

PART II
THE FIRST FAREWELL DISCOURSE AND
JOHANNINE CHRISTIANITY

CHAPTER VI

THE CHARISMATIC COMMUNITY AND THE PARADIGMATIC PAST

The central issue which has been raised by the analysis of the first farewell discourse presented above is the plausibility of the conflict over authority postulated as the *Sitz im Leben* of the discourse. In the concluding part of this study I wish to focus directly on this issue. In doing so I am attempting to say something about the Christian community or group represented by the Gospel. The difficulties attending such an enterprise have been sadistically emphasized by practically every scholar who has addressed the matter. Yet, as has been equally emphasized, it is an issue which cannot be avoided. It is "the great unsolved problem in Johannine studies with which almost all other problems are closely linked."¹ If not addressed directly, it is addressed implicitly by anyone who attempts to interpret the Gospel.

The need to address the issue explicitly has been increasingly acknowledged in recent years. According to Charles Scobie, "the quest for the Johannine community has become central in Fourth Gospel studies."² Among the most important recent works engaging in this quest we may note the articles by Wayne A. Meeks, D. Moody Smith Jr., James M. Robinson, Charles Scobie's own unpublished paper, the dissertation by Richard Culpepper on *The Johannine School*, monographs by Ernst Käsemann, Oscar Cullmann, Louis Martyn, and, somewhat earlier (1959), the study by Alv Kragerud.³

This is not the place to review in detail all of this literature. Some of the scholars referred to are concerned with tracing the sequence of stages from which the Johannine form of Christianity emerged.⁴ Others are more concerned with describing its particular character in contrast to other forms of early Christianity.⁵ D. Moody Smith's article is a judicious attempt to point to "significant patterns and points of coincidence" in what seems to be a "trackless morass" of scholarship.⁶

Scobie's article, like Smith's, draws on a wide range of approaches and methods to produce a coherent, detailed view of the development of the Johannine community. In what follows we must confine ourselves to noting only those points most pertinent to the present argument.

In the first place, a number of scholars writing recently have emphasized the "sectarianism" reflected in Johannine literature. According to D. Moody Smith, "it can probably be agreed that on any reading of the Gospels and Epistles there appears a sectarian consciousness, a sense of exclusiveness, a sharp delineation of the community from the world."⁷ However, as Smith goes on to point out, it is not as clear what the "roots, causes and social matrix" of this sectarianism are. "What thereby comes to expression? A Christian sense of alienation or separation from the world generally? From the Synagogue? From developing ecclesiastical orthodoxy?"⁸ Herbert Leroy, for example, argues that the Gospel is characterized significantly by the use of in-language, a *Sondersprache* belonging to a closed, esoteric circle.⁹ For Wayne Meeks the sectarian consciousness means, as we have seen, "transfer to a community which has totalistic and exclusive claims."¹⁰ It is also not clear what "sectarianism" means with reference to the social organization of the Johannine community, its understanding of leadership and authority.

In the second place, many scholars emphasize in various ways the importance of the "prophetic" or "charismatic" or "pneumatic" or "enthusiastic" element. J. Ramsey Michaels, in a paper entitled "The Johannine Words of Jesus and Christian Prophecy,"¹¹ calls the Johannine circle "a prophetic community," and "a pneumatic community," though acknowledging that "whatever 'prophetic' characteristics may be associated with Jesus' disciples in the Fourth Gospel are carefully limited and qualified."¹² According to Ernst Käsemann, the author of John, "at the very centre of his proclamation, is dominated by a heritage of enthusiasm against which Paul had already struggled violently in his day and which in the post-apostolic age was branded as heretical."¹³ "It is not at all sufficiently

emphasized," Käsemann says, "that John must be seen in the historical and theological context of a Christian prophecy whose characteristic feature, according to 1 Cor. 14, is the actualization of the Christian proclamation."¹⁴ While "tradition is absolutely necessary" in John, nevertheless, "the peculiar feature of the Johannine use of tradition . . . is that he deals with what he has received more freely and more vigorously than anyone else in the New Testament."¹⁵

D. Moody Smith suggests that "charismatic prophetic activity likely played a significant role in the development of Johannine tradition,"¹⁶ and was probably one of the elements "constitutive of the Johannine Eigenart."¹⁷ The discourses of Jesus in John were "obviously spoken from the standpoint of a spirit-inspired post-resurrection community," he observes, citing also the Paraclete promises as evidence in this connection.¹⁸ Smith points to the demand in 1 John to test the spirits in the face of false prophets as evidence that the First Epistle of John faces "a situation in which spirit-inspired prophets uttering words of the risen Lord have become a distinct problem in the church." If this is the case "this would be exactly the development one might have anticipated" on the basis of the Gospel evidence.¹⁹ Smith also points to the miracles in John as evidence of charismatic origins. Citing the work that has been done by D. Georgi and others on the opponents of Paul in II Corinthians 10-13, Smith concludes, "When all cautions and reservations are allowed for . . . it is still tempting to see in Paul's Jewish-Christian Corinthian opponents, with their charismatic excesses, their interest in miracles, and possibly their conviction that the heavenly world was already opening out before them close relatives of these early Christians responsible for the miracle tradition of John's Gospel."²⁰

Smith's emphasis on the charismatic origin of the community is all the more significant in light of the fact that his purpose, in the article cited, is to adduce evidence of a community (or communities) "with some stability, with which it has been endowed in part by its continuity with the past."²¹ In other words, Smith's purpose is to show that the Johannine literature reflects a community with a tradition. Smith

properly sees no contradiction between the charismatic activity which appears to be characteristic of this community and the notion that it had its own tradition. Smith acknowledges that the Johannine Jesus is "in large part a Jesus distilled from the confession and controversies of the Johannine church," but points out that this does not necessarily militate *against* the traditional nature of the material "*since the questions of historical authenticity and traditional character are altogether distinct.*"²² In this connection it is particularly important to note Smith's conclusion regarding the Paraclete sayings in 14:15f. and 16:12-15. He sees in them "the enunciation of a theory concerning the phenomenon of spirit-inspired utterance intended on the one hand to ground it in Jesus' own historic ministry, and thus to validate it (14:26), and on the other to *set some control over it* by placing it within the context of a portrayal of Jesus who was not only the word become flesh, but one who spoke words with the irrevocable status of divine commandments."²³

The Charismatic Tradition of Origin

At this point we must ask how useful the term "charismatic" is in describing the Johannine group. Our particular interest is in what can be said about the social organization of the group and the dynamics of the social situation reflected in the Gospel. The term "charismatic" draws attention to the aspect of authority, together with the related issues of power, legitimation, rank, and prestige. We shall draw upon the sociological literature on authority relations within groups to bring into focus the way we are using the term "charismatic authority," and the related terms. One of the advantages of using a category like "charismatic authority" is the amount of effort which has been devoted by sociologists to its conceptual clarification. For the non-specialist this creates in its turn a problem of critically evaluating the alternative positions put forward by sociologists. We shall take the recent discussion of Michael Hill in *A Sociology of Religion* as a guide in what follows.²⁴

Three features of charismatic authority will be emphasized. In the first place, charismatic authority is understood to be innovative, revolutionary. According to Max Weber, "the genuine prophet, like the genuine military leader and every true leader in this sense, preaches, creates, or demands *new obligations.*" "From a substantive point of view," Weber observes, "every charismatic authority would have to subscribe to the proposition, 'It is written . . . , but I say unto you. . . .'"²⁵ The newness is described by Weber, in the first instance, over against what is *routine* and *profane*. "Charismatic authority is . . . specifically outside the realm of every-day routine and the profane sphere. In this respect, it is sharply opposed both to rational, and particularly bureaucratic, authority, and to traditional authority, whether in its patriarchal, patrimonial, or any other form. Both rational and traditional authority are specifically forms of every-day routine control of action; while the charismatic type is the direct antithesis of this."²⁶ The contrast with the routine involves, further, an opposition to rules and precedents. "Charismatic authority is specifically irrational in the sense of being foreign to all rules. . . . Within the sphere of its claims, charismatic authority repudiates the past, and is in this sense a specifically revolutionary force."²⁷

Michael Hill underscores this feature of charismatic authority. "Above all," he says, "charisma is a source of new ideas and obligations."²⁸ Hill illustrates this by the vivid example of the career of Jan Bockelson, the messianic leader of the Anabaptists of Münster in 1534. Bockelson's first important act was to run naked through the town of Münster in a frenzy, after which he fell into a silent ecstasy which lasted three days.²⁹ Hill comments: "Bockelson's tactic of establishing a charismatic claim included denuding himself--the pun is not entirely inappropriate--of all other symbols of authority. The anti-institutional character of charismatic leadership is well demonstrated in this case by the initial break with traditional channels of authority."³⁰

Hill's interpretation of Bockelson's nudity needs to be modified in light of the fact that his nudity was a very archaic symbol wholly in the public domain.³¹ It is therefore

misleading to suggest that the nudity symbolized the discarding of all symbols of authority. On the other hand, Bockelson's act did signal a claim to direct divine inspiration as the authority for his subsequent legislation.³² It represented a claim to authority outside of the routine, officially recognized channels of authority of his day. The innovative character of charismatic authority has to be defined in relation to the specific social and cultural context in which the prophet appears, and in relation to the specific time he appears.

We may clarify this point further by drawing on a distinction which Peter Brown makes in his article, "Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity: From Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages." Brown distinguishes between two "systems of power," articulate and inarticulate. "Articulate" power is "power defined and agreed upon by everyone (and especially by its holders!): authority vested in precise persons; admiration and success gained by recognized channels."³³ Over against such power "there may be other forms of influence less easy to pin down--inarticulate power: the disturbing intangibles of social life; the imponderable advantages of certain groups; personal skills that succeed in a way that is unacceptable or difficult to understand. Where these two systems overlap, we may expect to find the sorcerer."³⁴ Using Brown's language, I would suggest that the charismatic figure stands outside the system of power "defined and agreed upon by everyone," either because he does not occupy recognized office, or because he has gone beyond the recognized and accepted boundaries of his office.

The charismatic figure claims direct, unmediated authority from the divine source of power and authority. Such a claim may be seen as one form of "inarticulate" power since it bypasses the channels of authority which belong to the system of power defined and agreed upon by everyone. It constitutes, so to speak, a "short circuit," from the point of view of articulate power. It is a usurpation of powers of access which is potentially threatening. Typically, the charismatic figure's claim to authority is, as we have seen, on behalf of new obligations, new in relation to the prevailing structure of order, so that there is a challenge to the direction or limits of the officially recognized system of power. The claim to direct inspiration

from "god" or the gods, or the Spirit is, to be sure, an act which acknowledges the basic traditional source of authority, namely, the divine. But it is independent of the routine mediators of tradition and therefore also typically takes the form of reviving archaic, unfamiliar or esoteric traditions.

A second feature of charismatic authority stressed by Weber is the focus on the individual person. Charismatic authority, he says, rests on "devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him."³⁵ Weber points out that in the traditional authority type, obedience may be owed to the person of the chief who occupies the traditionally sanctioned position of authority and the obligation of obedience is a matter of "personal loyalty within the area of accustomed obligations." In the case of charismatic authority, however, "it is the charismatically qualified leader as such who is obeyed by virtue of personal trust in him and his revelation, his heroism or his exemplary qualities so far as they fall within the scope of the individual's belief in his charisma."³⁶ Michael Hill likewise notes that "traditional authority shares with charismatic authority the feature of a personal capacity on the part of the leader to define for himself the limits of the obligations owed to him by his followers--the difference between tradition and charisma being that in the former the leader's scope in this respect is limited while in the latter, theoretically at least, it is not."³⁷

In a classic passage Weber uses the word "personality" (*Persönlichkeit*) in defining "charisma":

The term "charisma" will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader.³⁸

This passage has been the basis for the popular use of the term "charisma" which essentially reifies the notion of charismatic qualities or the charismatic personality. According to Peter

Worsley, however, charisma is "not an attribute of an individual personality or a mystical quality." It is a social relationship, a "function of recognition" on the part of followers, who follow not simply because of some abstract "mystical" quality but because the leader evokes or plays upon some strand of intellectual or emotional predisposition in the followers, and because he purports to offer the realization of certain values in action. The leader is followed "because he embodies values in which the followers have an 'interest.'"³⁹

Michael Hill takes issue with Worsley's view that the original attribution of charisma is largely determined by the interests of the followers, seeing in this a restricted notion of charismatic innovation.⁴⁰ However, Hill agrees with Worsley on the essential point, the *relational* character of "charisma."⁴¹ Charisma, in other words, does not exist apart from the recognition and acceptance of followers. Worsley's statement that the charismatic leader "is singularly dependent upon being accepted by his followers" is echoed in Hill's view that "no leader can be labelled charismatic unless he is accredited with the possession of such a quality by his followers."⁴² "Recognition," says Hill, "is the relational aspect of charismatic authority, because what one 'population' may recognize as a charismatic qualification (epilepsy, for instance) another may recognize as an illness that required treatment."⁴³

Hill goes on to argue that Weber himself intended the term charisma to be used as a category of sociological analysis rather than as a reference to an inherent psychological trait. Hill's remarks must be quoted in full. In "his most rigorous formulation of the concept of charisma, says Hill,

Weber made an even more explicit step away from the individualistic conception when he referred to it as the "quality of a personality" (*Qualität einer Persönlichkeit*), indicating an abstract category rather than a "person," a concrete individual. He also qualifies his definition by stating that charisma is a quality "believed to be extraordinary" (*als anseralltäglich [sic!] geltend*). The emphasis in these phrases is clearly towards a sociological construction rather than to some vague, quasi-mystical conception of "Great Men" in history.⁴⁴

What is involved, to put it another way, is the difference between the viewpoint of the insider and the outsider. From the point of view of the insider it is precisely the extraordinary quality, attribute, or "gift" of the charismatic leader which is all important. From the point of view of the outside observer, on the other hand, it is the *attribution* which is definitive of the charismatic leader.

In talking about charismatic authority, then, we are talking about a particular type of social relationship, situation, and group. The charismatic situation is one in which, for a particular group, authority is concentrated in a single individual who stands outside the dominant, articulate system of power, or who has gone beyond the recognized boundaries of his position.

The third feature to which we wish to call attention is the crisis of succession and routinization that follows the death or departure of a charismatic leader if the followers are to continue as a group. The process "through which an *audience* becomes a *following*, then a *movement*, and finally an *organization*" is, it should be noted, only one possible outcome of the disappearance of a prophet.⁴⁵ The focus of Weber himself and much subsequent scholarship on the process of routinization has tended to obscure, perhaps, the fact that a variety of other outcomes are possible. For one thing, the followers of the prophet may disperse. Michael Hill points out that the charismatic power may be "blocked" by the cult of the dead leader, for example, or by other events such as the restriction of charismatic power to the original group of disciples.⁴⁶

What comes to expression in the crisis of succession are, in Weber's words, "the ideal and also the material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community."⁴⁷ It is true of course that succession can be problematic in the case of traditional and legal or rational types of authority. In the case of charismatic authority, however, succession is inevitably a problem, since charisma involves the attribution of *exceptional* powers or qualities to one person as an individual. Any provision made for transferring that authority to another individual or group modifies, to that extent, the exceptional quality of that authority, and tends to

transform it from an authority received directly from the divine to an authority *mediated* by the original figure. The nature of charismatic authority seems to militate against succession, whereas the interests of the group formed by the leader require succession.

This paradox may be illuminated if we distinguish between the relationship of the charismatic leader to the larger society and his relationship to the group of followers. On the one hand, the prophet has stepped outside of the routines of the larger society by which authority is transferred. His claim to authority is exceptional in relation to the prevailing structure of power. On the other hand, if the new group is to continue a means of transferring authority must be instituted within the group.

It should be clear that the first and third features to which we have called attention, namely, innovation and succession crisis may be viewed as expressions of the second feature, the concentration of extraordinary authority upon an outsider. The innovative aspect expresses this concentration over against the articulate system of power. The succession crisis is an expression of the same in relation to the group of followers. If we follow the logic of this conception a step further we can say that charismatic authority tends to stand in *exclusive* association only with the original prophet. We take this to be a legitimate inference from Weber's statement that in its pure form charismatic authority may be said to exist "only in the process of originating."

At the same time, it is, perhaps, even more important to emphasize that the charismatic concentration of authority occurs *within the context of a process of social change and conflict*.⁴⁸ The focus of attention on the appearance of a charismatic leader and the outcome of his appearance must be balanced by equal attention to the social milieu in which he emerges.

Kenelm Burridge locates the emergence of a prophet within a broad pattern of millenarian activities which begins with members of a community becoming aware of being "disenfranchized" and "separated from the mainstream of power and its associated

activities."⁴⁹ This first phase is followed by "an attempt to give overt and active expression to the problems and their solutions."⁵⁰ But these activities are "merely probings," says Burridge. "Until a prophet emerges to symbolize the new man by concentrating these probings in himself and giving them coherence, the activities remains (sic!) inchoate and disorganized."⁵¹ This second phase is followed by a third and last phase in which, as in each of the other two phases, a variety of developments are possible:

Sometimes, as organizational skills are deployed and the new assumptions begin to be firmly established, a sect develops. In other cases there follows a period of anticlimax and disillusion which then tends to redevelop into the first phase of intellectual probing, rumour-mongering and heightening emotional tensions. Failure to bring about the overt ends of the activities tends to restart the cycle: we recognize those outstanding figures we call precursor prophets. . . .⁵²

Returning now to the Gospel of John, I wish to point out that, in the way it depicts the Son, it conforms, in an extreme way, to the three features of the charismatic type of authority we have described above. First, in relation to the official systems of authority of his time, the Son appears as *an outsider*, the "Stranger par excellence."⁵³ Second, he claims an unheard of *concentration* of power and authority based upon direct access to the Father, an access which bypasses all of the mediating channels of authority, an access which elevates him above all of the official channels of authority, an access which relativizes all officially accepted legitimating procedures. Third, his departure creates a crisis of succession.

Not only does the Johannine Jesus conform to the charismatic type of authority, but, I suggest, this charismatic Jesus reflects a charismatic group, a group with a "charismatic tradition of origin."⁵⁴ Such a picture of the Johannine group is consistent with the near consensus description of it as sectarian.⁵⁵ Sectarianism is characterized above all by its stance over against and outside of the "world," which is equivalent to the system of power recognized and accepted by the society at large. This matches the first feature of charismatic authority noted above. The directness of the relationship to the divine

source of power and authority is also matched in sectarianism. This is emphasized in Peter Berger's description of sectarianism.⁵⁶ Berger suggests that the distinguishing mark of the sect, as distinct from the church, is to be found in the kind of relationship to the "spirit" characteristic of each. "The sect," he says, "may be defined as a religious grouping based on the belief that *the spirit is immediately present*. And the church, on the other hand, may be defined as a religious grouping based on the belief that *the spirit is remote*."⁵⁷ The spatial imagery is underscored by Berger as the basic criterion in this typology of religious groups. "Social groupings that are religiously based can be understood as forming themselves *around* the location of the sacred. The area near the sacred is that which is specifically religious; outside lies the world, in the religious sense of the word. Figuratively, one may speak of the sociology of religion as an ecology of the sacred."⁵⁸ The sect, standing immediately next to the spirit on this schema, requires no mediation. "The church, on the other hand, sees the spirit as remote, having to be brought near by its apparatus of mediation."⁵⁹ Berger qualifies this by observing that in some sects there is a "mediating apparatus" required by particular religious conceptions. This suggests that the important thing is not whether an apparatus of mediation as such exists, "but what it means in the total religious gestalt." Citing the example of the Roman Catholic church, on the one hand, and the Christian Community originating in the Anthroposophist movement, on the other, Berger points out that both "possess a priesthood and an elaborate sacramental system, yet the latter is filled with a constant sense of the *immediacy* of the spiritual world it seeks to contact."⁶⁰

It is a short step from Berger's characterization of the sect, in terms of a group separated from the world and standing in direct proximity to the sacred center, to our definition of charismatic authority in terms of the concentration of power and authority in an outside figure--or group.

The Beginning As Norm

The christology of the Gospel, read as a projection of the community's self-understanding, points to a charismatic, sectarian group. On the other hand, the christology, read in relation to the author's intended message in the Gospel,⁶¹ appears as a step in the direction of the routinization of authority. These two conclusions are not contradictory, if understood as aspects of a social process. On the contrary, they are mutually confirming. On the one hand, charismatic groups tend to issue in conflicts over authority which in turn issue in attempts to establish an ordered, routinized hierarchy of authority. On the other hand, the explicitness with which the author of the Fourth Gospel marks off the time of Jesus from the subsequent time of the disciples and elevates the former over the latter in the "remembering" motif is, in my opinion, evidence that he is consciously addressing a threat arising from charismatic claims. In the final part of this dissertation I wish to focus attention once more on the "remembering" motif in order to locate it within the context of the charismatic social process described above, and, in so doing, to locate the whole first farewell discourse in this process.

I have argued that the purpose of the farewell discourse is to subordinate the disciples to the Son. In the last two verses of the body of the discourse, vss. 25, 26, it is unmistakably clear that the author understands the vertical hierarchy of Son and disciples to apply "horizontally," that is, temporally, to the relationship between the time of the disciple's agency and the prior time of the Son's agency.

This temporal hierarchy is implicit in the promise in 14:12, where it is the works of the departing Jesus which the disciples will do, where, in other words, it is a matter of two parties who stand in a succession relationship which is also hierarchical.

The temporal framework, which is so pointedly expressed in the promise that the Spirit will recall all the words which were spoken by the departing Jesus, is, in fact, present throughout the discourse in its very *form* as a farewell discourse. It is the departing Son who is speaking, whom the reader

is hearing. The author has cast his work in the form of words spoken by a departing (and, for the reader, departed) figure. He has chosen "historical" narrative as the form of his work, thereby identifying the Son in terms of past time. This statement is not contradicted by the fact that the Son transcends time. The author has chosen to identify the Son in terms of his "work" *finished*, in some sense, in the past, and his words spoken in the past, and has explicitly subordinated the disciples, and the Spirit, to the Son *in this role*.

To say that the disciples are subordinated to the Son in his role as a figure of the past is not enough, of course. It is necessary to go on to ask what "the past" means *in the Gospel*, more specifically, what *this* past means. It is not simply "history." It is not the "center of time" in a linear chronology. The problem is how to talk about kinds of time. We do not have a systematic vocabulary for talking about temporal quality since we are not used to thinking systematically about time as something that has varying qualities. The embarrassment of scholars in the face of this problem as it occurs in connection with the Gospel of John, for example, may be illustrated by looking at various attempts to describe the author's point of view on the time of Jesus' earthly life, what Günter Bornkamm calls the "retrospective" point of view of the author.⁶²

W. Nicol, in *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel*, speaks of "a strong anchor in history" which was necessary "in order to keep the Johannine Christology from being blown away." Nicol is concerned to argue for the unity of "event" and "meaning" in John. He faults Ernst Käsemann for attributing to John a docetic view of history in which "the unity of event and meaning" are situated "above the sphere of historical reality." Against such a view, Nicol holds that for John there had to be a "unity of meaning and *real* history."⁶³ This formulation begs the fundamental question as to what is "real history." For John the time of Jesus' appearance belongs to the "past," a "past" marked off from the present by a real line of differentiation. This sort of sequence in time is what Nicol seems to mean by "real history," since he says that in order for there to be real history John "needed two phases for it."⁶⁴ But we must go

on to ask whether the two "phases" of this history are qualitatively the same. We are suggesting that they are *not*, that the first "phase" has been ascribed a quality of uniqueness and absoluteness which marks it off from all ordinary "history."

Ernst Käsemann poses the question of John's conception of history directly.⁶⁵ Käsemann rightly insists that "history" does not exist as a kind of independent entity whose meaning and reality can be taken for granted by the interpreter. The same is true if, as in Käsemann's discussion, one invokes the term "incarnation" in order to get at the particularity of the Son's appearance in time. According to Käsemann "incarnation" does not refer to "merely a miraculous event within history." "Incarnation rather means, as the prologue unmistakably indicates, the encounter of the Creator with his creature. This, however, implies that history and the world must be understood in this light and from this perspective. . . . In the confrontation with the Creator, history ceases to be what we imagined it to be. John placed this idea at the very centre of his presentation and developed it with many variations. This idea is the perspective from which he composed his Gospel and therefore it is the hermeneutical key to its interpretation."⁶⁶

Attention to Käsemann's ascription of a naive docetism to John has led some interpreters to overlook the central insight of Käsemann's work, namely, the assigning of decisive significance to the perspective of creation. The Creator-creature perspective to which Käsemann here refers is a further development of the idea of "protology," to which we have made reference above (pp. 40ff).⁶⁷ Käsemann, I would insist, is perfectly correct in designating the perspective of creation as "the hermeneutical key" to the Gospel. I suggest, however, that there are serious problems with the way in which he has applied that key.

The initial clue to the problem is Käsemann's use of the term "incarnation" in addressing the question of temporality. The use of this term leaves room for an evasion of the germane fact, namely, the *specific time frame* of the "incarnation." Käsemann thus can define "incarnation" in essentially timeless

terms as "the encounter of the Creator with his creature" and on this basis go on to show how the author, from this perspective, relativizes all temporal boundaries.⁶⁸

But the author has *not* relativized all temporal boundaries. If we have interpreted the farewell discourse correctly, the author has, in marking off so sharply the period in which the events narrated occurred from the subsequent time in which the narrative is being written, extended the hierarchical relationship of Son and disciples *to time*. The author has introduced a hierarchical division into time, a division which is no more to be blurred or relativized than is the hierarchical boundary between the only-begotten Son and his disciples.

In part, therefore, I agree with Bornkamm's criticisms of Käsemann's statements. According to Käsemann, the Gospel's presentation of Jesus is so dominated by the glory that the passion becomes problematical, so problematical, in fact that "one is tempted to regard it as being a mere postscript which had to be included because John could not ignore this tradition nor yet could he fit it organically into his work."⁶⁹ Over against this preposterous statement, Bornkamm makes the highly pertinent observation that, despite the fact that Käsemann's study is based upon the farewell prayer in chapter 17, the farewell discourses play a remarkably minor role in his argument.⁷⁰ By contrast, Bornkamm emphasizes the place of the farewell discourses in the Gospel in a way that few other scholars have done. According to him, the farewell is "the actual birth-hour of faith." Jesus' departure constitutes "the ground and beginning of a new day which has no end."⁷¹ In short, the farewell has, as we saw earlier, eschatological significance for Bornkamm. Furthermore, the Gospel was written from the standpoint of this post-departure faith. It is written from a *retrospective* point of view, a feature Käsemann has, according to Bornkamm, completely failed to do justice to.⁷²

Bornkamm is surely correct in stressing, over against Käsemann, that the hour of death and departure plays a central role throughout the Gospel in marking off a division in time.⁷³

On the other hand, Bornkamm has completely failed, himself, to do justice to the importance of the creation and pre-existence perspective emphasized by Käsemann. Bornkamm fails, as we have seen above, to address directly the crucial question of the status and rank of the periods of time, marked off by the departure of Jesus, relative to each other. As a result, only one aspect of the relationship comes into view in his discussion, the fact that the faith perspective on Jesus' earthly life is only possible after Jesus' departure. Viewed in terms of this aspect alone, the relationship of the two time periods shows a progression from a time of incomprehension and unbelief or immature faith to a time of faith and full vision. But this aspect, the growth of faith, has been placed by the author in a larger context, the overarching time frame of the pre-existent Son and the cosmogony (John 1:1-3). The way in which this larger framework alters the relationship of the two time periods is overlooked entirely by Bornkamm as a result of his easy dismissal of the creation perspective stressed by Käsemann.⁷⁴

According to Bornkamm, Käsemann has exaggerated the creation motif and lifted it out of its context within the thought of the Gospel. In Bornkamm's view the creation idea belongs within the framework of the "urjohanneischen Relation von Offenbarung und Glauben." "Here is where the creation motif has its proper place in John, that is to say, in the field of antitheses of light and darkness, truth and illusion, freedom and bondage, life and death as possibilities of man, which he grasps or rejects."⁷⁵ Bornkamm's critique here amounts to nothing more than a declaration, with no argument, that Käsemann is wrong. But Käsemann has not *isolated* the creation motif from the thought of the Gospel, as Bornkamm asserts. He has argued that it is the ultimate horizon of the "field of Antitheses" referred to by Bornkamm. Bornkamm has simply reiterated a position which Käsemann quite emphatically rejected. Furthermore, just as Käsemann's understanding of "incarnation" turns out to be a timeless abstraction, so with Bornkamm's understanding of the creation motif.

Käsemann and Bornkamm each have emphasized a piece of the whole picture. If we retain the division in time emphasized by Bornkamm, together with the creation emphasis of Käsemann, we

arrive at the conclusion that the author has marked off the time of Jesus' visible presence, as belonging to the time of "the beginning," from the period of time after his departure. The time of Jesus' visible presence takes on the normative, paradigmatic character of cosmogonic time, normative and paradigmatic for the time of the Paraclete which follows.

How then does the creation perspective affect the relationship of the two time periods marked off by the departure of Jesus? Most importantly it places the motif of the incomprehension of the disciples prior to the coming of the Spirit followed by their retrospective illumination by the Spirit in a very different light. The disciples' incomprehension and misunderstanding stands now in primary contrast to the perfect knowledge of the Son from the beginning. Whereas the disciples must await the coming of the Spirit before they understand who Jesus is and therefore who the Father is (14:9), Jesus possesses perfect knowledge of the Father from the beginning. In light of the specific contrast between the prior, primary agency of Jesus and the subordinate, dependent agency of the disciples in the farewell discourse, I would argue that it is the contrast with the Son's perfect knowledge which is the determinative perspective for understanding the disciples' illumination by the Spirit. In other words, the contrast between the incomprehension and subsequent illumination of the disciples, which Bornkamm makes decisive, is overshadowed by the far more basic contrast between Son and disciple.⁷⁶ The epiphany of the Son is not any the less complete because of the blindness of the world or the disciples.

In this light, the remembering motif is to be understood as an expression of the paradigmatic, protological status of the words and works of the Son in his epiphany in the past. Furthermore, the remembering motif says something about the way the author views his own book. His work is clearly one expression of Spirit-inspired recollection of Jesus' words, and is therefore authoritative. Thus, by his Gospel, the author has elevated the charismatic tradition of origin into a controlling, paradigmatic channel of mediation for authority in the community. The writing of the Gospel is, in other words, a step in the process of the routinization and stabilization of authority.⁷⁷

Conclusion

In conclusion it may be helpful to attempt a summary of the argument from the beginning. I began by calling attention to the promise of the Paraclete as a successor figure to Jesus in 14:16, 17 and noted the anomaly which it represents over against the radical christocentrism of the Fourth Gospel.

In the first part (Chapters I-V) we analyzed the promise of the Paraclete in terms of its function within the context of the first farewell discourse. The message of the first farewell discourse is that the authority of the disciples as agents of the works (14:12) and words (14:25,26) of the Son is mediated by and dependent upon the Son. The disciples are dependent upon the Son both for their eventual access (14:2-3) and their interim access to the Father (14:20). The disciples are appointed to be successors to the Son, but succession is understood hierarchically. The union of the Son with the Father (14:10,11) is extended to include the disciples (14:20), but the union of the disciples with the Father is mediated by the Son. In short, the message of the first farewell discourse is that the authority of the disciples is *not* charismatic, in the sense of *direct access* to the ultimate source of power and authority. It is *mediated* authority. The Paraclete-Spirit becomes, within the discourse, the form in which Jesus returns to his disciples to mediate their access to the Father.⁷⁸

In the second part of this dissertation (Chapter VI) we have shifted attention from the specific literary context of the Paraclete promise to ask after the tradition behind the Gospel. Taking the attention given to the Paraclete and to the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel as a clue to the kind of group from which the Gospel emerged, we have suggested that it was an actively charismatic variety, defining "charismatic" in terms of direct access to the Spirit. Such a picture is supported by the christology of the Gospel, if the christology is likewise taken as a reflection, or projection, of the self-understanding of the community. The Son in the Fourth Gospel is a "charismatic" figure par excellence. He has direct, unmediated access to the Father. His authority is independent of all officially recognized, taken-for-granted channels of authority. In this respect,

then, the Paraclete promise, and the exclusive christology of the Gospel are consistent as reflections of the kind of Christianity which nourished the author.

On the one hand, then, the Paraclete promise and the christology of the Gospel reflect a charismatic type of authority. On the other hand, the first farewell discourse locates the Paraclete promise within a message of mediated authority. This paradox can be explained on the hypothesis that the occasion for the writing of the Gospel is a situation in which claims to direct, independent access to divine authority have, in the author's eyes, gotten out of control by becoming a threat to the primacy of the Son. To counter this threat the author draws on the traditions of his circle, which were profoundly charismatic. As I picture it, the author and those he is countering were very likely drawing on the same charismatic tradition of origin. What was viewed by the author as an illegitimate type of authority could be viewed as very consistent with the traditions of Jesus drawn on by the author. In other words, those who in the author's eyes appeared to be rivals of Christ may very well have considered themselves to be the rightful "followers" or "successors" of Christ *in the sense of claiming the same kind of direct access which he claimed.*⁷⁹ Against such a view, the author in the farewell discourse set forth his own doctrine of a hierarchical succession.

Returning to the question of the reason for the inclusion of the Paraclete promise in this Gospel, I suggest that the author included it because it was just as important to him as it was to his opponents. He understood himself to be a prophet, speaking in the Spirit, and was invoking the Spirit to legitimate his Gospel. On the other hand, his purpose was to take the very doctrine that was being, in his view, misappropriated, and interpret it correctly and safely. In its context in the farewell discourse, its anomalous implications have been defused.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

¹James M. Robinson, "Introduction: The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship," James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 4.

²Robert Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975), p. 280.

³The increase in attention to the social world of early Christianity has brought with it an increase in attention to issues of leadership, authority, power and magic. The works of John Schütz, Gerd Theisen, Theodore Weeden, John Gager, Peter Brown, and Morton Smith illustrate this trend (see Jonathon Z. Smith's review article, "The Social Description of Early Christianity," *Religious Studies Review* 1 [1975]:19-25, for an influential analysis of what this trend might mean and for a bibliography). It is striking, however, to note what little effect this trend has had to date on Johannine scholarship. "Authority" as an interpretive category continues to be neglected by Johannine scholars, perhaps, in part, as a result of the dominating influence of "eschatology" as an organizing principle of interpretation. Bultmann, for example, has much to say on the subject of "legitimation" in John but interprets legitimation by means of his understanding of realized eschatology. One of the better discussions of authority and leadership in Johannine Christianity is to be found in chs. V and VI of Alv Kragerud's 1959 monograph on the "beloved disciple," *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium* (Oslo: Osloer Universitetsverlag, 1959). But Kragerud's monograph as a whole illustrates a typical feature of most discussions of leadership and authority in John in that he bases his conclusions upon peripheral, or subordinate texts, such as ch. 21, and those texts having to do with "the beloved disciple." What is needed is a study which relates the central texts of the Gospel to the picture, drawn by Kragerud, of the Johannine community as an itinerant prophetic group.

⁴The theme of succession is one which is, a priori, worth examining closely for clues to the social structure of Johannine Christianity. It is a motif which lends itself to those claiming leadership as a means of establishing the claim to authority. Max Weber pointed out that in the particular situation of the disappearance of a charismatic leader, and the problem of succession following upon his disappearance, the interests of his followers "become conspicuously evident" in attempts to maintain the group. (See S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968], p. 55.) One way in which the political interests of a group may become evident is in its literary products, especially in those having to do with

succession. Thus, for example, appeal to the dying words of a founder may become a significant propaganda instrument. There are numerous examples of the use of farewell literature for propaganda purposes. One of the most striking has been set forth by James D. Purvis in a study of Samaritan traditions on the death of Moses. Purvis points out that in the great fourth century work, the *Memar Marqah*, there is a conscious attempt to downgrade the significance of Joshua in the account of the death of Moses (James D. Purvis, "Samaritan Traditions on the Death of Moses," George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., Ed., *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, No. 4 [Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973], p. 111). According to the *Memar Marqah*, the time of Apostasy and Disfavor which Moses foresees after his death will come because of Joshua (p. 96). On the other hand, a later abridgement of part of *Memar Marqah's* account of the death of Moses deviates most conspicuously from its source precisely in its treatment of Joshua. The passage in the *Marqah* which says that the time of Disfavor will come because of Joshua is omitted. Purvis lists other points of contrast, and then goes on to suggest that these contrasting accounts of Joshua's role in the succession are to be understood within the context of lay-priestly conflict in the Samaritan community (p. 112). The *Memar Marqah* reflects "the anti-Joshua theology of the priestly dominated orthodoxy," whereas the abridgment has its provenance in lay-heterodox circles with a strong theology of Joshua (p. 112). In the case of the Gospel of John it is worth noting Richard Culpepper's recent proposal that the event which is reflected in the Paraclete texts is the death of the beloved disciple, whom Culpepper regards as the founder of the Johannine "school." According to Culpepper, this event causes the Johannine community to reach back to traditions of the death of Jesus and appropriate them in the new crisis of leadership (Richard Alan Culpepper, *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, Number 26 [Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975], p. 269).

⁵ *Allon parakleton* may be translated: "the Father will give you another, a Paraclete," a pleonastic usage found in Luke 23:32, for example. Aside from the fact that this usage is not typical Johannine style, which renders it less probable as a translation, it does not remove the idea of the Paraclete as a successor figure to Jesus. This is also true of the translation, "and he will give to you as another paraclete . . . the spirit of truth," taking *allon parakleton* as an adjectival phrase modifying *to pneuma tes aletheias*. The latter translation is adopted by George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), p. 84).

⁶ Hans Windisch, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel*, trans. by James W. Cox (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 20. This book contains the translations of two articles by Hans Windisch, "Die fünf johanneischen Parakletsprüche," first published in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1927), and "Jesus und der Geist in

Johannesevangelium," first published in *Amicitiae Corolla* (London: University of London Press, 1933).

⁷ See below, Chapter III, for a discussion of Johannine christocentrism. One of the most striking expressions of this christocentrism is that noted by Rudolf Bultmann in one of his earliest articles on the Fourth Gospel, where he called attention to the fact that though the Johannine Jesus is depicted as one who has come from the heavenly world to reveal secrets, the only thing that he reveals, in fact, is that he *is* the revealer. This observation is, as Wayne A. Meeks points out, the starting point for Bultmann's interpretation of the Gospel (Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 [1925]:102). Wayne Meeks's comment is in "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972):47. There is no room in John's Gospel, it would seem, for other mediator figures besides the Son. "Jesus becomes the only mediator between God and man: voices, dreams, visions, angels, signs all disappear. All are absorbed within the glory of the one who is the sole channel of traffic between heaven and earth (John 1:51)." (John M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, Second Series, No. 28 [London: SCM Press LTD, 1974], p. 122.)

⁸ Windisch, *Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 24, citing Oswald Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes 2* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924):277.

⁹ Günther Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet im Johannes-Evangelium," *Geschichte und Glaube*, Part I, *Collected Essays* 3 (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968):68-89.

¹⁰ The tendency to overlook the successor role is even more pronounced in the case of the disciples than it is in the case of the Paraclete. Fortna illustrates this tendency in his comment that "Jesus is not one to be imitated, but on the contrary recognized as unique. While the initial disciples are said to 'follow' him (1:40), this leads not to a sharing in his divine power but only to *belief* in it (2:11c)." (Robert T. Fortna, "Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Redaction-critical Perspectives," *New Testament Studies* 21 [1975]:493).

¹¹ There is a large body of literature on the Paraclete. Two recent monographs are Otto Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums*, Vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), and Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Betz provides a useful review of the research in his opening chapter. Johnston's work is very disappointing. His critical review of Betz's argument, for example, is impossible to follow. Raymond E. Brown has a brief discussion of the Paraclete in Appendix V of *The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI)*, The

Anchor Bible, Vol. 29A (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), as well as in a longer earlier article, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967):113-32. An important article published subsequent to Johnston's and Brown's works is U. B. Müller, "Die Parakletenvorstellung im Johannes-evangelium," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 61 (1974):31-77. Two other recent discussions are Rudolf Schnackenburg's excursus in *Das Johannesevangelium*, Part III, *Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* 4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1975):156-73, and Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 234-40.

12

Neither Betz, Schnackenburg, nor Müller touch on the problem, except incidentally. The only reference to the problem by Betz, for example, is in a brief footnote denying that the Paraclete leads to a second stage of revelation "surpassing" that of Christ (*Der Paraklet*, p. 189, n. 3). Brown does not mention the problem, even though he sees in the Paraclete "another Jesus." See *Gospel According to John* (XIII-XXI, p. 1141. Johnston apparently senses the problem, but deals with it in summary fashion (*The Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 95). The same is true of Bornkamm, despite the way in which his forerunner-fulfiller thesis highlights the issue!

13

See above, p. 2, no. 2.

14

Müller points this out in his critical review of scholarship ("Die Parakletenvorstellung," pp. 38-40).

15

See below, chapter IV.

16

Siegfried Schulz, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch* 4 (12th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972):178. But Robert Kysar's recent review of research has no separate treatment of the farewell discourses as such, and only mentions them in passing (Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 137, 143). Likewise, Robert Fortna notes, on the one hand, that the author's "principal structural alteration" of his source was "the insertion of the farewell discourse into the combined narrative," but then concludes that the farewell discourse "is only a kind of massive parenthesis in the gospel" (Fortna, "Christology in the Fourth Gospel," pp. 502-3).

17

For a review and critical assessment of the Signs Source discussion see Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 13-37.

18

There is no sustained critical treatment of the farewell material from a form- and redaction-critical point of view which asks why so much of the Gospel is cast in a form which underscores the *separation* of Jesus from the disciples.

19

The most striking example of this sort of thematic study is the scholarship on the Paraclete sayings.

20

A good review of the discussion may be found in Jürgen Becker's article, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59 (1970): 215-46. See also Raymond E. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, pp. 581-604 for a general discussion of the farewell discourses.

21

Wilhelm Heitmüller, "Das Johannes-Evangelium," J. Weiss, ed., *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* 2 (2nd improved and expanded edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908):829. Heitmüller's judgment has not found much support. Bibliographical data show that the first farewell discourse has not been a focus, as such, of scholarly attention. I have found only two articles devoted specifically to the first farewell discourse. One, which I was unable to obtain, has the title, "La Présence dans l'absence (Jean 13:31-14:31)," by C. Charlier, *Bible et vie chrétienne*, no. 2 (May-July, 1953), pp. 61-75, referred to by I. de la Potterie, "Je suis la Voie, la Vérité et la Vie" (Jn 14:6)," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 88 (1966):907, n. 2. The second is Rudolf Schnackenburg's recent study, "Das Anliegen der Abschiedsrede in Joh 14," H. Feld and J. Nolte, eds., *Wort Gottes in der Zeit: Festschrift Karl Hermann Schelkle zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden, Schülern* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1973), pp.95-110. Schnackenburg's focus on this discourse as a unity is in response to Jürgen Becker's excellent study (see previous note), which, though it is devoted to the farewell discourses as a whole, goes further than any work since the article by Heitmüller in treating 13:31-14:31, as a single literary unity with a coherent structure. Interpretation of the discourse has suffered from what could be called "atomistic exegesis," that is to say, particular pericopes, such as the Paraclete sayings, have been discussed endlessly, but seldom with a rigorous concern for the specific literary context. In addition, a great deal of the literature on the farewell discourses is accurately characterized by G. B. Behler's forthright comment on his own work. It "ist nicht--dies sei von vornherein mit aller Klarheit gesagt--als Beitrag zur wissenschaftlichen Forschung gedacht" (G. B. Behler, *Die Abschiedsworte des Herrn: Johannesevangelium Kapitel 13-17* [Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1962], p. 9).

NOTES

CHAPTER I

¹ For example, C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), p. 392; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. by G.R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), p. 459; Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, 3:100.

² Bultmann, *Gospel*, 459.

³ For example, B.F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Photolithograph reprint of the 1908 edition. Two Volumes in One; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), p. 197.

⁴ Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 583.

⁵ P. Corssen, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu in dem vierten Evangelium," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 8 (1907): 125-42.

⁶ Heinrich Zimmermann, "Struktur und Aussageabsicht der johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Jo 13-17)," *Bibel und Leben* 8 (1967): 289. C.H. Dodd has a similar interpretation: "With the words of verse 31 the journey has begun. There is no physical movement from the place. The movement is a movement of the spirit, an interior act of will, but it is a real departure nevertheless. As we shall see, the next stage of the discourse takes definitely a standpoint beyond the cross" (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: University Press, 1965], p. 409). This is an explanation which goes back to Cyril of Alexandria. See E.C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. by F.N. Davey (2d ed., rev.; London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1961), p. 465.

⁷ Bultmann summarizes several proposals, *Gospel of John*, p. 460, n. 1.

⁸ Rainer Borig, *Der Wahre Weinstock: Untersuchungen zu Jo 15:1-10, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 16 (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1967):20.

⁹ Howard lists Moffatt, Macgregor, Bernard, F.W. Lewis as placing chapter 17 after chapter 14 (W.F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* [3d ed. rev. by C.K. Barrett; London: Epworth Press, 1955], p. 303).

¹⁰ Friedrich Spitta, *Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), pp. 297-301. Spitta's order is: 13:21-31a; 15:1-17:26; 14:1-31.

¹¹ *Gospel of John*, p. 461.

12

Bultmann's proposal is criticized by Dwight Moody Smith, Jr., *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), pp. 168-75. Smith argues for keeping chapter 17 after the discourses. Cf. also the sharp words of J. Schneider, who calls Bultmann's rearrangement theory "ein absurder Gedanke" since the prayer "nur den Abschluss der Abschiedsreden bilden" [kann] ("Die Abschiedsreden Jesu: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Komposition von Johannes 13:31-17:27," *Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag* [Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958], p. 104.

13 J. Wellhausen, *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907), pp. 7-15. Cf. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Reimer, 1908), p. 79.

14 Georg Richter, "Die Deutung des Kreuzestodes Jesu in der Leidensgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums (Jo 13-19)," *Bibel und Leben* 9 (1968):21-36. Cf. also Richter's monograph, *Die Fusswäscher im Johannesevangelium: Geschichte ihrer Deutung, Biblische Untersuchungen*, Vol. 1 (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1967). Richter finds evidence of the same two tendencies in the Bread discourse. See his article "Zur Formgeschichte und literarischen Einheit von Joh 6:31-58," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60 (1969):21-55. This is a critique of Peter Borgen's analysis of the homily in chapter 6.

15 Becker, "Abschiedsreden." Schnackenburg distinguishes two secondary speeches; ch. 15 containing the first, ch. 16 the second (*Johannesevangelium*, 3:102-3).

16 Cf. for example Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 407 and Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 379. Raymond Brown holds that there were "several independent last discourses" (p. 586). He suggests that 13:31-14:31 represents "substantially the discourse that stood in the early written form of the Gospel" and that the material in chs. 15 and 16 was added later by the final redactor (p. 594). However, he holds that both parts contain earlier and later material.

17 Namely, 13:31-14:31 and 16:4b-33. Raymond Brown sets out the parallels in a synoptic chart on pp. 589-593 of his commentary.

18 Cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg's conclusion that "in der neu einsetzenden Diskussion über Schichten im Johannesevangelium . . . wird die Herkunft der Abschiedsrede in Kap. 14 vom Evangelisten selbst nicht bestritten" ("Das Anliegen der Abschiedsrede in Joh 14," p. 95).

19 Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 623.

20 This is true of J.H. Bernard, Hoskyns, Leon Morris, Westcott, and Lindars. See J.H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, The International Critical Commentary* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929); Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John, the New International Commentary on the New*

Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971). Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John, New Century Bible*, ed. by Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black (London: Oliphants, 1972).

21 Adolf von Harnack, "Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-his. Klasse, 1915, p. 551, n. 2. Cited by Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet," p. 86, n. 38.

22 See below, pp. 24ff.

23 We are here speaking only of the rearrangement aspect of such theories. Source critical theory has not treated chapter 14 so kindly.

24 See above pp. 17-18.

25 Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 609.

26 Cf. Brown's discussion, *ibid.*, pp. 608, 609.

27 *Gospel*, p. 612. Cf. Schneider, "Abschiedsreden," p. 107 and A. Wikenhauser, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes, Das Neue Testament*, ed. Alfred Wikenhauser and Otto Kuss 4 (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet):221. But Gächter, followed by Ibuki, holds that the theme of "believing" in 14:1 and 11 form an "inclusio," which defines 14:1b-11 as a unified piece (see P. Gächter, "Der formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 58 [1934]: 176, 177; and Yu Ibuki, *Die Wahrheit im Johannesevangelium, Bonner Biblische Beiträge* 39 [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag GMBH, 1972]:213).

28 *Gospel According to John*, p. 623.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 624

30 See Bernard, Bultmann, Brown, Schulz, *Evangelium*; Wikenhauser, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, and Dominic Crossan, *The Gospel of Eternal Life: Reflections on the Theology of St. John* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967).

31 Bernard, Lindars, Crossan, and Friedrich Büchsel, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk*, ed. by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm, Vol. 4 (4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946).

32 With Bernard, Büchsel, and Wilhelm Heitmüller.

33 With Bultmann, Wikenhauser, Westcott, Crossan.

34 Dominic Crossan has followed this principle most consistently, outlining chapters 13-17 as a whole, on the basis of the disciples' questions, as follows: 1) Dialogue with Betrayal (13:1-35); 2) Dialogue with the Apostles (13:36-16:33); 3) Dialogue with God (17:1-26). There is, of course, no "dialogue" in chapter 17. It is a monologue. Crossan divides the second

division up according to the disciples' questions (Crossan, *Gospel of Eternal Life*).

³⁵Brown recognizes that the questions do not introduce new motifs, but obscures the consistency with which they are used to develop a theme (Cf. *Gospel According to John*, pp. 624, 643). Schnackenburg recognizes the function of the questions. Philip's request in vs. 8 "hat, ähnlich wie die Einrede des Tomas, vor allem eine literarische Funktion. Sie ermöglicht es Jesus, in seiner Antwort noch schärfer den Kerngedanken zu formulieren" (*Johannesevangelium*, 3:76).

³⁶Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 403; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 598; Becker, "Abschiedsreden," p. 221; Schneider, "Abschiedsreden," p. 106.

³⁷*Interpretation*, p. 403.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 404.

³⁹J. Becker, "Abschiedsreden," pp. 219-28. See the critique of Becker offered by Rudolf Schnackenburg in his article on the first farewell discourse (Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Das Anliegen der Abschiedsrede in Joh 14"). Schnackenburg goes even further than Becker in emphasizing the theme of the presence of the Son, arguing that the promise in 14:2-3 already refers to the return of Jesus at the resurrection. My criticism of Becker, that he overlooks the emphasis on distance and separation in the discourse, applies all the more to Schnackenburg.

⁴⁰It is not clear what Becker means when he calls this piece of tradition an *Offenbarungswort*. He cites Otto Michel, but Michel does not define the term either (Otto Michel, "oikos," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromily 5 [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967]:132). Karl Kundsins speaks of *Offenbarungswörter*, *Offenbarungssprüche*, referring to core elements of the Johannine speeches, such as the "I am" sayings, sayings which, according to Kundsins, arose in the visionary manifestations of the risen Christ to Christian prophets. Becker is using the term with reference to a different sort of saying, one which, on his understanding, is more like Bultmann's category of "prophetic and apocalyptic sayings" (Karl Kundsins, *Charakter und Ursprung der johanneischen Reden*, *Acta Universitatis Latviensis*, 1 [Riga, 1939]:198-99; R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, N.F. 12 [6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964]:113ff.). The term *Offenbarungswort*, "word of revelation," is particularly unhelpful to use to distinguish one piece of speech material from another; Bultmann has described the speech material as a whole as consisting of "revelation discourses."

⁴¹See Becker, "Abschiedsreden," p. 222, n. 36: "In der Tat spricht 14:3 für sich den Gedanken der Parusieerwartung klar aus."

⁴²*Ibid.*, pp. 222-23. Schnackenburg points out that if Becker is correct, this would be the only instance in the Gospel where a saying which is to be corrected is first attributed to Jesus (Schnackenburg, "Das Anliegen der Abschiedsrede in Joh 14," p. 107).

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 223.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 228.

⁴⁵*Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo, Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 10 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965).

⁴⁶See especially ch. 2 of *Bread from Heaven* and the summary of the pattern on p. 47.

⁴⁷Wayne A. Meeks, "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972):58, n. 50.

⁴⁸I owe this observation to Professor Jonathon Z. Smith, who cites Jacob Neusner's studies of the laws of purities in *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Vol. 6 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974-). See also J.A. Neusner's article, "The Meaning of Oral Torah," in *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Jacob Neusner 13 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975):3-33. In "The Meaning of Oral Torah" Neusner argues that "the Mishnaic Law is separate and autonomous from Scripture, though in its unfolding it is made to interrelate, where it can, to Scripture" (p. 28).

⁴⁹David E. Aune, *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity, Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 28 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972):68,69. Aune cites B.W. Bacon's comparison of the Johannine use of Synoptic tradition with midrash (B.W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, ed. by Carl H. Kraepling [New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933], pp. 156, 189). The quotation which Aune cites from Bacon is not, however, found on page 189 as Aune indicates. I was unable to locate the quote in Bacon's work.

⁵⁰Aune, *Cultic Setting*, p. 69.

⁵¹The discourse is a polemic "gegen die Vorstellung einer heilsleeren Gegenwart" (Becker, "Abschiedsreden," p. 228, n. 49a). Jesus is "absent" according to the *Gemeindeglaube* (*ibid.*, p. 224). The present is characterized as "einer von Jesus 'leeren' Gegenwart" (p. 224).

⁵²"Die Rede entfaltet in einer polemischen Exegese gegen eine im Traditionsstück 14:2f. benannten Christologie in ihrem Hauptteil 'die praesentia Christi,' des Erhöhten, als 'die Mitte' ihrer 'Botschaft'" (*ibid.*, p. 228). Becker is here alluding to

Ernst Käsemann's summary of the message of the Gospel in terms of the *presentia Christi*, in *Jesu Letzter Wille nach Johannes 17* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966), p. 33. Käsemann's study has been translated by Gerhard Krodel as *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).

⁵³The discussion is extensive. For a review of the scholarship see Aune, *Cultic Setting*, pp. 128-32. S. Schulz also lists with brief critical remarks, the various interpretations that have been proposed. See Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 164ff.

⁵⁴*Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 2. Spitta says of 14:21-23: "Hier handelt es sich, kurz gesagt, um die mystische Einwohnung des Vaters und des Sohnes in dem Gläubigen" (*Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 348).

⁵⁵Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, pp. 482-83. Cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 646.

⁵⁶Macgregor interprets 14:20 as referring to a "mystic communion of Father, Son, and Believer" (p. 310). But he has earlier made it clear that he understands this "mystic communion" in strictly ethical terms. Commenting on 15:4 he says, "though the Evangelist may employ the thought-forms of the semi-physical mysticism of his day, union with Christ is for him, 'more a matter of will and moral effort than of feeling,' . . . To be 'in Christ' (in this Gospel) is just to accustom oneself to breathe in the atmosphere of the moral standard Jesus has set--to develop within us a set of Christian instincts" (G.H.C. Macgregor, *The Gospel of John, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary* [New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1928], p. 287, citing R.H. Strachan). Macgregor does not give the exact source of the citation.

⁵⁷*Gospel*, p. 581. This quotation is taken from the discussion of 16:16-24, but it is clear that Bultmann understands 14:18-24 in exactly the same way (see p. 619, especially note 5, which refers back to p. 581). It is important to note that Wilhelm Heitmüller in 1908 offered a very similar interpretation of this text. Heitmüller understands the author here to be equating Easter, Pentecost, and Parousia and to be interpreting all of these eschatological events as "interior" events: "Die ungemein folgenreiche und wertvolle Arbeit, die wir als ein besonderes Kennzeichen unseres Evangeliums ansehen müssen, die Vereinfachung und die Verdiesseitigung, bez. Verinnerlichung der altchristlichen Vorstellungswelt zeigt sich hier [i.e., 14:18-20] in besonders glänzendem Lichte" ("Das Johannes-Evangelium," pp. 827-28).

⁵⁸*Cultic Setting*, p. 129.

⁵⁹Karl Kundsinn "Die Wiederkunft Jesu in den Abschiedsreden des Johannesevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 33 (1934):215. The Evangelist "denkt vor allem an den auch den Jüngern bevorstehenden Leidens- und Todesweg. In der Todesstunde zeigt sich Jesus dem Sterbenden, vor allem dem Märtyrer, um ihn in die ewigen Wohnungen heimzuholen."

⁶⁰See below, Chapter IV for a more extended discussion of the literature on this issue.

⁶¹For Becker the Paraclete is the "Modus der Gegenwart Jesu" ("Abschiedsreden," p. 227). Cf. Raymond E. Brown's formula. The Paraclete is "another Jesus," that is, "the presence of Jesus when Jesus is absent" (*Gospel According to John*, p. 1141). According to E.F. Scott, the Paraclete "is simply Himself returning as an unseen presence" (*The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908], p. 343).

⁶²"Abschiedsreden," p. 227.

⁶³Cf. Nils Dahl's reference to the Spirit's role in 15:26 as "comme une clé de l'Évangile de Jean." Dahl's remarks are even more appropriately applied to 14:25, 26 where the "commemorative" function which Dahl has highlighted in his article is explicit (Nils A. Dahl, "Anamnesis: Memoire et Commemoration dans le christianisme primitif," *Studia Theologica* 1 [1948]:94).

⁶⁴Becker, "Abschiedsreden," p. 228, citing Ernst Käsemann, *Jesu Letzter Wille nach Johannes 17*, p. 33.

⁶⁵*Testament*, p. 36.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, p. 7

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁶⁹It is important to observe that Käsemann does, in a note, recognize the fact that, rightly understood, "the death of Jesus does have the character of a centre of gravity." *Ibid.*, p. 19, n. 30.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁷²*Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁷³*Jesu Letzter Wille*, p. 35.

⁷⁴*Testament*, p. 23.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 45

77

Cf. Günther Bornkamm's critique of Käsemann's anachronistic use of such categories in his important essay, "Zur Interpretation des Johannes-Evangeliums. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Ernst Käsemanns Schrift 'Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17,'" *Evangelische Theologie* 28 (1968):8-25. Republished in *Geschichte und Glaube, Part I, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie* 98 (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968):104-121. I shall quote from the latter. See pp. 120-21 for the discussion of anachronisms.

78

Theo Preiss, "Justification in Johannine Thought," in *Life in Christ, Studies in Biblical Theology*, no. 13, trans. by Harold Knight (Chicago: Alex R. Allenson, Inc., 1954), pp. 10-11.

79

George W. MacRae, "The Fourth Gospel and Religionsgeschichte," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970):23. Cf. idem. "The Ego-Proclamation in Gnostic Sources," in *The Trial of Jesus, Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series*, 13 (London: S.C.M. Press, 1970):133-34.

80

W.D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), p. 302, n. 23.

81

F. Hahn, "Sehen und Glauben im Johannesevangelium," *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament: Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. by Heinrich Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), p. 140. Hahn takes the term from H.G. Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960), pp. 289f., 375, so that it has, in the first instance a specific hermeneutical significance, but Hahn does not use it in this strict sense exclusively.

82

Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandaischen und manichaischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 (1925):102. Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by Kendrick Grobel 2 (n.p.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955):66-67. Cf. also Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 390. See Meeks, "The Man from Heaven," p. 47.

83

Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 67.

84

Meeks, "Man from Heaven," p. 68. See also p. 55, n. 41 where he cites Hoskyns.

85

Meeks, "Man from Heaven," pp. 68-69.

86

See Chapter V for detailed discussion.

87

Raymond E. Brown's translation.

88

Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet," pp. 85-86.

89

Ibid., p. 86.

⁹⁰J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 8.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁹²*Ibid.*, p. 9, n. 21.

⁹³*Ibid.*, p. 54. Emphasis in the original.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 128. Note that here Martyn refers to two stages.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*

⁹⁷Wilhelm Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, ed. by M. Meinertz 21 (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960): 48-49. The second revised edition of 1970 was not available to me.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 48, cf. p. 289.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, p. 204.

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, pp. 201-4.

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, p. 201.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, p. 204.

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵Käsemann, *Testament*, p. 10, n. 13; pp. 17-19.

¹⁰⁶*Gospel*, p. 523.

¹⁰⁷See, for example, Raymond E. Brown's argument that these were the two problems defining the *Sitz im Leben* of the Johannine Paraclete promise (*Gospel According to John*, p. 1142). A forceful statement of the view that the author was addressing the problem of distance from Jesus is to be found in Paul Minear's recent article, "The Audience of the Fourth Evangelist" (*Interpretation* 31 [1977]:339-54). According to Minear, "the distance in time and space from Jesus" created difficulties for the second generation of Christian believers, who "imagined themselves at a distinct disadvantage in comparison with their predecessors" (p. 345), and Minear speaks of "the dismay of followers who no longer have access either to Jesus or to the apostles, but who must rely upon the hearsay of later witnesses" (p. 349). He refers to the "chain of being," that is, the word of Jesus, which constituted, for the author, "a bridge over every distance of time and space" (p. 354). Minear's texts are evidence that the

author and his audience were aware of the distance in time from Jesus (or from the founding generation of the Johannine group), but it is not so clear that the problem created by this distance was the problem of *access to Jesus*, as Minear holds. I maintain that the problem created by this distance was one of hierarchy and status. Interestingly, Minear touches on the issue of rank, but only in a tangential way, pointing out that "in the chain of witnesses that reaches back to the beginning, no link ranks higher than any other, for all respond to the Word and all become mediators of the Word" (p. 349). This leveling of all witnesses is, according to Minear, reflected in the fact that each disciple in John is typically enlisted "not by Jesus directly, but by another witness" (p. 349). Minear connects the rank of the disciples with the *indirectness* of their access to Jesus, and even recognizes this as a positive point! Yet, from the point of view of Minear's whole discussion, this aspect is lost from view and is not developed.

¹⁰⁸Cf. Dwight Moody Smith, Jr.'s recent attempt to characterize "Johannine Christianity." Smith emphasizes the "charismatic" element throughout ("Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on its Character and Delineation," *New Testament Studies* 21 [1975]: 232, 233, 243, 244). See below, Chapter VI, for full discussion of this argument.

¹⁰⁹Cf. for example, George Johnston's observation that "it was no fantastic, inconceivable possibility that another claimant might arise to dispute the pre-eminent place of Jesus Christ." Johnston goes on to cite the example of the "charismatic Montanus" who appeared to have identified himself with the Paraclete and, as such, to have fulfilled the eschatological promises made by Jesus in John (*The Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 95). This threat was a particularly live possibility in the form of a contrast between the "earthly" Jesus and the resurrected Christ in which the believer would have understood himself to be "on the side" of the resurrected Christ, having received post-resurrection revelations from the heavenly Christ. See James M. Robinson's highly relevant discussion of the two Gospel forms, the canonical Gospel and the "gnostic" Gospel, the latter consisting of post-resurrection revelations. Robinson points to the possibility, exploited by gnosticism, "of relegating to insignificance the early earthly life of Jesus, as just a lower and hence irrelevant prelude" (James M. Robinson, "On the *Gattung* of Mark (and John)," *Perspective* 11 [1970]:133).

NOTES

CHAPTER II

¹ See for example Raymond E. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 608; Gächter, "Der formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu," p. 176; Ibuki, *Die Wahrheit*, p. 212; Schulz, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 182. "14:1ff. besitzt keine direkte Verbindung zum vorherigen Abschnitt, der Verleugnung des Petrus." On the other hand, R. Schnackenburg, though not explicitly assigning 14:1-3 to the "introduction" of the discourse, does recognize that the saying in vss. 2-3 represents "eine gewissen Abschluss" to the line of thought beginning in 13:33 (Schnackenburg, "Anliegen der Abschiedsrede," p. 101).

² Within the context Peter becomes a representative figure as do the other disciples mentioned by name. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 597, n. 1: "Peter's denial (v. 38) is only a representative event."

³ Contra Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 608.

⁴ Schnackenburg traces the *Gedankenlinie* from the announcement in 13:33, to 13:36, to 14:2-3, overlooking the announcement in terms of "glorification" in 13:31-32 ("Anliegen der Abschiedsrede," p. 101).

⁵ Thus elaborating on the brief hint to this effect in 13:36.

⁶ It is remarkable that scholars can overlook the pervasive concern of the Gospel with Jesus' *status*. Yet Fortna takes the position that a singular attention to Jesus' status distinguishes the miracle source from the redactor! (Forna, "Christology," p. 491.)

⁷ Heitmüller calls 13:31-32 a "Triumphlied" (*Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 823). Schulz calls it a "Menschensohn-Hymnus" (*Evangelium*, p. 178).

⁸ The third line is omitted in several important witnesses including p⁶⁶Bx *C* and D. It is accepted by many commentators, including Brown, Schnackenburg, Bernard, Bultmann, Lagrange, Schulz, and Thüsing. Its absence can be explained by homoio-teleuton.

⁹ On the *doxa*, *doxasthenai* motif see Thüsing, *Erhöhung und Verherrlichung*, and Käsemann's critique of Thüsing in *Testament*, ch. II.

¹⁰ This is not to be understood in the Pauline sense, as Thüsing interprets it (*Erhöhung und Verherrlichung*, pp. 222f.). See esp. p. 224 where Thüsing comments on the "entscheidende Bedeutung" of the terminology of spatial movement in John, which

he interprets in a Pauline sense. My understanding of the legitimating significance of the return of Jesus to heaven is consistent with Käsemann's interpretation of the death of Jesus (*Testament*, p. 20). The return of Jesus to heaven functions as a legitimating act in similar fashion to the function of the descent of Jesus in 7:25-29, for example.

¹¹See pp. 27, 28.

¹²From this point of view, the "new commandment" in vs. 34-35, which calls for solidarity among the disciples left behind in and over against "the world," is not out of place. Cf. to the contrary Becker, "Abschiedsreden," p. 220.

¹³Cf. Wayne Meeks' comment that "the evangelist has constructed this whole dialogue in order to provide a new setting for the traditional logion predicting Peter's denial (vs. 38), so that the denial is now reinterpreted in the light of the descent/ascent motif that separates Jesus from all earthly men, even the disciples" (Meeks, "Man from Heaven," p. 65. Emphasis not in the original).

¹⁴So Raymond Brown, Bultmann.

¹⁵Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 75; *emprosthen mou gegonen* "refers to his status." Bultmann notes that the basis of the usage here is probably "the Rabbinic 'to precede'=to have the greater dignity."

¹⁶Cf. the term *axios* in 1:27.

¹⁷Cf. 3:28-30 where the issue of rank is again to the fore in the statement of the Baptist that "He must increase, but I must decrease." This is followed by the further contrast between the one who comes "from above" and the one who is "of the earth." Twice it is stated that the one who is from heaven is "above all." This may or may not refer specifically to the Baptist, but in any case includes him.

¹⁸"Der Paraklet," p. 87. Bornkamm does note the polemic based on Jesus' pre-existence (p. 76) but does not recognize its implications. See below, pp. 132ff. on Bornkamm.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 87.

²⁰On the premise that the christology of John is a projection of the self-understanding of the prophetic or charismatic Johannine community (see below, Chapter VI), the motif of the Son being "out of place" has significance as pointing to *itinerancy* as a feature of the prophetic "collective." Itinerancy is emphasized as a basic feature by Kragerud (*Der Lieblingsjünger*, pp. 87ff.). Cf. also Gerd Theissen, "Wanderradikalismus: Literatur-soziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum" (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 [1973]:245-71); John G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Englewood Cliffs, N.Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 73; and Jonathon Z. Smith on the

motifs of "out of place" and "mobility" (Jonathon Z. Smith, "Native Cults in the Hellenistic Period," *History of Religions* II [1971]:236-38); and especially the essay, "The Temple and the Magician," published as chapter 8 of the collection of essays by Professor Smith entitled *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Jacob Neusner 23 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978): see particularly 185-89. Professor Smith's essay describes the broad socio-cultural context within which the christocentrism of the Fourth Gospel is to be located, namely, the "reversal" or "shift" from temple to magician as sacred center across the Mediterranean world in Late Antiquity.

²¹Meeks follows Odeberg and Bultmann in finding a polemic against "the claim of prophets or seers to have received revelations by means of 'heavenly journeys' as for example in apocalyptic or in the *merkabah* speculation, or in the traditions of the theophanies to Moses and the Patriarchs" ("Man from Heaven," p. 52).

NOTES

CHAPTER III

¹Cf. Spitta's comment on vss. 4-11: "Jedenfalls hat es eine absolut fremde Tonart in diese Abschiedsrede hineingebracht. . . . An Stelle des milden Trostes, den der scheidende Jesus seinen erschütterten Jungern spendet, tritt die Forderung der Bedingungen für den Eingang in das Himmelreich, der Glaube an Jesus als das Ebenbild und den wahrhaftigen Sohn Gottes" (*Johannesevangelium als Quelle*, p. 344). The contrast is not as sharp if we include 13:31-38 with 14:1-3 as the contrasted section, since "gentle comfort" does not characterize 13:31-38.

²Another contrast between 14:4-11 and 13:31-14:3 is that 14:4-11 is predominantly in the present tense, in contrast to the many future tense verbs in 13:31-14:3.

³The unity of Father and Son is expressed in a number of different forms in the Gospel, of which the reciprocal formula of indwelling is only one example. It is found, in reverse order, in 10:38, and again in 17:21, with reference to the indwelling. The reciprocal pattern is found also in 10:14 with reference to the mutual knowledge of Father and Son. In addition to the reciprocity forms, however, there are correlative forms which indicate that as the Father acts *to the Son*, so the Son acts to others (10:14; 15:9; 17:8; 18:22; 20:21), which indicate that as the Father acts *to others*, so the Son acts to others (5:17,9,21,26; 6:57; and cf. 6:44 with 12:32), and which indicate that as the Father commands, the Son obeys (5:30; 8:28; 12:50; 14:31). There are also forms expressing the fact that man's action towards Christ is equivalent to action towards the Father (14:7,9, and see below, note 7).

⁴Cf. the statement of Yu Ibuki regarding 14:6a: "Dieses Ego-eimi-Wort ist der Höhepunkt des ganzen Abschnittes. . . ." Ibuki provides a very thorough analysis of 14:1-11 in *Die Wahrheit im Johannesevangelium, Bonner Biblische Beiträge* 39 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1972):222. I. de la Potterie calls vs. 6 "une véritable charnière entre les deux subdivisions majeures (les vv. 2-6 et 6-11)" (I. de la Potterie, "'Je suis la Voie, la Verité et la Vie' (jn 14:6)," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 88 [1966]:927). On the "I am" sayings as such see the discussion later on in this chapter.

⁵Cf. Ibuki, *Wahrheit*, p. 218; de la Potterie, "'Je suis la Voie,'" p. 931.

⁶With vs. 6b it becomes clear that the Father is the destination in view in connection with the "way" symbol.

⁷The correlative forms in vss. 7 and 9 express the mediating role of the Son. The conditional form of vs. 7 (*ei agnokeite me, kai ton patera mou an edeite*) is found in 8:19 (and in 5:46 with reference to Moses and Jesus). The participial correlative of vs. 9 (*ho heorakos eme heoraken ton patera*) is found in 5:23 and 15:23 (with the negative), and in 12:44,45; and 13:20.

⁸ On the background of the "way" motif see the bibliography below, note 11. On the particular question of the relationship of the three predicates, "way," "truth," and "life," I. de la Potterie provides a comprehensive historical review of opinion in "Je suis la Voie." See Raymond E. Brown's summary of de la Potterie in *Gospel According to John*, pp. 620-21. In my opinion the immediate context, especially the elaboration of the "I am" statement in vss. 6b-11, makes it clear that "the way" is the controlling predicate and that the other two predicates are subordinate.

⁹ To my knowledge, no one has interpreted vss. 4-11 as already addressing the issue of succession, or 13:31-14:3 as already raising the issue, despite the fact that this is the issue taken up from vs. 12 on. Discussion of the shift that occurs at vs. 4 (or, according to some, at vs. 5 or 6) has focused on the pros and cons of some sort of eschatological reinterpretation (See Schulz, *Menschensohn-Christologie*, p. 159, n. 6 for bibliography in addition to Becker and Dodd whom we have discussed above, Chapter I).

¹⁰ This is the common rendering of the shorter reading, *kat hopou ego hupago oidate ten hodon*, which, despite its ungrammatical construction, is accepted by most scholars as the original reading because of its strong manuscript support in p^{66c}, Sinaiticus, B, C*, L, W, X, 33, 1071.

¹¹ The "I am" sayings have been the focal point of most of the literature on the discourse material in John, from Eduard Norden on. See Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede* (Berlin: B.G. Taubner, 1913); Karl Kundsinn, *Charakter und Ursprung der johanneischen Reden*, *Acta Universitatis Latvianica*, Teologisches Fakultates, Series 1, Vol. 4 (Riga: 1939); Karl Kundsinn, "Zur Diskussion über die Ego-Eimi-Sprüche des Johannesevangeliums," *Charisteria IOHANNI KÖPP*. Octogenario Oblata, Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 7 (Holmiae, 1954):95-107. Heinz Becker, *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede* (1941 Marburg dissertation, published posthumously by Rudolf Bultmann, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956); J. Richter, "Ani hu und Ego eimi: Die Offenbarungsformel 'Ich bin es' im Alten und Neuen Testament" (Unpublished dissertation, Erlangen, 1956); Karl Schaedel, "Das Johannesevangelium und 'die Kinder des Lichts': Untersuchungen zu den Selbstbezeichnungen Jesu im vierten Evangelium und zur Heilsterminologie der 'En Fesha-Sekte'" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vienna, 1953); S. Schulz, *Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1960); Heinrich Zimmermann, "Das absolute Ego eimi als die neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformel," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, N.F. 4 (1960):54-69; A. Feuillet, "Les Ego eimi christologiques du quatrieme Evangile," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 54 (1966):5-22, 213-40; George MacRae, "The Ego-Proclamation in Gnostic Sources," in *The Trial of Jesus*, ed. by Ernst Bammel, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, Second Series 13 (London: S.C.M. Press, 1970):122-34; Philip B. Harner, *The "I am" of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought*

(Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970); Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Herkunft und Sinn der Formel ego eimi," Excursus in *Das Johannesevangelium*, Part II, *Kommentar zu Kap. 5-12*, *Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, ed. by A. Wikenhauser, A. Vogtle, R. Schnackenburg 4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1971): 59-70; D. Daube, "The 'I am' of the Messianic Presence," in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone, 1956), pp. 325-29; Raymond E. Brown, "EGO EIMI - 'I AM,'" Appendix 4, *Gospel According to St. John*, pp. 533-38; W.L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (London, 1939), pp. 55-89; E. Stauffer, *Jesus and His Story*, trans. by Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), pp. 174-95; E. Stauffer, "Ego," *T.D.N.T.*, 2:343-62. Eduard Schweizer, *EGO EIMI: Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bldreden*, FRLANT, N.F. 38 (2d ed.: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965). Jan Bergman, *Ioh bin Isis: Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisaretalogien*, *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum*, Vol. 3 (Uppsala: n/p., 1968). See also the review of Bergman by Jonathon Z. Smith, "Native Cults in the Hellenistic Period," *HR* 11 (1971):236-49.

¹² *Gospel*, p. 225, n. 3.

¹³ *Ibid.*, citing *Altorientalische Texte I*, ed. by Hugo Gressmann (Second Edition, Berlin, 1926).

¹⁴ *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 533.

¹⁵ Schaedel, "Das Johannesevangelium und 'die Kinder des Lichts,'" p. 15.

¹⁶ *Gospel*, p. 255, n. 3.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 457, n. 4. Raymond Brown has overlooked this change of opinion in his reference to Bultmann (Brown, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 534).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ According to Karl Schaedel, the recognition formula "muss polemisch-exklusiven Charakter haben. Sie fordert ausschliessliche Geltung, muss also jedem anderen gleichlautenden Anspruch feindlich gegenüberstehen" ("Das Johannesevangelium und 'die Kinder des Lichts,'" p. 9). Schaedel proceeds to argue as if only the recognition formula can express a polemic. Cf. also Schulz, *Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden*, pp. 127-28. Brown is more careful, speaking of a "contrast" expressed in the recognition formula, rather than a "polemic." But he too slights the fact that the "identification" formula can express a contrast, given the right context.

²⁰ While we have made use of Bultmann's classification scheme here, it should be pointed out that a more complex analysis of the "I am" form is urgently needed, one that will take account of the whole set of factors which can affect the usage of the form, not just the one factor to which Bultmann

called attention, namely, What question is being answered? Other factors which should be used in such an analysis would include the identity of the speaker, the audience, the occasion--time and place, etc. E. Schweizer, for example, supplements Bultmann's scheme with one which he describes as "mehr inhaltlich-theologisch," but which could be broken down in terms of the relationship between speaker and hearer (*EGO EIMI*, pp. 27-33).

²¹The importance of this point, so elementary on the face of it, cannot be exaggerated. We have cited its importance in the development of Bultmann's interpretation of the Gospel (see above, p. 2, n. 7). Before Bultmann Wellhausen had emphasized the same fact, that "bei Joh. stösst Jesus die Juden immer nur mit der Tatsache vor den Kopf, dass Er die Wehrheit sei, worin die Wahrheit bestehe, sagt er nicht" (*Evangelium Johannis*, p. 112).

²²*Gospel*, p. 266.

²³This is implied by what Michael Hill, for example, calls the "relational" aspect of charismatic authority, by which he means that charismatic claims and behavior depend upon the recognition of the hearer. "It is the definition that actors in a situation give to it that is of primary importance, rather than a purely external evaluation of it" (Michael Hill, *A Sociology of Religion* [New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973], pp. 163-64).

²⁴I am placing emphasis on the *directness* of access to divine power in the definition of charismatic authority, directness relative to the prevailing, officially recognized channels of authority in a given society. I am using the term "traditional" in the sense of that order which has become recognized generally as official and legitimate in a given society. See further the discussion below, Chapter VI.

²⁵Cf. Wayne Meeks's reference to self-contradictions that are "manifestly deliberate" (Meeks, "Man from Heaven," p. 48). The best discussion of John 5:31 and 8:13 is Anitra Kolenkow's address to the 1974 Society of Biblical Literature Fourth Gospel Session. See below, p. 85, n. 60.

²⁶Bultmann's interpretation of the Gospel assigns prime importance to this lack of external distinguishing marks, but understands this to mean that Jesus did no miracles or offer other marks of prophetic possession. According to Bultmann the Johannine Jesus appears to be no different from other "ordinary" men. But this is hardly the Johannine viewpoint. The miracles cannot be dismissed in this fashion (see below, Chapter IV). It is, however, correct to say that for the author Jesus *appears* to be no different from other "extraordinary" men, i.e., prophetic claimants.

²⁷*Agnostos Theos*, pp. 188-201.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 197.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 214. Professor Jonathon Smith has called my attention to the fact that Celsus may have been describing Christian figures, possibly Montanist prophets. According to W.L. Knox, "The language of these prophets is merely Celsus' parody of perfectly good ante-Nicene Christian preaching of a rather enthusiastic type" (W.L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* [London: Oxford University Press, 1944], p. 83, n. 2). See Thomas W. Gillespie's recent discussion of the Celsus reference in the article, "A Pattern of Prophetic Speech in First Corinthians," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 74-95.

³⁰Kundsin, *Charakter and Ursprung der johanneischen Reden*, pp. 268ff.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 223, 229, 267-68.

³²*Gospel According to John*, pp. 534-35.

³³For the literature see above, p. 52, n. 11. There has been an apologetic note in the debate which has led to the posing of all sorts of false disjunctions as regards the issue of "boasting" or self-glorification. According to Karl Kundsin, for example, the so-called distinctively Christian "soteriological clause" reflects a difference at a much deeper level between Christian and pagan "I am" forms. In the Hellenistic and Oriental texts, he writes, one finds self-glorification. The predications and attributes are listed for the sake of the god. Particularly the Babylonian and Egyptian texts are as far removed from the Johannine discourses as possible. Here the style reflects "absolutism . . . without reference to the receiver or hearer" (*Charakter und Ursprung*, p. 267): "Der Ichstil der babylonischen und ägyptischen Texte ist der Ausdruck für die Majestät des Redenden in ihrem reinen Für-sich-sein" (*ibid.*, p. 268). There is "nothing even in the way of an anticipation of the idea that the transcendent being of the speaker might also signify strength and help, life and salvation for others" (*ibid.*, p. 267). Despite certain anticipations of the Johannine style in Jewish tradition (the Pentateuch, Deutero-Isaiah, the Psalms, and Wisdom literature), Kundsin concludes that it is "auf sein tieferes Wesen gesehen durchaus etwas *sui generis*, wie es scheint, sogar etwas Schöpferisches and Neues" (*ibid.*, p. 229).

A similar distinction is drawn by Heinrich Zimmermann between what he calls the "I-form" and the "I-style." Zimmermann lists several points of difference; however, I find the points of difference cited so confusing as to be incapable of application. One of the most curious and revealing points is that the one who uses the "I-style" makes a "very particular claim which goes beyond the measure belonging to man" (Das absolute *Ego Eimi* als die neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformel, p. 65). Zimmermann states that within the Old Testament the "eigentlichen" "I-style" is found only in Proverbs and Sirach. Everywhere else in the Old Testament we find the "I-form" (00. 65-66). Behind what is presented as a formal literary distinction is, in fact, a theological, i.e., confessional judgment. The "I-style" is characteristically found in the mouth of the ancient Oriental

and Hellenistic gods, according to Zimmermann, and differs from the Old Testament formula of revelation (in the "I-form") "as the revelation of Jahweh differs from the revelation of these gods" (p. 66, my emphasis).

We cite Zimmermann together with Kundsins because both attempt to correlate a formal-stylistic distinction with a confessional distinction between Christian and non-Christian (Kundsins), or Old Testament and pagan (Zimmermann). Zimmermann's distinction between an "I-form" and an "I-style" is not to be equated with Kundsins's distinction between an "absolute" and a "soteriological" style of self-testimony. However, Zimmermann's notion that the "I-style" involves a claim which goes beyond the measure belonging to man, which implies an illegitimate self-aggrandizement, recalls Kundsins's notion that in the Oriental and Hellenistic texts we find self-glorification. In both cases, in other words, the issue is boasting, or autodoxology.

Zimmermann's two categories, I have suggested, are too confusing to be operational. Kundsins's distinction is clearer. But it can easily be shown that the distinction between "soteriological" and "self-glorifying" types of first person self-testimony does not coincide with the distinction between the Christian and non-Christian literature. The introduction to the Hammurabi law code is an example of "soteriological" self-testimony:

Hammurabi, the shepherd, called by Enlil, am I;
the one who makes affluence and plenty abound;
.....
the one who made Ur prosper;
... the lord, who revived Uruk;
who supplied water in abundance to its people;
The preamble concludes:
When Marduk commissioned me to guide the people aright,
to direct the land,
I established law and justice in the language of the land,
thereby promoting the welfare of the people . . .

("The Code of Hammurabi," trans. Theophile J. Meek, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to The Old Testament*, ed. James B. Pritchard [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1950], pp. 163ff.) Examples could be multiplied from the Isis aretalogies. Soteriology is implied in the claim of Alexander the False Prophet: *Eimi Glykon . . . phaos anthropoisin* (Lucian, 18). It should be recalled that Norden described the speech type which he postulated on the basis of the Babylonian, Egyptian, and Hellenistic texts as "soteriological."

A further difficulty with Kundsins's analysis is that "soteriological" accomplishments may be cited in a particular address for purposes of self-glorification or boasting. An example is the Sumerian hymn, "The King of the Road." Lines 28-35 recite the king's deeds on behalf of the wayfarer. But the hymn as a whole is recited, as the king says explicitly, "that my name be established unto distant days that it leave not the mouth (of men),/that my praise be spread wide in the land,/that I be eulogized in all the lands . . ." (Pritchard, lines 37ff.).

A step toward clarification may be made by noting that the numerous self-laudatory royal hymns in Sumerian literature

are cited by S.N. Kramer as one expression of a psychological drive which, according to Kramer, was a pervading source of motivation in Sumerian behavior and which deeply colored their way of life--"the ambitious, competitive, aggressive, and seemingly far from ethical drive for pre-eminence and prestige, for victory and success" (S.N. Kramer, *The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963], p. 264). Kramer calls this drive "the will to superiority, the driving ambition for victory over a rival." Typical expressions of this "drive" are the "Copper-Silver" debate in which Copper and Silver, personified, boast of their superiority over each other, and taunt each other with insults concerning their respective shameful and humiliating social roles. Kramer cites also a "bragging speech by the shepherd-god, Dumuzi, whose plea for marriage has just been rejected by the goddess Inanna in favor of the farmer-god, Enkimdu" (p. 226). He points out that the competitive drive played a large role even in Sumerian formal education. A teacher encourages the ambitious student in the following words: "Of your brothers may you be their leader, of your friends may you be their chief; may you rank the highest among the schoolboys" (p. 266). Political rivalry between the Sumerian city-states as it is expressed in at least two epic tales reveals the same exaggerated competitiveness. "To judge from the contents of these two poems," Kramer says, "it was the driving ambition of each of these rulers to break down the morale of his rival by a kind of 'war of nerves' and thus to make submissive vassals of him and his subjects. The tales are replete with taunts and threats carried back and forth by messengers and heralds as well as with challenges and contests" (p. 267). The loser in one case acknowledges the superiority of the victor in the following words: "You are the beloved of Inanna, you alone are exalted, Inanna has truly chosen you for her holy lap; From the lower (lands) to the upper (lands) you are their lord, I am second to you, From the (moment of) conception, I was not your equal, you are the 'big brother.' I cannot compare with you ever!" (ibid., p. 267). We may note in passing the fact that the "I am" form is used here to express the opposite of boasting, namely submission, subordination: "I am second to you!"

In the Sumerian literature, then, which includes numerous examples of self-laudatory hymns using the "I am" form, we have unambiguous boasting, bragging speech. That such speech is not uncommon elsewhere may be demonstrated by citing an example from the nineteenth-century American frontier. Henry Adams records a quarrel overheard on a Mississippi flatboat between two boatmen:

'I am a man; I am a horse; I am a team! cried one voice;
'I can whip any man in all Kentucky, by God!' 'I am an alligator!' cried the other; 'half man, half horse; I can whip any man on the Mississippi, by God!' 'I am a man!' shouted the first; 'have the best horse, best dog, best gun, and handsomest wife in all Kentucky, by God!' 'I am a Mississippi snapping turtle!' rejoined the second; 'have bear's claws, alligator's teeth, and the devil's tail; can whip any man, by God!'

(Henry Adams, *The Formative Years*, condensed and edited by Herbert Agar I [London: Collins, 1948]:28). Cf. Mark Twain's similar account in Samuel L. Clemens, *Life on the Mississippi* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1968), pp. 17-19, which starts out, "Whoo-oo! I'm the old original iron-jawed, brass-mounted, copper-bellied corpse-maker from the wilds of Arkansasaw!"

I cannot attempt here a comprehensive classification of possible functions of self-testimony language. I can only suggest that the classifications proposed to date are inadequate and misleading. There are, as the Sumerian and American frontier examples show, cases where self-testimony forms function as boasts. It is absurd, however, to suggest, as one reading of Kundsins and Zimmermann implies, that all non-Christian examples of "I-am" self-testimony have the kind of self-glorifying function of the Sumerian examples. The purpose of the self-testimony of Hammurabi which precedes the law code, for example, appears to be the legitimization of the law code. Against Zimmermann's specious distinctions there are examples of self-glorifying speech within the Old Testament, particularly in Deutero-Isaiah (See H.-M. Dion, "Le Genre Littéraire Sumerien de L'Hymne a soi-meme" et quelques Passages du Deutero-Isaie, *Revue Biblique* 74 [1967]: 215-34. Dion also provides one of the most complete catalogues of Sumerian self-laudatory hymns to be found). A comprehensive analysis of the "boasting" theme should take into account also the classical rhetorical forms which Judge has called attention to in relation to Paul (E.A. Judge, "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice," *Australian Biblical Review* 16 [1968]:37-50).

³⁴Cf. the point made by Reiling that the problem of distinguishing between the false and the true prophet in Israel was a conflict between "prophets with an identical claim to divine authority," and as such, one which could not be solved by means of "external criteria" or "distinctive semantic terms" (J. Reiling, "The Use of PSEUDOPROPHETES in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus," *Novum Testamentum* 13 [1971]:147-56). In other words, distinctions between true and false prophets are distinctions drawn by insiders of a given group between what, to outsiders, are equivalent figures. The resemblance of the Johannine Jesus to other savior figures has been insisted upon by only a few scholars. Cf. G.P. Wetter's conclusion that "in allem Auseren ist dieser Christus ein echt antiker 'Sohn Gottes,' . . . ja das Evangelium scheint dazu geschrieben werden zu sein, um die Menschen davon zu überzeugen" (Wetter, *Die Sohn Gottes; Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums; zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Heilandsgestalten der Antike* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916], p. 156). Cf. too, the similar conclusion of Richard Reitzenstein in *Poimandres: Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur* (Photographic reproduction of the Leipzig, 1904 edition, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), p. 223, n. 2. Reitzenstein's statement is quoted, in agreement, by E. Schweizer, *EGO EIMI*, p. 126. Cf. too the article by Wayne A. Meeks, "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel," in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. by Elisabeth S. Fiorenze (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), pp. 43-67.

³⁵Similar to Brown's distinction between autodoxology and soteriology is Robert Fortna's recent attempt to formulate the contrast between source and redaction in the Gospel in terms of a movement "from christology to soteriology." See the two articles, "From Christology to Soteriology: a redaction-critical study of Salvation in the Fourth Gospel," *Interpretation* 7 (1973): 31-47; and Fortna, "Christology in the Fourth Gospel." Fortna holds that there is a polemical thrust to this movement. The redactor's explicit "soteriology" is intended to "counter" the source's "single-minded attention to Christology" ("Christology," p. 491). Fortna himself supplies material which calls this thesis into question, for, as he points out, the redactor himself equates salvation, or life, with Jesus. "Jesus does not accomplish salvation; he is salvation" ("Christology," p. 40). The redactor's soteriology is christology, in other words. "John's most characteristic word for salvation" says Fortna, "is life, and ultimately it is not a quality, a state, to which Jesus brings men, but Jesus himself" (ibid.). If in fact the redactor was concerned about the source's christocentrism, why has he himself chosen as one of his most characteristic forms of expression the "I am" saying? That Fortna has difficulty maintaining this aspect of his argument becomes apparent in his attempt to summarize the contrast between source and redaction. There is a kind of oscillation back and forth between acknowledgment of the continuity between source and redaction, and an effort to preserve the difference between them as significant. First he points out that what John had added would not have caused offense to one who was familiar with the source, "for John has both drawn out the theological potential hidden in the source and extended it in a way that makes its original meaning clearer and deeper" (ibid.). Then he checks himself and insists that John's "advance" on the source is "a major one." One expects a summary statement of the "advance" to follow. And, indeed, there follows first a description of the source: it is a gospel of signs, a demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus, and "its soteriology is entirely subjected to Christology." As for the redactor, one finds the concession that "this christological emphasis is not diminished by John--on the contrary." Then where is the difference? Fortna proceeds: the redacted Gospel is "a Gospel not only of signs, that is, of Jesus and his identity, but much more of salvation, of life." But then he must add, "Or rather, it finally asserts that the two are one, that to know who Jesus is and to believe in him is to live (20.31). Presumably John's experience, and that of his church, showed him that christology alone is insufficient; belief in Jesus, unless perceived soteriologically, is of no account" (ibid., p. 41). I suggest that whatever John may have "countered" in his source, if anything, it was not a single-minded attention to christology. He is as guilty of this charge as is his source. He has a more explicit soteriology, as Fortna points out, but one which ends up even more insistently directing the reader's attention back to Jesus as in some way or other the source and the substance of salvation. In other words, both source and redaction are equally christocentric.

³⁶Dieter Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*, *Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 11 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964):210-13.

³⁷Ibid., p. 232.

³⁸Ibid., p. 229.

³⁹Ibid., p. 213.

⁴⁰See, for example, W. Nicol's observation that "a more or less general consensus of opinion has been reached that the Jesus of the S[igns Source] was in some way or other influenced by *theios aner*-ideas,"--in contrast to the author or redactor (W. Nicol, *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction, Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 32 [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972]:49).

⁴¹I am suggesting, in other words, that the hypothesis of a Signs Source and its redaction by the author may not be used to dissociate the author from the image of Jesus as a miracle worker. Even though to the author Jesus is more, much more, than this, he knows that this is what Jesus *looked like*, outwardly.

⁴²See below, pp. 150ff.

⁴³Cf. Bultmann's statement that "I am the Way" is "the pure expression of the revelation idea" (*Evangelium*, p. 467, my translation. Cf. *Gospel*, p. 605).

⁴⁴Wetter called it a "Streitschrift" (*Sohn Gottes*, p. 127). Wilhelm Wrede held that a historical understanding of the Gospel would only be achieved when it was seen "als eine aus dem Kampfe geborene und für den Kampf geschriebene Schrift" (Wrede, *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1903], p. 40).

⁴⁵Notably Louis Martyn among recent scholars, in *History and Theology*, and "Source Criticism and Religionsgeschichte in the Fourth Gospel," *Perspective* 11 (1970):247-73.

⁴⁶See for example Oscar Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle*, trans. by John Bowden (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 60. On this point Cullmann follows W. Baldensperger, W. Bauer, and R. Bultmann.

⁴⁷O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955):225; Schaedel, *Das Johannesevangelium und 'die Kinder des Lichts'*, p. 231.

⁴⁸Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 377.

⁴⁹E.C. Colwell, *John Defends the Gospel* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1936), p. 13.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 376. Cf. Schweizer, *EGO EIMI*, p. 126, who follows Bultmann on this point.

⁵¹Ibid., emphasis in original

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Ibid., p. 377.

⁵⁴*Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972):44-72.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 69.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 69-70. My emphasis.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 71.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 69.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 70.

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 70-71.

⁶¹This point needs stressing, since some may view our reading of the farewell discourse as a polemic arising from current fashion in New Testament scholarship. The fact is, however, that I have not introduced the idea of a polemic into the discourse, but rather suggested an alternative issue to the eschatological polemic usually found there.

⁶²Cf. the "we" of 3:11, which associates the author and his group, with the one who is "from above" in 3:31ff. For the question of the *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel this observation may be reversed. The earthly locus of those whose standpoint is heaven is some form of prophetic calling or vocation.

NOTES

CHAPTER IV

¹For the literature, see above, p. 3, n. 11.

²Brown, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 645; Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, Part III, p. 90, n. 98; Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 405; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 619.

³See Schnackenburg's summary of the problem and the alternative solutions proposed. Schnackenburg concludes that the two texts, 14:16, 17 and 18ff. refer to different theological aspects "und nicht knofrontiert werden dürfen" *Johannesevangelium*, Part III, p. 88).

⁴Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1907. The literary break within the farewell material at 14:31 served, in fact, as the starting point for Wellhausen's investigation.

⁵Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: George Reimer, 1908), p. 77: "Es hat sich in Kap. 14 ein innerer Zwiespalt gezeigt."

⁶Ibid.

⁷*Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 3.

⁸Ibid., p. 5.

⁹Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 13.

¹¹Ibid., p. 17.

¹²Ibid., p. 19.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 10. That this is a speculation is clear from the note Windisch adds, which proposes an alternative possible understanding of the sequence (note 27).

¹⁸Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁹Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet im Johannes-Evangelium." See also the rector's address by Bornkamm, published as "Die Zeit des Geistes: Ein johanneisches Wort und seine Geschichte," in *Geschichte und Glaube*, 1:90-103.

²⁰"Der Paraklet," p. 70.

²¹Ibid., p. 71.

²²Ibid., p. 84.

²³Ibid., p. 79. A further indication of the unsatisfactory nature of Bornkamm's understanding of the Paraclete is his ambiguity on the identification of the Paraclete with the glorified Son. Though Bornkamm claims that the Paraclete is none other than the Son of Man glorified, he subsequently states that "the evangelist does not speak of a new 'Spirit-form' of the exalted one, but rather places the Spirit in the service of the dying exalted one," and adds that "the unity with the Father which is reserved for Jesus alone is consequently not attributed to the Paraclete" (p.88).

²⁴Ibid., p. 87.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid., p. 88.

²⁷Ibid., p. 85.

²⁸Bultmann pointed out, in criticism of the original version of Bornkamm's article (published in *Festschrift für R. Bultmann* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1949], pp. 12-35), that the two changes introduced by the author in applying the forerunner-fulfiller conception leave nothing of the original pattern (Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 567, n. 2). In his reply to Bultmann, incorporated into the revised version of the article, Bornkamm held that the eschatological relationship of the two times remained. Despite the changes introduced by the evangelist, Bornkamm asserted, the idea retained significance "because it was able to express the qualitative difference between Then and Now and at the same time the indissoluble connection of both, the time of the historically limited preparation and the time of the eschatological fulfilment" (Der Paraklet," p. 86). But this reintroduces the notion of rank.

²⁹As in Acts 2:16ff., for example. See Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by Kendrick Grobel 1 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951):155. Cf. Robin Scroggs' important article, "The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1965):359-73.

³⁰Brown cites Spitta, Delafosse, Windisch, Sasse, Bultmann, and Betz as holding to the position that the Paraclete was once an independent salvific figure, later confused with the Holy Spirit (Brown, "The Paraclete," p. 113, no. 4).

³¹*Der Paraklet*, p. 149ff., cf. p. 2.

³²Ibid., p. 127.

³³Ibid., p. 149.

³⁴Ibid., p. 150.

³⁵The one subsequent reference to the text (page 163) does not resolve this problem.

³⁶We have not touched on interpretations of the Paraclete where the Paraclete is identified with the Beloved Disciple. In such interpretations the distinction between the Paraclete and Jesus, the Son, receives its most pointed expression. See especially H. Sasse, "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 (1925): 275; Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjunger im Johannesevangelium*, p. 82. Brown agrees "in principle" with those who see in the Beloved Disciple the "incarnation" of the Paraclete (Brown, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 1142). Cf. also Culpepper, *The Johannine School*, pp. 267-70. Although Culpepper makes it clear that for the author the Beloved Disciple "was not the Paraclete" (p. 268), nevertheless, he suggests that for the Johannine community the Beloved Disciple was "their first Paraclete" (p. 269).

³⁷Windisch, *Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 25.

³⁸Becker, "Abschiedsrede," p. 227; Bultmann, *Gospel*, pp. 581, 619. Betz cites also Heilmüller, Corssen, Holtzmann, and Feine (Betz, *Paraklet*, p. 149, n. 5). Cf. also Brown, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 646, and the discussion by Ernest Scott (Ernest F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906] pp. 346-49).

³⁹As noted above (p. 70, n. 3) Schnackenburg concludes that these two parts of the text should not be brought into confrontation!

⁴⁰Windisch, *Spirit-Paraclete*, p. 3.

⁴¹With this cf. the promise of authority to Peter in Matt. 16:18, 19, later extended to all the disciples, Matt. 18:18. See also John 20:22, 23, discussed below in Chapter V.

⁴²Becker recognizes that this formula introduces a new section or subsection, but pays little attention to the disciples as the subjects of Jesus' announcement ("Abschiedsrede," p. 224). Spitta likewise quotes B. Weiss on v. 12 as follows: "Die feierliche Versicherung zeigt, dass hier eine neue Gedankenreihe beginnt. . . ." (Spitta, *Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle*, p. 344).

⁴³Fortna assumes that the uniqueness precludes a sharing in the divine power of the Son by the disciples. But such a sharing is just what is in view in vss. 12-24. See above, p. 3 n. 10.

⁴⁴On the "magical potency" of Jesus' self-identification see Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements*, p. 87. It is the effect of Jesus' words in the narrative which demonstrates their power.

The argument over whether or not the absolute *ego eimi* without predicate appears in the magical literature is beside the point (See Zimmermann, "Das absolute *ego eimi*," p. 56). What the parallels cited by Knox and others show is the well-known role of identification, of knowing the identity of the deity, or proclaiming the name of the deity, in magic.

⁴⁵See under *ekballo* in William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

⁴⁶Cf. Caird's comments in his article, "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel" *An Exercise in Biblical Semantics*, p. 266.

⁴⁷Cf. the magical parallels for the use of *tarasso* cited by Campbell Bonner, "Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles," *Harvard Theological Review* 20 (1927):177. Cf. Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 223. According to Bonner we have in John 13:21 "a clear case of the phrenetic agitation of the prophet" (p. 178).

⁴⁸Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 119, n. 2 raises the question explicitly as to whether "the Evangelist" believed the miracle (in 2:1-11) to have been "an actual historical occurrence" or not, without giving an answer. But when he argues that "the divinity of the figure of Jesus in John is completely lacking in visibility" (*Theology of the New Testament*, 2:42), and concludes that the miracles "are neither more nor less than words, *verba visibilia* (ibid., p. 60), he points the way to the conclusion that their actual historicity as demonstrations of divine power is a matter of indifference to the author. According to Bultmann miracles are a "a concession to the weakness of man" (*Gospel*, p. 696).

⁴⁹The primary statement of the "hiddenness" theme is to be found in Bultmann's comments on John 1:14, *ho logos sarx egeneto* (*Gospel*, p. 63).

⁵⁰Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2:59-60.

⁵¹Jürgen Becker, "Wunder und Christologie," *New Testament Studies* 19 (1970): 130-148.

⁵²Ibid., p. 146.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 146-47.

⁵⁴Fortna, "Christology in the Fourth Gospel," p. 491. Fortna here follows Paul Achtemeier, "Gospel miracle tradition and the divine man," *Interpretation* 26 (1972): 174-97.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 492.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 493.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 491. Cf. above, p. 61, n. 35, for a specific critique of Fortna.

⁵⁸See above, p. 61.

⁵⁹*Testament*, p. 22.

⁶⁰The miracles have become events freighted with a significance which places them on a level with creation, resurrection, and judgment, but this symbolic importance which they have acquired as a result of the one who performs them does not take away from their importance as events. As events, in fact, they belong to the time of "the beginning." The symbolic importance of the miracles does not make them any the less miraculous or magical. Anitra Kolenkow's term "goetic" to describe the outright assertion of claims to divine power such as one finds in the Johannine discourse material is legitimate, and underscores the fact that the motifs found in the discourses, such as the power to give life, to judge, and even the identity and indwelling motifs (14:10, 11, for example) "may be associated with a miracle milieu." Kolenkow's study was presented as an address at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1974, under the title "Argument Among Miracle Believers: Johannine Use of 'Goes' Motifs to Modify 'Miracle Apology' Motifs in John 5 and 8." Unfortunately it has not been published.

⁶¹Cf. Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 1037; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 692; Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, Part III, p. 387.

⁶²See Büchsel on common use of the terms "bind" and "loose" in magic (Friedrich Büchsel, "deo," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 2:60-61).

⁶³Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 384.

⁶⁴Karl Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (2d rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Verlag B.G. Teubner 2 [1974]:45ff).

⁶⁵Ignored completely by C.K. Barrett, C.H. Dodd, and R.E. Brown, for example, in their discussions of the background of the Gospel as well as in their detailed comments on the text. Schnackenburg in his three volume commentary does not cite Preisendanz anywhere in his bibliography, nor PGM in the list of abbreviations. In the study of early christian literature generally a shift in attitude to magic is occurring. Hull's book on *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* is an example of a new willingness to take the magical literature seriously. David Aune's forthcoming article, "Magic in Early Christianity," in W. Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1987, is another important example.

⁶⁶A.-J. Festugière, "La valeur religieuse des papyrus magiques," in *L'ideal religieux des grecs et l'évangile* (Paris: n.p., 1932), pp. 281-328. See esp. p. 285.

⁶⁷On the concern with transmission and succession see, for example, the instruction in *PGM*, 1:193ff.: "These things deliver to no one except to your own actual son alone." Cf. also the instructions in the so-called Mithras Liturgy, *PGM*, 4:734f. The "Mithras Liturgy" has been translated by Marvin W. Meyer in the SBL Texts and Translations series: *The "Mithras Liturgy," SBL Texts and Translations*, No. 10, Graeco-Roman Religion, Series 2, ed. and trans. by Marvin W. Meyer (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976). See A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (3d expanded ed., published by Otto Weinreich; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1923), p. 52, for other examples.

⁶⁸In the spell for a light oracle (*luchnomantias*) the deity is called on to "enter in" (*eiselthe*) seven times (*PGM*, 4:955-1034. Cf. also 4:24, 75, 91, 879).

⁶⁹Martyn, *History and Theology*, p. 7. Cf. Windisch, *Spirit-Paraclete*, pp. 19-20.

⁷⁰Aune, *Cultic Setting*, p. 78.

⁷¹Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 610; Schnackenburg, *Johannes-evangelium*, 3:80-81; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, p. 633.

⁷²*Johannesevangelium*, 3:81.

⁷³*Gospel*, pp. 610-11.

⁷⁴*Perspective*, 9 (1970):110.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 114.

⁷⁷Examples of this gospel form would be the *Pistis Sophia*, *The Apocryphon of James*, *The Apocryphon of John*. See also W. Schneemelcher's discussion of types of apocryphal gospels in Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, English translation ed. by R. McL. Wilson, 1 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963):p. 82ff.; also H.-Ch. Puech *ibid.*, pp. 231ff. The contrast in the gospel forms is valid, regardless of whether or not the non-canonical gospel form is usefully described as "gnostic."

⁷⁸Robinson, "Gattung," p. 107.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁸⁰This phrase is from Peter Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia* (2d, augmented ed.: New York: Schocken Books, 1968), p. 1. See below, Chapter VI for further discussion of the term "charisma."

⁸¹Cf. Georgi's observation that in the case of the charismatic or "pneumatic" apostle "der Triumph in der Konkurrenz" is in essence the content of their message (*Gegner*, p. 213). Georgi emphasizes the element of competition throughout

his analysis. Worsley points to the "fissiparity" of charismatic movements, but traces this phenomenon to the primacy of the message, rather than the person of the prophet. Worsley cites Talmon in support, but this is misleading since in Talmon's analysis the kind of message is only one of several factors contributing to the fissiparous tendency of millenarian movements. Talmon also points out that "millenarian movements suffer from frequent cessation and fission partly because they base their recruitment of their leaders on inspiration." (Y. Talmon, "Pursuit of the Millennium: The Relation Between Religious and Social Change," *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 3 [1962]: 134). Cf. also Lewis Coser's analysis of sectarian dynamics in *Greedy Institutions*, Ch. 7, "Sects and Sectarians," (London: Free Press, 1974). Coser points out, for example, that the sect often "invents" inner enemies in order to strengthen its solidarity (p. 110). Again, "The world of the sect is a stern world where the sheep and the goats are continually sorted anew . . ." (p. 14).

⁸²See in particular Klaus Haacker, *Die Stiftung des Heils: Untersuchungen zur Struktur der johanneischen Theologie, Arbeiten zur Theologie*, First Series 47 (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972: 75ff).

⁸³See Chapter V below on 14:25, 26.

⁸⁴*Gospel*, p. 611. The whole of verse 14 is omitted in two minor uncials, and some other MSS, "no doubt because it seemed redundant after v. 13," as Barrett points out. Commentators have in one way or another stumbled at the extreme christocentrism of the verse. Bernard omits the *me*, though acknowledging the strong MSS support. Wellhausen and Spitta change *potesei* into *potesei*. But Bultmann's argument for the verse as it stands is very much to the point.

⁸⁵The basic formal structure of the thought in vs. 20 is hierarchical; that is, it sets forth two levels in which one is subordinate to the other. *Superior level*: "I (am) in my Father." *Subordinate level*: "You (are) in me." The third element ("and I (am) in you") introduces the *reciprocal* structure of vs. 10, 11 into the subordinate relationship. The hierarchical structure is present in 10:14; 15:9,10; 17:21,22; 13:16; 15:20; 17:18, repeated in 20:21. It is insisted upon polemically in 13:16 (recalled in 15:20) though here it is the superiority of the middle party, Jesus, to the disciples, which is in view, at least by inference. With this we should compare 14:28, which indicates the superiority of the first party, the Father, to Jesus. On 17:18, the hierarchical correlation of the sending of Jesus with the sending of the disciples, see Robert M. Grant, "Chains of Being in Early Christianity," in *Myths and Symbols: Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*, ed. by J.M. Kitagawa and C.H. Long (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 279-89, esp. 285.

⁸⁶On the polemic in 3:13 see Meeks, "Man from Heaven," p. 52. David Aune argues that the polemic in 3:13 "against those who claim to have ascended into the heavenly realm, should not be interpreted to exclude that experience on the part of the Johannine community. The prophetic revelation of the exalted

and glorified Jesus was mediated to the community through just such visionary and audiotory pneumatic experiences" (*Cultic Setting*, p. 99). My reading of the farewell discourse suggests, however, that for the author there was an important, basic, distinction between the descent and ascent of the Son which were primal, archetypal events, and the access of the believer to the Father which was, precisely, "mediated" (Aune's word) by the Son. The author denies the possibility of ascent and access independent of Jesus.

NOTES

CHAPTER V

¹Cf. Hugo Odeberg's observation that 5:30-47 is "a typical *ooda*-section, of the same category as 3:22-36 in relation to 3:3-21 and 4:31-42 in relation to 4:7-30" (*The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* [Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, Publisher, 1968], p. 217.

²Miller, "Parakletenvorstellung," p. 46.

³This is not to say that an association of the Spirit with the task of interpreting tradition is uniquely Johannine. Far from it. See, for example, Georgi on Philo and the Jewish apologetic literature (*Gegner*, pp. 127-30). Though the general idea is not unique, the explicitness with which our text ascribes the office of "remembering" to the Spirit is striking, and, taken with the other references in John to the remembering motif, in 2:17, 2:22; 12:16, constitutes a fundamental clue to the redactional point of view of the Gospel. Wead and Mussner in particular have emphasized this, though I take issue with their interpretations (see David W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, University of Basel Dissertation [Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970], ch. I; and Franz Mussner, *Die johanneische Sehweise und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesu, Quaestiones Disputatae* 28 [Freiburg: Herder, 1965]: esp. pp. 38ff., 45ff. and ch. V).

⁴For bibliography on the remembering motif see, in addition to the commentaries to the passages cited and the discussion in Wead and Mussner (see previous note), Nils A. Dahl, "ANAMNESIS"; O. Michel, "mimneskomai," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 4:675-83 (disappointingly brief on John); W. Theiler, "Erinnerung," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Vol. 6, cols. 43-54; Müller, "Parakletenvorstellung"; Robinson, "Gattung"; Haacker, *Stiftung*, pp. 154-162; Nicol, *Semeia*, pp. 125-130; Betz, *Paraklet*, pp. 94ff., 184ff.

⁵Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, 1:362.

⁶Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 128.

⁷Cf. the expository pattern of the farewell discourse itself as a formal expression of this "remembering."

⁸See above on Bornkamm, pp. 132ff.

⁹I return to the rank issue and the notion of "the beginning" referred to here in the following chapter.

¹⁰Cf. Haacker's discussion of the Johannine idea of tradition, especially the discussion of *terein*, where he refers specifically to the "remembering" motif (*Stiftung*, pp. 74-75, and his discussion of the conditional promises of the farewell discourse (*ibid.*, pp. 148ff).

¹¹One of the better discussions of the Johannine idea of tradition is Klaus Haacker's monograph *Die Stiftung des Heils*. I do not think Haacker has acknowledged sufficiently the extent to which the Gospel reflects a prophetic, charismatic community such as Kragerud, for example, sets forth, but neither do I think that the prophetic, charismatic character of Johannine Christianity precludes the sort of attitude to tradition which Haacker develops.

¹²See the discussion below (Chapter VI) of Bornkamm's notion of the "retrospective" point of view in the Gospel.

¹³Nils Dahl, "Der erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels (Polyk 7:1 und John 8:44)," *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 30 (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964):70-84.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

¹⁵Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, 2:293.

¹⁶John 8:30 suggests that the polemic is in fact against Christian "heretics" (Cf. Dahl, "Der erstgeborene Satans," p. 80).

¹⁷Windisch, *Spirit-Paraclete*, pp. 8-9.

¹⁸*Gospel*, p. 576, n. 2.

¹⁹"Parakletenvorstellung," p. 51. Müller cites Sasse, Mussner, Brown, and Kümmel as sharing this view (p. 51, n. 63).

²⁰Citing 4 Ezra 14, Ass. Mos. 10:11; Slavic Enoch 33:5ff., 36:1; 47:1-3; 66:7 as examples, Müller concludes "dass die literarische Gattung Abschiedsrede dazu dient, dass der anonyme Autor dieser Schriften die sterbende Gestalt der Vergangenheit den Anstoss zur Abfassung von Schriften geben lasst, die auf die jeweils vorliegende Schrift jenes Autors verweisen. Die Gattung Abschiedsrede dient der Legitimation der pseudepigraphen Literaten" ("Parakletenvorstellung," p. 56).

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 57.

²²Müller cites Windisch to the effect that 2 Peter is in fact the "Testament of Peter" (Müller, "Parakletenvorstellung," p. 57; Hans Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* 15 [3d. extensively revised edition by Herbert Preisker; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1961]:87).

NOTES

CHAPTER VI

¹Charles H.H. Scobie, "The Origin and Development of the Johannine Community," a paper delivered to the SBL Fourth Gospel Section, 31 October, 1976 (unpublished), p. 3. Cf. Käsemann, *Testament*, p. 2; I am not convinced that the state of knowledge about the social situation of the other three canonical gospels is that much further advanced.

²*Ibid.*

³Meeks, "Man from Heaven"; Smith, "Johannine Christianity"; James M. Robinson, "The Johannine Trajectory," in *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, by James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 232-68; Culpepper, *The Johannine School*; Käsemann, *Testament*; Cullman, *The Johannine Circle*; Martyn, *History and Theology*; Kragerud, *Lieblingsjünger*.

⁴Smith, Scobie and Cullmann.

⁵Meeks (sectarianism); Culpepper (school); Käsemann (conventicle).

⁶Smith, "Johannine Christianity," p. 222.

⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 223-24.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 224. It is not even completely clear that for Smith sectarianism is incompatible with universalism. Cf. the question at the conclusion of his article: "Finally, the extent to which the widely perceived universalism of the Gospel is rooted in the intention of the evangelist seems to me also to be a question worthy of further reflection . . ." (p. 248).

⁹Herbert Leroy, *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums, Bonner Biblische Beiträge*, Vol. 30 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1968).

¹⁰"Man from Heaven," pp. 70-71.

¹¹*SBL 1975 Seminar Papers*, ed. by George MacRae 2 (Missoula, Montana: University of Montana for The Society of Biblical Literature, 1975):233-64.

¹²*Ibid.*, pp. 240, 249.

¹³*Testament*, p. 15, cf. pp. 31, 38.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 38.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.

- ¹⁶"Johannine Christianity," p. 243.
- ¹⁷Ibid., p. 233.
- ¹⁸Ibid., p. 232, cf. p. 244. Smith's view here recalls Kundsins's earlier argument that the "I am" self-testimony form in John goes back to early Christian prophetic experience. Smith cites Kundsins in this connection (p. 233, n. 2). I accept the connection between the Johannine self-testimony and Christian prophecy, but do not accept Kundsins's corollary that this makes it a uniquely Christian form. Cf. also the use made by David Aune of Kundsins's thesis. Aune, *Cultic Setting*, pp. 66-73, esp. p. 72.
- ¹⁹"Johannine Christianity," p. 233.
- ²⁰Ibid., p. 239.
- ²¹Ibid., pp. 236-37.
- ²²Ibid., p. 232.
- ²³Ibid., p. 244.
- ²⁴Michael Hill, *A Sociology of Religion* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973), chs. 7 & 8. Other sources used include especially Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound*; Peter L. Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," *American Sociological Review* 28 (1963): 940-50; Max Weber on *Charisma and Institution Building*, ed. by S.N. Eisenstadt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Edward Shils, "Charisma, Order, and Status," *American Sociological Review* 30 (1965):199-213; John Howard Schütz, "Charisma and Social Reality in Primitive Christianity," *Journal of Religion* 54 (1974):51-70; Kenelm Burridge, *New Heaven New Earth: A Study of Millenarian Activities* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969). Following a suggestion made by Professor Jonathon Smith I have placed my interpretation of charismatic authority within the framework of Peter Brown's contrast between "articulate" and "inarticulate" power. See Peter Brown, "Socery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity: From Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages," *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (London: Farber and Farber, 1972), pp. 119-46.
- ²⁵Max Weber on *Charisma*, p. 51.
- ²⁶Ibid.
- ²⁷Ibid., p. 52.
- ²⁸*Sociology of Religion*, p. 179.
- ²⁹Ibid., p. 162, citing Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London: Paladin, 1970), p. 268.
- ³⁰*Sociology of Religion*, p. 164.

- ³¹See Jonathon Z. Smith, "The Garments of Shame," *History of Religion* 5, No. 2 (Winter, 1966): esp. p. 223, n. 23.
- ³²Cf. Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 268.
- ³³P. 124. My emphasis.
- ³⁴Ibid.
- ³⁵Weber on *Charisma*, p. 46.
- ³⁶Ibid., pp. 46-47. My emphasis.
- ³⁷*Sociology of Religion*, pp. 153-54. My emphasis.
- ³⁸Weber on *Charisma*, p. 48.
- ³⁹*Trumpet Shall Sound*, p. xii. My emphasis.
- ⁴⁰*Sociology of Religion*, p. 171.
- ⁴¹Ibid., pp. 140-42, and 163.
- ⁴²Worsley, *Trumpet Shall Sound*, p. xiii; Hill, *Sociology of Religion*, p. 153.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 163.
- ⁴⁴Ibid., p. 164.
- ⁴⁵*Trumpet Shall Sound*, p. xxxvi.
- ⁴⁶*Sociology of Religion*, p. 174. Hill is here following Robert C. Tucker, "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership," *Daedalus* 97, No. 3 (Summer 1968):754.
- ⁴⁷Weber on *Charisma*, p. 54.
- ⁴⁸It is all the more imperative to stress this side of the matter in relation to the Fourth Gospel because of the extreme concentration of authority in the Son which characterizes it. On the other hand, it is just this radical concentration which constitutes the single most important clue to the kind of social situation out of which the Gospel arose. The quest for the social context of the Gospel must begin with the question of the social context of its christocentrism.
- ⁴⁹*New Heaven New Earth*, p. 105.
- ⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 107-8.
- ⁵¹Ibid., p. 111.
- ⁵²Ibid., p. 112.
- ⁵³Meeks, "Man from Heaven," p. 50.

⁵⁴The view that Johannine christology reflects the self-understanding of the Johannine group and, therefore, may be used as evidence of the kind of group it constitutes is hardly novel. David Aune has, perhaps, made the point most explicitly in observing that "the Johannine Jesus becomes comprehensible as a projection (or retrojection) of the religious needs and experiences of the Johannine community in combination with other more traditional historical and conceptual factors" (*Cultic Setting*, p. 77, cf. p. 76). Wayne Meeks similarly suggests that the book of John may be regarded as an "etiology" of the Johannine group in which "the fate of the community [is] projected onto the story of Jesus" ("Man from Heaven," pp. 69, 71). Cf. too the way Louis Martyn uses his concept of the Christian witness as the "double" of Jesus (*History and Theology*, p. 140). Cf. too Haacker's related point that "Johannes ersetzt den Begriff der Kirche durch die Beschreibung der Christusrelation, die nach seiner Auffassung das Wesen der Kirche ausmacht" (*Stiftung*, pp. 66-67). This is the principle underlying Käsemann's argument in *Testament of Jesus*. Cf. for example the relationship between the "docetic" Christology and the "ecclesiology" (*Testament*, p. 70, for example). Aune has overlooked this in his critique of Käsemann (Aune, *Cultic Setting*, pp. 75-76).

⁵⁵The "sectarianism" reflected in the Gospel has been emphasized especially by Wayne Meeks in the article, "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." We have cited above D. Moody Smith, Jr.'s assumption of a "sectarian consciousness" in the Gospel ("Johannine Christianity," pp. 223-24).

⁵⁶Peter Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," *Social Research* 21 (1954):467-85. See Hill's discussion of Berger's article, *Sociology of Religion*, pp. 91ff.

⁵⁷"Sectarianism," p. 474.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 475.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, p. 476. My emphasis.

⁶¹In making this distinction I have in mind the distinction between the setting in the life of the church (Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche) and the setting in the gospel (Sitz im Evangelium), to use the terms proposed by R.J. Sneed and cited by Norman Perrin (R.J. Sneed, "The Kingdom's Coming: Luke 17:20-21, *Studies in Sacred Theology*," Vol. 130 [Washington D.C., 1962]). See Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), p. 256 and Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 34-35.

⁶²"Zur Interpretation," p. 114.

⁶³p. 136. Emphasis in the original

⁶⁴*Ibid.*

⁶⁵*Testament*, p. 33. The debate over John's use of tradition "really centres upon John's conception of history."

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁶⁷I have run across two other New Testament scholars who have used the word "protology." David Aune uses the term in *Cultic Setting*, pp. 7, 8. John C. Meagher states, in the conclusion of *The Way of the Word: The Beginning and the Establishment of Christian Understanding* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1975): "Earliest Christian thought is radically protological." This means, among other things, the notion of "participation in the fulfillment of original creation" (pp. 184-85). The use of the term "protology" in NT scholarship is symptomatic of increasing attention to mythological aspects in early Christian attitudes towards the past, a much needed relaxation of its one-sided preoccupation with eschatology. Another indication of this shift is the attention to the "founder" as a category (see Haacker, *Die Stiftung des Heils* and Culpepper, *The Johannine School*).

⁶⁸*Testament*, pp. 34ff.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁷⁰"zur Interpretation," p. 112.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁷²*Ibid.*, pp. 113-14.

⁷³Note that Käsemann has very significantly qualified his statement later on: "The hour of the passion and death is in a unique sense the hour of his glorification because in it Jesus leaves the world and returns to the Father." To this statement he adds the following note: "In this respect, the death of Jesus does have the character of a centre of gravity . . ." (*Testament*, p. 19, n. 30)!

⁷⁴Given the stress laid by Käsemann on this perspective as the "hermeneutical key" to the Gospel, Bornkamm's discussion of it is startlingly brief, consisting of one paragraph ("Zur Interpretation," p. 119).

⁷⁵*Ibid.*

⁷⁶Note that the first occurrence of the remembering motif, in connection with the temple destruction saying, is followed immediately by the reference to Jesus' complete knowledge, 2:23-25.

⁷⁷One of the most striking formal features of the Fourth Gospel supports the thesis developed here. I have in mind the fact that the author has taken "revelation discourses" (that is to say, discourses by a revealer figure speaking in the first person using, characteristically, the "I am" form), and placed them in the mouth of the pre-resurrection "earthly" figure of

Jesus. This "revelation discourse" form is, everywhere else in Christian literature, found in a post-resurrection setting. Whatever the specific historical reasons for the author's anachronistic projection of post-resurrection "Christian" discourses back into the pre-resurrection narrative, the effect is to insure "against the possibility--exploited by gnosticism--of relegating to insignificance the early earthly life of Jesus, as just a lower and hence irrelevant prelude" (Robinson, "On the Gattung of Mark (and John)," p.113).

⁷⁸My understanding of the unity of the discourse is that it is an illogical, but nevertheless *systematic* unity. The fact that a set of statements can be illogical and still be systematic is beautifully illustrated by Milton Rokeach in an article on "the nature and meaning of dogmatism" in which he quotes a saying believed to be from Sholom Aleichem: "I did not borrow your pot; besides it was broken when you lent it to me; besides I have already returned it to you." As Rokeach points out, "despite its illogical character, the statement is nevertheless systematic. While each of the beliefs expressed is contradictory to the others, they all reinforce each other to serve the end of protecting the central authority (in this case, the person speaking) against threat" (Milton Rokeach, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, ed. W.P. Hollander and R.H. Hunt [New York: Oxford University Press, 1967], p. 163, n. 1)

⁷⁹It is even possible that they were understood to be claiming to be Jesus himself. Evidence of such a phenomenon is perhaps to be found in the warning of Jesus in the apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13. Jesus tells the disciples, "Take heed that no one leads you astray. Many will come in my name, saying *ego eimi*, and they will lead many astray" (Mark 13:5,6). According to Werner Kelber, the *ego eimi* is a "formula of theophany" (following Stauffer), and affirms the presence of Jesus in such a way that those who come in the name of Jesus "assert the identity of the very one in whose name they come. The people the Markan Apocalypse opposes come in the name of Jesus, because they claim to be Jesus himself" (Werner H. Kelber, "Kingdom and Parousia in the Gospel of Mark" [unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago Divinity School, 1970], p. 155).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Paul. "Gospel Miracle Tradition and the Divine Man," *Interpretation* 26 (1972):174-97.
- Adams, Henry. *The Formative Years*. Condensed and edited by Herbert Agar, Vol. 1. London: Collins, 1948.
- Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Aune, David Edward. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity, Supplements to Novum Testamentum* Vol. 28. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972.
- _____. "Magic in Early Christianity." Edited by W. Haase. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1982.
- Bacon, B. W. *The Gospel of the Hellenists*. Edited by Carl H. Kraeling. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: S.P.C.K., 1965.
- Becker, Heinz. *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede*. Dissertation accepted March 10, 1941 by the Theological Faculty of the University of Marburg. Published posthumously by Rudolf Bultmann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Becker, Jürgen. "Wunder und Christologie." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1970):130-48.
- _____. "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59 (1970):215-46.
- Behler, G. B. *Die Abschiedsworte des Herrn: Johannesevangelium Kapitel 13-17*. Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1962.
- Berger, Peter L. "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy." *American Sociological Review* 28 (1963):940-50.
- _____. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism." *Social Research* 21 (1954):467-85.
- Bergman, Jan. *Ich bin Isis: Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisaretologien. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum*, Vol. 3. Uppsala: n.p., 1968.

- Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, The International Critical Commentary*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Betz, Otto. *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums*. Vol. 2. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963.
- Bonner, Campbell. "Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles." *Harvard Theological Review* 20 (1927):171-81.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo, Supplements to Novum Testamentum*. Vol. 10. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.
- Borig, Rainer. *Der Wahre Weinstock: Untersuchungen zu Jo 15:1-10, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament*. Vol. 16. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1967.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Der Paraklet im Johannes-Evangelium." *Geschichte und Glaube, Part I, Collected Essays*, Vol. 3. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968. Pp. 68-89.
- _____. "Die Zeit des Geistes: Ein johanneisches Wort und seine Geschichte." *Geschichte und Glaube, Part I, Collected Essays*. Vol. 3. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968. P. 90-103.
- _____. "Zur Interpretation des Johannesevangeliums: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Ernst Käsemann's Schrift 'Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17.'" *Evangelische Theologie* 28 (1968):8-25.
- Brown, Peter. "Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity: From Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages." *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*. London: Farber and Farber, 1972. P. 119-146.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John, The Anchor Bible*. Vols. 29 and 29a. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966, 1970.
- _____. "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966/67):113-32.
- Buchsel, Friedrich. "deō." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- _____. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes, Das Neue Testament Deutsch*. Vol. 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannes-evangeliums." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 (1925):100-46.
- _____. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. N.F., Vol. 12 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- _____. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Vol. 2. n.c.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- Burridge, Kenelm. *New Heaven New Earth: A Study of Millenarian Activities*. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- Caird, G. B. "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968-69):265-77.
- Charlier, C. "La Presence dans l'absence (Jean 13:31-14:31)." *Bible et vie chretienne* 2 (May-July 1953):61-75.
- Clemens, Samuel L. *Life on the Mississippi*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1968.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. *John Defends the Gospel*. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1936.
- Corssen, P. "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu in dem vierten Evangelium." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 8 (1907):125-42.
- Coser, Lewis A. *Greedy Institutions: Patterns of Undivided Commitment*. London: Free Press, 1974.
- Crossan, Dominic. *The Gospel of Eternal Life: Reflections on the Theology of St. John*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967.
- Cullman, Oscar. *The Johannine Circle*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- _____. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955):213-26.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series*. Number 26. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.

- Dahl, Nils A. "Anamnesis: Memoire et Commemoration dans le christianisme primitif." *Studia Theologica* 1 (1948): 69-95.
- _____. "Der erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels (Polyk. 7:1 und John 8:44)." *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Vol. 30. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964. Pp. 70-84.
- Daube, David. "The 'I am' of the Messianic Presence." *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone, 1956. Pp. 325-29.
- Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Dieterich A. *Eine Mithrasliturgie*. 3d expanded ed., published by Otto Weinreich; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1923.
- Dion, H.-M. O.P. "Le Genre littéraire Sumerien de l' 'hymne a soi-même' et Quelques Passages du Deutéro-Isaie." *Revue Biblique* 74 (1967):215-34.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965.
- Eisenstadt, S. N., ed. *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Festugière, A.-J. "La valeur religieuse des papyrus magiques." *L'idéal religieux des grecs et l'évangile*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1932. Pp. 281-328.
- Feuillet, A. "Les Ego eimi christologiques du quatrième Evangile." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 54 (1966): 5-22.
- Fortna, R. T. "Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Redaction-Critical Perspectives." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974-75):489-504.
- _____. "From Christology to Soteriology: A Redaction-Critical Study of Salvation in the Fourth Gospel." *Interpretation* 27 (1973):31-47.
- Gachter, P. "Der formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 58 (1934):155-207.
- Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1975.
- Gillespie, Thomas W. "A Pattern of Prophetic Speech in First Corinthians." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 74-95.
- Grant, Robert M. "Chains of Being in Early Christianity." *Myths and Symbols: Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*. Edited by J.M. Kitagawa and C.H. Long. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969. Pp. 279-89.
- Haacker, Klaus. *Die Stiftung des Heils: Untersuchungen zur Struktur der johanneischen Theologie, Arbeiten zur Theologie*. Series 1. Vol. 97. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. "Sehen und Glauben im Johannesevangelium." *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament: Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Heinrich Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag/Tübingen: Mohr, 1972. Pp. 125-41.
- Harnack, Adolf von. "Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. - his. Klasse*, 1915.
- Harner, Philip B. *The "I am" of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. "Das Johannes-Evangelium" Edited by J. Weiss. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Vol. 2. 2d improved and expanded edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908.
- Hennecke, Edgar. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, translated by R. McL. Wilson. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963).
- Hill, Michael. *A Sociology of Religion*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.
- Hoskyns, E. C. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F.N. Davey. 2d ed., rev.; London: Farber and Farber Limited, 1961.
- Howard, W. F. *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. 4th ed. Revised by C.K. Barrett. London: Epworth Press, 1955.
- Hull, John M. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, Studies in Biblical Theology*. Second Series, No. 28. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1974.
- Ibuki, Yu. *Die Wahrheit im Johannesevangelium, Bonner Biblische Beiträge*. Vol. 39. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1972.
- Johnston, G. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.
- Judge, E. A. "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice." *Australian Biblical Review* 14 (1968):37-50.

- Käsemann, Ernst. *Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966. Translated by Gerhard Krodel, *The Testament of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Kelber, Werner H. "Kingdom and Parousia in the Gospel of Mark." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1970.
- Knox, Wilfred. *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*. London: Published for the British Academy, 1944.
- Kolenkow, Anitra B. "Argument Among Miracle Believers: Johannine Use of 'Goes' Motifs to Modify 'Miracle Apology' Motifs in John 5 and 8." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Fourth Gospel Section, 1974.
- Kragerud, A. *Der Lieblingsjünger im Johannesevangelium. Ein exegetischer Versuch*. Oslo: Osloer-Universitätsverlag, 1959.
- Kramer, S. N. *The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Kundsins, Karl. "Charakter und Ursprung der johanneischen Reden." *Acta Universitatis Latviensis. Theologisches Fakultates, Series 1, No. 4*. Riga, 1939.
- _____. "Die Wiederkunft Jesu in den Abschiedsreden des Johannesevangeliums." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 33 (1934):210-15.
- _____. "Zur Diskussion über die Ego-Eimi-Sprüche des Johannesevangeliums." *Charisteria IOHANNI KOPP*. Octogenerio Oblata. Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile Vol. 7. Holmiae, 1954. Pp. 95-107.
- Kysar, Robert. *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975.
- Leroy, Herbert. *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums, Bonner Biblische Beiträge*. Vol. 30. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag GMBH, 1968.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John, New Century Bible*. Edited by Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Macgregor, G.H.C. *The Gospel of John, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1928.
- MacRae, George. "The Ego-Proclamation in Gnostic Sources." *The Trial of Jesus*. Edited by Ernst Bammel. *Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series*. Vol. 13. London: S.C.M. Press, 1970. Pp. 122-34.
- _____. "The Fourth Gospel and Religionsgeschichte." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970):13-24.
- Martyn, J. Louis. "Source Criticism and Religionsgeschichte in the Fourth Gospel." *Perspective: A Journal of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary* 11 (1970):247-73.
- _____. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Meagher, John C. *The Way of the Word*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1975.
- Meeks, Wayne. "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972):44-72.
- _____. "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel." *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976. Pp. 43-67.
- Meyer, Marvin W., ed. and trans. *The "Mithras Liturgy," Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations*. No. 10, Graeco-Roman Religion Series 2. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. "The Johannine Words of Jesus and Christian Prophecy." *Society of Biblical Literature 1975 Seminar Papers*. Edited by George MacRae. Vol. 2. Missoula, Montana: University of Montana for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1975. Pp. 233-64.
- Michel, Otto. "oikos." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 5. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967. Pp. 119-59.
- Minear, Paul S. "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel." *Interpretation* 31 (1977):339-54.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John, The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.
- Müller, U. B. "Die Parakletenvorstellung im Johannesevangelium." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 71 (1974):31-77.
- Mussner, Franz. *Die Johanneische Sehweise und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*. Quaestiones Disputatae. Vol. 28. Freiburg: Herder, 1965.
- Neusner, Jacob. *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Vol. 6. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974- .

- _____. "The Meaning of Oral Torah." *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Vol. 13. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975. Pp. 3-33.
- Nicol, W. *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction, Supplements to Novum Testamentum*. Vol. 32. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972.
- Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1913.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, 1968.
- Perrin, Norman. *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- _____. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Potterie, I. de la. "'Je suis la Voie, la Verite, et la Vie' (Jn 14:6)." *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* 88 (1966):907-42.
- Preisendanz, Karl. *Papyri Graecae Magicae*. Vol. 2. 2d rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Verlag B.G. Teubner, 1974.
- Preiss, Theo. "Justification in Johannine Thought." *Life in Christ, Studies in Biblical Theology*. No. 13. Translated by Harold Knight. Chicago: Alex R. Allenson, Inc., 1954.
- Pritchard, James B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Purvis, James D. "Samaritan Traditions on the Death of Moses." Edited by George W.E. Nickelsburg, Jr. *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies, No. 4. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973. Pp. 93-227.
- Reiling, Jr. "The Use of PSEUDOPROPHETES in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus." *Novum Testamentum* 13 (1971):147-56.
- Reitzenstein, Richard. *Poimandres: Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*. Photographic reproduction of the Leipzig, 1904 edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Richter, Georg. "Die Deutung des Kreuzestodes Jesu in der Leidensgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums (Jo 13-19)." *Bibel und Leben* 9 (1968):21-36.
- _____. *Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium: Geschichte ihrer Deutung, Biblische Untersuchungen*. Vol. 1. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1967.
- Richter, Georg. "zur Formgeschichte und literarischen Einheit von Joh 6:31-58." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40 (1969):21-55.
- Richter, J. "Ain Hu und Ego eimi: Die Offenbarungsformel 'Ich bin es' im Alten und Neuen Testament." Unpublished dissertation, Erlangen, 1956.
- Robinson, James M. "Introduction: The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship." James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. Pp. 1-19.
- _____. "On the Gattung of Mark (and John)." *Perspective* 11 (1970):99-129.
- _____. "The Johannine Trajectory." James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. Pp. 232-68.
- Rokeach, Milton. "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism." *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*. Edited by W.P. Hollander and R.H. Hunt. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967. Pp. 158-67.
- Sasse, H. "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 (1925):260-77.
- Schaedel, Karl. "Das Johannesevangelium und 'die Kinder des Lichts': Untersuchungen zu den Selbstbezeichnungen Jesu im vierten Evangelium und zur Heilsterminologie der 'En Fesha-Sekta.'" Unpublished Dissertation, Vienna, 1953.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Das Anliegen der Abschiedsrede in Joh 14." Edited by H. Feld and J. Nolte. *Wort Gottes in der Zeit: Festschrift Karl Hermann Schelkle zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden, Schülern*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1973. Pp. 95-110.
- _____. "Herkunft und Sinn der Formel ego eimi." *Das Johannesevangelium, Part II, Kommentar zu Kap. 5-12, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by A. Wikenhauser, A. Vögtle and R. Schnackenburg. Vol. 4. Freiburg: Herder, 1971. Pp. 59-70.
- _____. *Das Johannesevangelium, Part III, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 4. Freiburg: Herder, 1975.
- Schneider, Johannes. "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Komposition von Johannes 13:31-17:26." *Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958. Pp. 103-12.

- Schulz, Siegfried. *Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1960.
- _____. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes, Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, II. 12th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- _____. *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Schütz, John Howard. "Charisma and Social Reality in Primitive Christianity." *Journal of Religion* 54 (1974):51-70.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *EGO EIMI . . . Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*. 2d ed. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. New Series, Vol. 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Scobie, Charles H. H. "The Origin and Development of the Johannine Community." Unpublished paper presented to the Society of Biblical Literature Fourth Gospel Section, 31 October, 1976.
- Scott, Ernest F. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- Scroggs, Robin. "The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965): 359-73.
- Shils, Edward. "Charisma, Order and Status." *American Sociological Review* 30 (1965):199-213.
- Smith, D. Moody, Jr. *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- _____. "Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on its Character and Delineation." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974-75):222-48.
- Smith, Jonathon Z. "The Garments of Shame." *History of Religions* 5 (1966):217-38.
- _____. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Vol. 23. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978.
- Smith, Jonathon Z. "Native Cults in the Hellenistic Period." *History of Religions* 11 (1971):236-49.
- _____. "The Social Description of Early Christianity." *Religious Studies Review* 1 (1975):19-25.

- Smith, Morton. *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Sneed, R. J. "The Kingdom's Coming: Luke 17:20-21, Studies in Sacred Theology." Vol. 130. Unpublished Dissertation, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1962.
- Spengler, Oswald. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. Vol. 2. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924.
- Spitta, Friedrich. *Das Johannes-Evangelium Als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. "Ego." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- _____. *Jesus and His Story*. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.
- Talmon, Yonina. "Pursuit of the Millennium: The Relation Between Religious and Social Change." *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 3 (1962):125-48.
- Theiler, W. "Erinnerung." *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Vol. 6, Cols. 43-54. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersmann, 1966.
- Theissen, Gerd. "Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 245-71.
- Thüsing, Wilhelm. *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*. Edited by M. Meinertz. Vol. 21. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.
- Tucker, Robert C. "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership." *Daedalus* 97, No. 3 (Summer, 1968):731-56.
- Wead, David W. *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*. University of Basel Dissertation. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium*. Berlin: Reimer, 1907.
- _____. *Das Evangelium Johannis*. Berlin: Reimer, 1908.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Photolithograph reprint of the 1908 edition. Two volumes in one. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.

Wetter, Gillis Petersson. "Der Sohn Gottes"; Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Heilandsgestalten der Antike. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, N.F. 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. Das Evangelium nach Johannes, Das Neue Testament übersetzt und kurz erklärt. Edited by A. Wikenhauser and Otto Kuss. Vol. 4. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1948.

Windisch, Hans. Die katholischen Briefe, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 15. 3d extensively revised edition by Herbert Preisker; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951.

_____. The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel. Translated by James W. Cox. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Worsley, Peter. The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia. 2d augmented ed.; New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. "Das absolute Ego eimi als die neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformel." *Biblische Zeitschrift*, N.F. 4 (1960):54-69.

_____. "Struktur und Aussageabsicht der johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Jo 13-17)." *Bibel und Leben* 8 (1967): 279-90.

- 102 Cosmogonic time
103 Gospel itself as the tradition"
117
155 Mississippi flat boat man boating
176 n 78 Rokeach
Lewis Coza Greeny Institutions