining four uses are, not knowing where one is going in the dark 2:11 (see John 12:35). More important, in 2:20, those who have the "Chriism from the Holy One" are all said to know (not "know all things") and in 2:21 what they are said to know is indicated to be the truth. Here the truth is not personal as in John 14:6; as 2:22, makes clear. The liar denies that Jesus is the Christ, but the one who knows the truth knows that Jesus is the Christ. γνῶσκειν
is also used with ὁμοιογραφικον clauses supplying the content of knowledge, but seems to be distinguished from εἰς ἐνακρίνα when used with a personal object.

In the Gospel εἰς ἐνακρίνα is used 86 times γνωρίσκειν 56 times. The frequency is reversed in 1 John where εἰς ἐνακρίνα is used only 15 times while γνωρίσκειν is used 25 times. Perhaps this reversal is to be explained by the lack of narrative passages in the Epistles and the frequent use of the ἐν τούτῳ γνωρίσκομαι formula. But there still remains the fact that εἰς ἐνακρίνα is not used with a personal object in the Epistles though frequently used in this way in the Gospel 1:26, 31, 33; 4:22; 6:42; 7:28, 29; 8:19, 55; 14:7; 15:21. This change may be explained by the heretical usage where γνωρίσκειν (and probably also γνῶσις ?) was used as in 1 John 2:4; 4:6, 7, 8.

i. God knows all things 3:20. This affirmation is commonplace in Judaism where God's omniscience was assumed. To declare that God knows all things is to assert his control over the universe.

ii. The world does not know us "because it did not know him. 3:1.

"The world did not know him", John 1:10 lies behind this statement, together with John 15:18ff. The failure to know Jesus is not simply an intellectual failure, that is, a failure to recognize him, it is this, but it is also the categorical rejection of him which can be described as hatred. The disciple can expect no different treatment from the world than it gave to his master. The world does not recognize the Children of God, it does not accept them but rejects them in the same manner in which it rejected Jesus before them.

The person who hates his brother walks in the darkness and does not know where he is going 1 John 2:11. Compare John 12:35 which seems to lie behind this saying. The world is in darkness in the power of the evil one and one aspect of the meaning of this darkness is that those in it do not know where they are going. Their lives lack direction and purpose.

iii. The false claims of the heretics. As we have already seen the heretics claimed; "We know him" 2:4. The context suggests that the "him" is Christ. The knowledge of Christ which they claimed was akin to direct mystical knowledge of God. But to truly know him is to obey the
command which was given during his ministry on earth. In obeying his
command one had authentic knowledge of Jesus, but more than this, the
obedience was in itself the assurance of that knowledge "we know that
we know him in this, we keep his commandments", 1 John 2:3; and is
synonymous with 2:5, "we know that we are in him".

The first test to be faced by those who claimed to have mystical
knowledge of Jesus was that of keeping his commandments, the same test
applied to those who claimed to be in him. Consequently, those who
claimed to abide in him, to have seen and known him, but continued to
live in sin, were refuted by their own conduct 3:6. Conduct displays
the new life which those who know Jesus have 5:11/13,20; and the kind
of conduct which the life manifests itself in is love for brethren, so
that those who love the brethren may know that they have passed from
death to life, while it is clear that those who hate their brothers are
murderers and are abiding in death 3:14/15. The basis for equating hate
with murder is to be found in the teaching of Jesus, see Matt.5:21f. No
person living in hate has eternal life in him because this life reveals
itself as love.

Secondly, the test to be faced by those who claimed to know God
was that of the Apostolic testimony to Jesus. Those who claimed direct
mystical knowledge of God revealed the falsity of their claim in the
rejection of this witness 4:16. The inspiration of those who claimed
this knowledge was due to the Spirit of Error. We see then that the
witness to the events of the gospel history was the test for the claim
to know God and to have his Spirit. Those who know God and have his
Spirit are those who accept the Gospel. Thus we see that knowing God
and knowing Christ are a unity, see 1 John 2:23,24; 5:20.

Thirdly, to know God, which is also to be born of God (another way
of speaking of having eternal life; see 5:1ff.,20) leads to the love
for the brethren 4:7. The reverse is true also: The person who does
not love does not know God 4:8. Not only does God reveal himself as
love 4:9, God is love 4:8. This love is revealed in the Father's giving
of his Son that the world may live, that is share in his life, have
fellowship with the Father and the Son 4:10; 1:3. To know that God is
like this, can only lead man to be like him, at least this is the con­
sequence which "ought" to follow 4:11. The man who knows God's love
ought to love his brother in the same manner. The revelation of God's love lays a command upon those who know it, and the command is not all that is given because the new life which God gives is life like his which is expressed in love. To know God, to know his love, using "know" as John does, can only mean that the one who knows will love his brother. (31)

(The heretics also claimed to be in God and God in them. Love for one another was also the test for this claim 4:12. A second test of this "mutual abiding" was the gift of the Spirit 4:13. But in what way did John expect the presence of the Spirit to be detected? The answer to this question is to be found in 4:15 "Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him and he in God". This mutual abiding is revealed by the presence of the Spirit and the confession of faith in Jesus. This does not give us two lines of verification as 4:1ff shows. The inspired confession of faith in Jesus indicates the "mutual abiding". The heretics' claim to love God will be dealt with in section 12 below.)

iv. The content of knowledge and the means of knowing. In 5:15 the knowledge that "our requests are granted" is based on the premise that God hears the godly, see John 9:31; Proverbs 10:24. The acceptance of the premise leads to the confidence in asking. Knowledge is deduced from an accepted presupposition and an historical occurrence in 2:18. From such sayings of Jesus as Matt.24:24ff the appearance of "many antichrist" gives knowledge that the end of the age was at hand. The writer of 3 John 12 appealed to Gaius, "you know that our witness is true". This knowledge was based on acquaintance.

The theological theme of knowledge will now be treated. The essential basis for knowledge is the acceptance of the fact that the love of God was revealed in Jesus, the acceptance of the fact that God is love, and that this love was revealed in the mission of his Son to give life to the world. Thus faith is the precondition of knowledge and knowledge can only be the knowledge of faith. All Christians have received the anointing of "the Holy One", which is bound up in the confession of faith at baptism, and consequently know the truth 2:20-21. The truth is that "Jesus is the Christ" (See also 2 John 1 where the
truth is the gospel) not Jesus himself as in John 14:6, but may be more closely related to John 8:32; though John 8:36 would seem to give a personal interpretation of the meaning of truth in 8:32. It could be that we should interpret the truth as the revelation that Jesus is the Son of God. Knowledge of this truth makes one free. Of course the truth about Jesus and Jesus as the truth cannot finally be distinguished in the Gospel so that pressing this distinction may be artificial. John 8:32 may be the basis for these statements in the Epistles.

The gospel which was communicated not only proclaimed who, in the most ultimate sense, Jesus was, it also proclaimed the purpose of his mission. "He was manifest to take away sin," (see John 1:29 etc.) 3:5. To know this was a consequence of accepting the gospel witness concerning Jesus. Part of the problem of sin was that man had lost his knowledge of God through his bondage in the world so that he no longer knew where he was going. But "the Son of God has come and given us σινοειν..." 5:20. Σινοειν occurs only here in the Johannine writings. It is not simply a substitution for γνῶσις, but refers to the "faculty of perception" or "gift of apprehension". Though related to the gift of the Spirit Σινοειν does not refer specifically to the gift of the Spirit. (32) Through the coming of the Son of God a new heart to know God has been given to believers (See Jeremiah 24:7; 31:33f.; 32:39/40; Psalm 51 esp. verse 10. Hebrews 10:16; 1 Kings 3:9,12; Ez.11:19; 18:31). Unlike the followers of many Hellenistic religions, John did not believe that man had a natural disposition to know God. Knowledge of God was a result of the life given through the coming of the Son of God. The agents through which life is given are the gospel and the Spirit 2:20, 27; 3:24; 4:13. Knowledge of the true God is rooted in the gospel events but made effective only through the presence of the Spirit of God.

The Σινοειν given through the coming of the Son of God makes it possible for us to know God and to have eternal life. (Compare 1 John 5:20 with John 17:3 on which it is apparently based).

The object of knowledge is the matter of some doubt. (1) Τὸν ἀληθινὸν is read by Νι B.K.P. a host of minuscules, Byz, Lect. Itm, Syr, P.h, Cop. 60 mss arm and some of the Fathers, (2) Τὸν ἀληθινὸν
The glosses are correct interpretations of the original text, the coming of Jesus has given believers the faculty to know the true God, and this is to be in him who is true and in his Son Jesus Christ. We are reminded here of John 17:21ff. The words ἐν τῷ ὑιῷ ἑαυτῷ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ have been taken in opposition with ἐν τῷ ἀληθεῖνον and as a consequence to know him who is true would mean to know him, but the ἑαυτῷ "and in his Son" makes this interpretation impossible. "In him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ". The means of being in him who is true is by being in his Son Jesus Christ. To know Jesus Christ is to know God and to have eternal life. The meaning is the same as John 17:3. Knowing the Father 2:14, and knowing the Son 2:13-14 does not involve two objects of knowledge for to know the Son is to know the Father just as to abide in the Son is to abide in the Father, 2:23-24. Because of this the author may write in such a way as to fail to distinguish clearly the Father and the Son without serious consequence. Thus knowledge in this sense is the knowledge of faith, the faith which confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, and in this confession of faith knows God's love. That love is known in faith which accepts Jesus as the one sent by the Father to be the Saviour of the world 3:16; 4:9; 4:14-16, as the one who has come (been manifested) to take away sin 3:15,8; 5:20, and to bring men to the knowledge of God.

The same life revealed in Jesus is given to those who receive him. This life is described in terms of love. Thus those who love may be sure that they have eternal life while those who hate their brothers may be sure that they have not 3:14-15. Just as the readers knew that...
Jesus is righteous so they should know that those who behaved righteously were born of him 2:29, (34) that is have eternal life. In the same way those who are in Jesus (which means the same as knowing him) walk as he walked 2:6, those who claim to be in him should behave as he did. Knowing Jesus, and abiding in him mean the same thing and this knowledge and abiding is manifest in keeping his commandments 2:3-5, and as a consequence not continuing in sin 3:6; 5:18. The fact that Jesus' commands are kept is the assurance of knowing and abiding in him 2:3-5; as is also the possession of the Spirit the assurance of abiding in God 3:24; 4:13, but the possession of the Spirit of God can only be recognized in the confession that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh 4:2,6. Thus ultimately knowing and abiding are expressed and recognized in the confession of faith in Jesus and in loving one another 3:23. In loving one another as Jesus had loved them the author said that they were to know that they were of the truth 3:16-19, that is that they were children of God, 5:1ff., that they have eternal life 3:14. The activity of the Spirit is known in the acceptance of the Apostolic witness to Jesus 4:6, and the confession of faith which resulted from it 4:2. Thus the lives of believers are directed both by the revelation of Jesus in history (including the command to love one another which he gave, see John 13:34f. etc. 1 John 2:7,8; 3:11,) and the activity of the Spirit. Thus the gift of life was experienced in the present, believers are really children of God, and the present experience gives the assurance of sharing in Jesus' glory in the future, 3:2; see John 14:1ff.; 17:24. The hidden relationship which believers experienced would then be revealed.

The purpose of the Epistle is declared in 5:13 which appears to be modelled on John 20:31. The Gospel was written that the readers may have eternal life through believing in the name of the Son of God. The Epistle was written that those who believed in the name of the Son of God may know that they have eternal life. The difference is most important. Evidently the heretics had undermined the gospel in claiming that only those who knew God directly in mystical experience had eternal life. Those who believed in Jesus, could not on account of such an earth bound claim, think that they have eternal life. John writes to
assure believers that they have eternal life in believing. The difference between John and the heretics was the belief that the Son was really incarnate, made man, that God had really revealed himself in history, and in this history achieved the salvation of the world.

To believe in Jesus was, for John, to know the most profound truth that God is love, and to know this was to have eternal life, because God has given us eternal life in his Son 5:11ff. This is the meaning of his love 4:7ff. The epistle was written to assure believers and to expose heretics.

12. Love for the brethren. The fact that God is love, and that his love has been revealed in sending the Son to be the Saviour of the world is absolutely decisive for all that is said about love in 1 John, see 3:16; 4:8,9,10,11,16,19. The activity of the living God is expressed in love, and love is life-giving so that those who receive God's love in his Son have eternal life, 5:11ff.

The gift of eternal life can be described as God's giving his Son so that those who have the Son have life 5:11ff; or as the giving of his love 3:1ff. In loving us God has bestowed his love on us so that we have a share in the divine nature. The love that God gives to those who believe is expressed in love for the brethren (2:5) which is what Jesus commanded, see also 2:7f,14,24; 3:11. Love for the brethren is understood as love for the neighbour. See 3:15; 4:20.

The love that the Father has given is not undefined in its nature. It is not love for the world 2:15. In other words faith has already decided for God against the world. The world is in darkness, in hatred, in death. Faith has rejected these standards and the love of God is the reality of the new possibility which has been chosen in Jesus.

The love which God has given is expressed in love to the brethren, and the active nature of this love is clear 3:17. This loving comes from the new nature given by God, and the nature is in harmony with him who is himself love 4:7. The love which is his gift of life comes to fruition in the acts of love for the brethren 2:5; 4:12. Because it is God's love in us it can be said that he abides in us and we in him, 4:12. This experience arises out of the confession of faith in Jesus, which sees in him God's love for us, and through him experiences the gift of
God's love 4:16. To abide in this love is to continue in the awareness of God's love for us and to love one another. (All of these references use the noun not the verb)

The fact that God's love as a gift is expressed by the noun ἀγάπη and never the verb suggests perhaps that the new nature that the child of God has from the Father is love. As the Father is love so are his children. For those who abide in love there can be no fear, because if there is the assurance that God loves us, there can be no fear of retribution 4:17,18.

The command to love the brethren is prominent (2:7f;14,24; 3:11). Those who love the brethren abide in the light 2:10, that is, accept the revelation, and as such are children of God 3:10; 4:7f. Their love is the proof of their new life which has been given to them 3:14. (The children of the devil do not love with the love of God and consequently abide in death 3:14). Just as the love of God is defined in terms of action 4:9ff; 3:17; so the command to love the brethren is shown to require action for the sake of the brother 3:17/18.

The love which Christians are to show to each other is a gift from God but is also something which the Christian himself must do. John appeals to his readers "If God loved you like this, you ought to love one another" 4:11. The love which God gives does not become action for the good of the brother automatically. The believer continues to make the revelation of the love of God be that which he decides for against the world and in his decision is the will to make actual God's love. God's love comes to fruition in the lives of those who love one another, 4:12. But the love which the believer has for his brother is always in response to God's love for him, but more, it is only because God loves that he is able to love in this way at all 4:19.

In 2 John 1,3,5,6 love for the brethren is mentioned. In verse 1 John speaks of those "whom I love in truth", that is, those I truly love, love according to the meaning of love as it is revealed in Jesus. In verse 3 the blessing which John asks for his readers is to be manifest in love. Verse 5 speaks of the command to love one another as does verse 6.

3 John refers to Gaius "whom I truly love" with the same meaning as
2 John 1 and in verse 6 the love referred to is without doubt the acts of charity shown to those who were in need.

The claim to love God was apparently made by the heretics 4:20, and made in such a way as to exclude the need of love for the brethren. But it is not clear that John accepted the validity of this way of speaking. The heretics considered love for God as the crowning mystical experience. John’s answer to them can be seen firstly in his definition of love in 4:10f. "In this is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us". The focus of attention is placed firmly on God’s act in Christ. Though we cannot conclude from this that it is wrong to speak of loving God, the suggestion does seem to be there. In 4:12 the suggestion is reinforced "If God loved us like this, we ought to love one another". If loving God was a valid expression of the Johannine exposition of love one would have expected to find an expression of it here.

Secondly, in 3:23 the dual commandment, which sums up the response to the revelation in Jesus, is this "that we believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another". Jesus had summed up the Law in the two commandments of love for God and love for the neighbour (see Mark 12:29ff. and parallels). Love for God in that sense had meant absolute obedience, but John had redefined love in terms of God’s revelation of himself in Jesus. The love for God command he had redefined as believing in Jesus, and consequently the close relationship of believing in him and loving the brother becomes clear.

Because of the Christ background to the idea of loving God, John could not simply say, "you should not say this". But he did have to show his readers that what the heretics claimed to be love for God was nothing of the sort. Perhaps even if there had been no Christian background John would have argued in the same way, seeking to lead his readers positively to an authentic understanding of love. This is in keeping with his method of argument.

The argument concerning love for God is beyond verification. But John states that those who claim to love God are liars if they do not at the same time show love to the brethren. Love for someone beyond the direct contact of sight seems unlikely if those close to hand are
not loved. In fact it seems that John questions the possibility of loving authentically those beyond our scope of activity 4:20. The command in 4:21 is love one another (See John 13:34; 1 John 2:7ff., 24; 3:11), given to those who claimed to love God. It is not a dual command to love. This way of arguing is continued in 5:1. The heretics claimed to love God. Did they realise that those who believed that Jesus is the Christ are born of God? If they loved the Father they should love the children. This argument is based on their claim to love God. Because love for God cannot be tested, love for his children is made the test of the claim to love him 5:2. The verse 2 looks back to what precedes in 4:6; 3:19. Dodd translates the passage in syllogistic form:

He who loves the parent loves the child.
Every Christian is a child of God.
Therefore, when we love God we love our fellow Christians.

John continues in 5:3 indicating that the command to keep the commandments. In this context "the love of God" seems to mean "love for God", but it could mean "God's love". This is the meaning in 2:15, and of the law of love for the world, but whereas the world (κόσμον) is in the accusative case, Father (πατέρας) is in the genitive case. The Father's love, given to man, is not expressed in love for the world, i.e. the lust of the flesh etc. Thus the meaning in 5:3 is that the gift of God's love is expressed in keeping the commandments. The argument thus returns to 3:22f. where the commandments are reduced to one two-sided commandment, to believe in Jesus, and to love one another. Love for God has, in the Johannine vocabulary, been redefined as believing in Jesus and loving one another because the giving nature of love as defined by John is misleading when used of man's love for God. Consequently it appears that John himself did not intend to speak of loving God directly, see 3:23; 4:11; 5:3.


As in the Gospel those who bear witness in the Epistles claim to have first-hand knowledge of the fact to which they bear witness.

1. The Apostolic witness to Jesus. The opening verses of the
Epistle could not make any clearer that the author claims for himself, and those included in the "we" eye witness knowledge of the Gospel events. "What we have seen with our own eyes, heard, what our hands have handled", we bear witness to you, we announce to you, we report to you, not only what he did, but also what he taught, we bring you the message about him, and the message he himself preached. 1:2,3,5. The witness claim to know the truth of what he tells as an eye witness and two important points arise out of this claim. John claims to know that the command to love one another is the authentic command given by Jesus himself 1:5; 2:23, and that as an eyewitness he testified that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. This testimony arises out of his experience of the gospel history 4:14. It was as a believer that he bore witness, but his presence with the Jesus of history is what was important in the face of the denial that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh 4:2.

11. The threefold witness to Jesus, 1 John 5:6ff. The witness of the Spirit, though probably including the baptism of Jesus (John 1:29ff.; Mk.1:9), has primary reference to the inspired confession that Jesus is the Christ and has come in the flesh, see 1 John 4:2ff. The witness of the Spirit is to the fact that Jesus Christ has come by water and blood, not only in baptism of water but in death also through the shedding of his blood. Such a statement runs contrary to the teaching of Cerinthus as reported by Irenaeus. Not only did the Spirit bear witness, baptism and death all concerned Jesus Christ who had come in the flesh, and died to save the world, see 4:4 also.

111. God's witness concerning Jesus, 5:9-11. John stated the obvious that God's testimony is weightier than human testimony and ought therefore to be accepted. His testimony concerns his Son and the eternal life given to those who receive him by faith, so that to believe in the Son, to have the Son, is to have life. To have life is to have God's testimony as part of one's own experience. To refuse this testimony is to call God a liar. The question that is not answered is; in what way did God make this testimony known and to whom? We presume that the answer is that he made it known through his Son to those who saw and heard him. (39)
Chapter One
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(1) See note (8) Chapter Nine. (2) In the Acts of the Apostles (ch.15), the Epistle to the Galatians, and perhaps the Epistle to the Hebrews, we meet aspects of this problem, but nowhere is it dealt with at a more profound and fundamental level than in the Fourth Gospel. See A. Wikenhauser: Introduction, pp.307f. (3) Compare Romans 1:18ff. (4) Though the form of these statements is Johannine, the defeat of Satan by Jesus is an essential strand of the Synoptic tradition; see Barrett: The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, pp.55-68. (5) It is unlikely that υμοσ translates the Aramaic יַעַל meaning "servant". The most natural Aramaic translation of תַּלַע would be מַלַע. (6) From the Stone Age to Christianity, pp.37ff.; JBL, LX, pp.206-208; The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology, p.170; see also Lorenz Dürr: Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient. (7) See pp.82f. above. (8) The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel. (9) Ibid, p.6. (10) Interpretation, pp.274f.
light which has its source in the life of God. There is another sense also, suggested by the context of 8:12. "The light of life" is "the life-giving light". Because the evangelist has believers in mind in 8:12 it is probable that this aspect is prominent. But it is to be understood as an aspect of what the evangelist means by judgement. The division caused by the coming of the light includes the giving of eternal life as well as the judgement of condemnation which becomes prominent in chapter 9; See 9:16,39ff.; 3:19-21,36. (32) See pp.152ff. below on The revelation as the life.

Chapter Eleven.

(1) For the background in the Qumran Texts see pp.77f. above. See also James Muilenburg; The Way of Israel,pp.33-36. For the background in the gospel tradition see Matt.7:14. (2) See pp.124ff. above. (3) Interpretation, p.175. (4) The Semantics of Biblical Language, pp.187-205. (5) For the antithesis of truth and falsehood in the Qumran Texts see 1 QS III:13-IV:26. (6) For the OT background to the idea of freedom see also Proverbs 25:10a(LXX) and also see Pirque Aboth III:6. The study of the Law was thought to free men. (7) For the idea of purification through the truth see 1 QS IV:20-21. (8) See Psalm 26 (25):3; Tobit 3:5; 14:17. (9) For the background of this terminology see 1 Esdras 4:40; Psalm 31:7 (30:6 in the LXX; and 31:5 in English); 1 QS III:13-IV:26; and see 1 John 4:16. (10) See Tobit 12:115; Psalm 25(24):5 in the LXX. (11) See Tobit 14:7; Psalm 145(144):18. (12) Perhaps John 6:55 should be added to this list, but the text is probably άληθής not άληθωσ. (13) Perhaps we should read άληθησ. (14) See Isaiah 59:4 (LXX) where άληθινος translates ΝΣΙΔΝΟΥ, and Psalm 19(18):9 where άληθινος translates ΝΝΩ. (15) See also Ezekiel 15:1-8; 19:1-10; Psalm 80:9-16; 2 Baruch 39:7; Sirach 24:17. (16) Dodd; Interpretation, p.146. (17) Bultmann’s view that the futuristic eschatology is the work of the redactor and irreconcilable with the realised eschatology of the evangelist is to be rejected. (17a) Bultmann; Gospel,pp.248ff. and especially note 5. (18) Ibid, note 2 pp.167f. (19) Isaiah 44:6,24; 45:5-7; 48:12 are examples of the Qualificatory formula in the OT. This evidence suggests that the usage in the Fourth Gospel could well be independent of any direct
(21) Ibid, pp.265f. (22) Ibid, p.168 note 4. (23) See Dodd: Interpretation, pp.82f., 146f., 336f.; P. Borgen: Bread from Heaven, pp.2,114, 147-158; Str. B. II, pp.483f.; Sirach 15:3; 24:19-21. Note John 5:39 where it is said that the Jews considered that in the Scriptures they had life. (24) For Synoptic parallels see Matt.7:13f. = Luke 13:28; Mk.12:15; Matt.25:10; Matt.7:7=Luke 11:9; Mark 9:43,45,47=Matt.18:8f., "to enter into life". It may be that John has used the theme of the kingdom of God of the Synoptic Gospels for a Christological purpose. (25) Bultmann: Gospel, pp.286ff. has a fine statement on the exclusiveness of the revelation. (26) For the OT background to the shepherd imagery see Psalm 23; 80; 78:70-72; Isaiah 40:11; Jer.31:9; Ezek.34; 37:24; etc. See also Exodus R.2.2. Note also Mark 6:34; 14:27; Matt.9:36; 18:12-24; 25:32; 26:31; Luke 15:3-7. (27) There does not appear to be any evidence for taking καλὸς in the sense of ἔλεγχος. Further, Jesus is the only shepherd who is contrasted to thieves, robbers, and the hireling, not to other shepherds. The point is rather that Jesus performs the shepherd's proper functions. (28) For the theme of Israel as the vine see Hosea 10:1; Ezek.15:1ff.; 19:10ff.; Psalm 80:9ff.; Str. B. II, pp.495,563; TDNT I,p.342. (29) Bultmann: Gospel, p.407. (30) TDNT I, pp.342-343. (31) This is also the effect of John's λόγος Christology; compare Hebrews 1:3 and Wisdom 7:26 noting the use of ἔλεγχος suggesting that Hebrews also develops a Christology based on Wisdom. Note also the kerygmatic appeal which follows in Hebrews 2:1-4. (32) See von Rad: TDNT II, p.843. (33) See von Rad: Th. O. T. I, p.444.

Chapter Twelve.

(1) TDNT II, p.248. (2) See the Targum on Isaiah 6:5 and also Exodus 16:7; 29:43; 33:17-34:10; 40:34f.; Num.12:8; Deut.5:24; 1 Sam.4:22; Ezek.1:25; 3:12,23; 8:4; 9:3; 10:4; etc. in the LXX. (3) See also Psalm 15(14):4; 22(21):23; 50(49):23; 91(90):15; and note Matt.15:8. (4) See Dodd: Interpretation, p.206. (5) See also Exodus 33:17-34:10; Isaiah 40:5; 66:18-19; Sirach 42:25. (6) See 2 Cor.3:18 for a similar use in the context of a discussion about Moses' transfiguration, Exodus 34:29ff. (7) It may be that Mark and Paul preferred μεταμορφοῦν
because it was more meaningful to a Gentile audience, though Paul does say that the transformation is from glory to glory, 2 Cor. 3:18ff. (8) Thus against Dodd Interpretation, pp. 206-208. (9) On the nature of sight see pp. 204-221 below. (10) See pp. 144f. above. (11) This is supported by Origen and the Old Latin. See Bernard: Gospel I, p. 24. (12) See Funk (Blass): Grammar, p. 81; Moulton: Grammar I, p. 50; II, p. 162. (13) Bernard: Gospel I, p. 24. (14) On "life" see pp. 152ff. above and note the reasons for the evangelist's choice of "eternal life" rather than "the kingdom of God" to describe Jesus' work. (15) See S. Mowinckel: He that cometh, pp. 346-450; A. Bentzen: King and Messiah, especially chapters 5 and 8; Wm. Manson: Jesus the Messiah, pp. 17-19, 174-190; J. W. Creed: JTS vol 26, pp. 113-136, The Heavenly Man; Frederick H. Borsch: The Son of Man in Myth and History, pp. 89-231, 257-313. (16) If Isaiah 7:14 was influential the title "the Son of the woman" is suggested, see 1 Enoch 62:5; and compare 62:29. But Charles and Sjoberg amend the text to read "Son of Man". But in view of 1 QH III:7ff. the possibility that the text is authentic must be recognized. See also Rev. 12:13. (17) See Mowinckel: He that cometh, pp. 385-387; 1 Enoch 62:6; 51:3; 46:13; 61:9; and also 48:7 and John 8:56. (18) See 3:13, though we do not accept this interpretation. (19) See A. J. B. Higgins: Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 159. (20) For the idea of the revelation of the glory of the Son of Man at his enthronement see Mowinckel: He that cometh, pp. 387-389, and note 2 Bar. 30:1; 1 Enoch 46:2; 49:2; 69:29. (21) See Bultmann: Gospel, p. 107 note 5. (22) This is the reading of P 66, 75, W D W, etc., and is to be preferred to the reading "the Son of God" A Ω, it vg, etc., because, not only is it better attested, but it is difficult to imagine "Son of God" being changed to "Son of Man" while the reverse is likely in a context where it is said that "the Son of Man" was worshipped. (23) Thus against those who argue that they are to be identified with a Jewish or Samaritan sect, or Greek speaking Jews. See J. A. T. Robinson: Twelve N.T. Studies, pp. 111f. (24) We have noted the connection of ἐπιβάλλειν with Ἀνάβαλλειν in relation to Jesus' exaltation. (25) See E. Jacob: Th. O.T., pp. 79f. (26) Note the use of δικαιο in 5:41, 44; 7:18; 8:50, 54; (9:24); 12:43. (27) Bultmann: Gospel, pp. 374ff.; 110 note 2; 232 note 2,
354

is of the opinion that the evangelist's theme of glorification is based on the Gnostic myth where the words σωματικάς, ψυχικάς, ἄκατος, and ἀναβαίνειν are used. The evangelist is said to have demythologized the myth. But as we have seen, the material used to reconstruct this myth is composite, and much of it is post-Christian in date. The texts from the magic papyri concerning glory are certainly post-Christian, see TDNT II, p.252.

Chapter Thirteen.


Chapter Fourteen.

(1) Bultmann: Gospel, p.45 note 1. (2) Ibid., p.45 notes 1 and 3. (3) Ibid., p.46. (4) See Bernardi: Gospel, I, p.56. (5) See TDNT I, p.697. (6) Bauer: Gospel, p.49. (7) The textual evidence is inconclusive though it probably favours the reading we have accepted. (8) TDNT IV, p.950 including note 8. (9) See Origen Fragment XCII (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, pp.554ff); Bauer: Gospel, p.165 attributes this view to Clement of Alexandria. See also Maurice Wiles: The Spiritual Gospel, p.109. (10) John 12:27ff. also has contacts with the transfiguration and baptism narratives in the Synoptic Gospels. (11) For the use of "signs and wonders" see Mark 13:22; etc and Acts 2:22, 43; 4:30; 5:12; 7:36; and Exodus 7:3. (12) In John 6:36 the reading "me" is supported by P^66 B D L W Θ f1 f13 etc. It is omitted by Ξ A etc. If me is omitted reference to 6:26 is clear, but we favour reading "me" because in 6:35 the transition
of the theme from Jesus' works to believing in Jesus has taken place, and wherever "seeing signs" is spoken of, faith, even if superficial, is the result. In 6:26 it is said that the crowd did not come because they saw signs, that is their coming was not the coming of faith, and thus the point is made negatively. Failure to see the signs leads to the failure to believe. It is interesting to note that Jesus always refers to his works (ἔργα), the Father's works, presented by the Father to the Son who performed them before men. When the miracles were properly seen by men they were seen as (ὑμῖν) signs of Jesus' relationship with the Father whom Jesus reveals. (13) In 1:32,33,34; 6:19; 20:12,14,27 a supernatural object is in view, to normal physical sight, but not in relationship to the theme of the development of faith. (14) See our discussion of 12:40 on pp.212-215 above. (15) See our discussion of this theme in our treatment of the work of Professor Dodd, pp.58ff. above. (16) The present tenses are to be read. The future tense is probably the result of a scribal misunderstanding of the post-glorification standpoint of this saying. (17) Against A.R.George: Communion with God in the N.T., pp.204-206. (18) Against Dodd: Interpretation, p.197; and George: Communion with God..., pp.205ff. (19) See note 16 in this chapter. (20) Bultmann: Th.N.T.II,p.88.

Chapter Fifteen.

Chapter Sixteen.


Chapter Seventeen.

(1) See Rosh Ha-Shannah 3:1; Kethuboth 2:9; Barrett: Gospel, p. 279. (2) In the plural the evangelist has joined believers with Jesus in this witness. (3) The Paraclete does not work in the world, but in believers 14:17 thus his work of conviction must be carried out through them. (4) See Ernst Kasemann: Jesu Letzer Wille nach Johannes 17. (5) In what follows references using ἀγαπᾶν will be listed under α, and those using φιλέιν will be listed under β. (6) The meaning of 5:42 is not "love for God", which could have been clearly expressed by the verb; "you do not love God." See our discussion of "loving God" in Chapter 18.
Chapter Eighteen.

(1) See BJRL xxi (April 1937); Epistles, pp.xlvii-lvi; and also Bultmann: Epistles, pp.9-10. Bultmann: Th.NT p.3 note + obviously did not think that the question of separate authorship was important for a Johannine theology, and although he asserts the independent authorship of 1 John in his commentary on the Epistles, no change in the treatment of our theme can be detected. (2) JTS (old series) xlvi (1947) pp.12-25. (3) See pp.62ff. above. (4) Bultmann: Epistles, p.29. (5) See Romans 8:34; Hebrews 7:25; 9:4; also for this idea. (6) See Dodd: Epistles, pp.111 etc.; and Bultmann: Epistles, p.9. (7) For further evidence of the similarities between 1 John and the Fourth Gospel see Brooke: Epistles, pp.1-xiv. (8) Bultmann: Epistles, pp.10ff.; etc.; Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes (Festgabe für Adolf Julicher zum 70 Geburstag) 26, Januar 1927, pp.138-158. (9) The Puzzle of 1 John. (10) Bultmann: Epistles, p.10. (11) We note 2:19 and 3:10 where first the verb and then the noun are used, but not in the sense of the revelation of God. (12) The same point is made in John 3:15f.; 6:35,53,58, etc. The relationship of 1 John 1:1ff. to John 1:1ff. suggests that the Logos of 1 John 1:1 is to be understood as a title applied to Jesus, See Brooke: Epistles, pp.xxv-xxvi; Bultmann: Epistles, pp.13-14; and see pp.316f. below. (13) See Irenaeus: Adv.Haez. I,xxvi,1. (14) Dodd: Epistles, p.28. (15) Bultmann: Epistles, pp.29-30 claims that forgiveness through the advocacy of Jesus is opposed to the statement about the expiation of sin. The latter has, in his opinion, been added by the Church redaction. But we do not agree that these statements are irreconcilable. (16) Bultmann: Epistles, p.30 says that God, not Christ, is the object of knowledge in 1 John 2:3 because ἐκεῖνος is always used of Christ whereas οὗτος is used here. In 1 John 2:16 ἐκεῖνος is used to refer to Christ (see also 3:3,5,7,16; 4:17). But the argument depends on the presupposition that the readers were familiar with this distinction. Further, the οὗτος in 2:3,4, takes up the οὗτος in 2:2 which clearly refers to Jesus. Of course Bultmann attributes 2:2 to the Church redaction, but this conclusion is not acceptable. ἐκεῖνος is used in 2:16; 3:3,5,16; 4:17 (5:16 refers to "that sin" and is not included in this statement), but only in the nominative case and when a definite
emphasis is clearly required. It would seem to be simply a grammatical distinction between ἐκεῖνος and ἄυτος, not a distinction of persons. But the difficulty of distinguishing the Father from the Son in these contexts should not be minimised. The reason for this, in part at least, is that John indicates that those who know and abide in the Father do so by knowing and abiding in the Son, 2:23ff.; 3:13-16; 5:20. Following 2:24 John speaks of that which "he" Promised (ἀπὸ τοῦ), and the Chrism received from "him" (αὐτοῦ), and as he taught (ἐσήκειν), abide in "him" (ὁ θεός). It is not clear whether John is speaking of the Father or the Son. But in 2:28 ἀνέφερε τα Καραοῦσιᾳ αὐτοῦ refer to Jesus as reference to his Parousia (ἐν τῷ Χαραοῦσιᾳ αὐτοῦ) indicates. Bultmann attributes this verse to the Church redaction thus removing the clear reference to Jesus. But we do not accept his view that this verse is contrary to the eschatology of the Epistle. Nor does it seem adequate to refer this verse to the manifestation of God wholly in the Old Testament sense. It is our opinion that the Parousia of Jesus is in view, and that John does use ἄυτος to refer to Jesus. Consequently it is not always possible to know whether the Father or the Son is in view, but as we have said, this distinction is not important because John indicates that the Father is known through the Son. It may be that the lack of clarity at this point is due to the teaching of the heretics. It is not clear whether the heretics claimed direct mystical knowledge of God, thus bypassing the Son, or whether they claimed mystical knowledge of the Son, thus bypassing the historical revelation of God in Christ. Perhaps the heretics were themselves divided on this point. John continually turns the question back to the revelation of God in the Jesus of history. Thus the discussion turns at one moment from knowing and abiding in God to knowing and abiding in Jesus. As far as John was concerned, the only way to know and abide in the Father was to know and abide in the Son, 2:22ff.; 5:20. (17) See 1 QH IV:23. (18) On the myth of "Error" see pp.97ff. above. (19) Dodd: Epistles, pp.58-64. (20) Ibid, pp.74-77. (21) See 1 QS IV:20f. (22) Bultmann: Epistles, pp.42f. says that τοῦ οὐσίων refers to Jesus, see 2:27, but he relates the anointing to the activity of the Spirit; see Acts 3:14; and note that Jesus is called the
"righteous one", 1 John 2:2; 3:29. (23) See Dodd: Epistles, pp.74-78.
(24) See our comments pp.33 (note 32), 54ff., 57, 63 above. (25) Bultmann: Epistles, pp.15ff. (26) Ibid, p.16 rejects the interpretation of the "we" in the OT sense of the corporate fellowship of Israel because of the eschatological nature of the events in view in the Epistles. This criticism is applicable to Dodd's interpretation, Epistles, pp.13ff.
But we reject both of these interpretations in favour of understanding these verses in terms of the original eye-witnesses. (27) See Dodd: Epistles, p.71. (28) See note 16 above. (29) See pp.324ff. and note 16 above. (30) See note 16 above. (31) It is not said that, "If God so loved us we ought to love him", but "we ought to love one another".
(32) See TDNT IV, p.967. (33) It is possible to take "this is the true God, and eternal life" as two statements in apposition as Moffatt does, and the sense is Johannine; see John 11:26; 14:6 which refer to Christ not God. But John 5:26 comes close to saying "God is life". We conclude with Dodd: Epistles, pp.140ff. that 1 John 5:20 is to be interpreted in the sense of John 17:3. (34) Bultmann: Epistles, pp.49-50 says that εἰς αὐτὸν γεννάω refers to begetting by God, not Jesus (see 3:1; 4:7; 5:1, 4) although 2:28-29 suggests that Jesus is in mind. Note the use of ἐγένετο in 2:29 and see 2:1; 3:7. We conclude that the author could speak of begetting by Jesus (the Word), though we may have another example of the author's failure to clearly distinguish between the Father and the Son. See note 16 above. (35) See Bultmann: Epistles, p.35. (36) In this context love for God cannot be the test of love for his children. With Dodd: Epistles, p.125 we accept the reverse. (37) Bultmann: Epistles, p.39 and note John 5:42 which is also to be understood in this sense. (38) Adv. Haer. I, xxvi, 1. (39) 3 John speaks only of the witness borne to the Christian lives of some people by those who knew them at first hand, 3 John 3, 6, 12.
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