

STUDIEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT UND SEINER UMWELT (SNTU)

Serie A, Band 13

Herausgegeben von DDr. Albert Fuchs
o. Professor an der Theologischen Fakultät Linz

Die „Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt“ (Serie A = Aufsätze) erscheinen seit 1976, mit Originalaufätzen oder bearbeiteten Übersetzungen sonst schwer zugänglicher Artikel.

Inhaltlich werden wissenschaftlich-exegetische Arbeiten bevorzugt, gelegentlich auch historische und philologische Fragen behandelt.

Alle Manuskripte, Korrekturen, Mitteilungen usw., die die Serie betreffen, werden an den Herausgeber, Prof. DDr. Albert Fuchs, Blütenstr. 17, A-4040 Linz, erbeten. Es wird darum ersucht, die Manuskripte in Maschinschrift einseitig beschrieben, spationiert (auch und besonders die Fußnoten) und in druckreifem Zustand einzusenden (eine Zusammenfassung, deren Umfang 10–15 Zeilen nicht übersteigen soll, ist sehr erwünscht).

Abkürzungen, Zitate und Schreibweise (Angabe von Untertitel, Reihe usw.) sollten den bisher erschienenen Bänden entsprechen bzw. sich nach LThK² und TRE richten. Biblische Namen (mit Ausnahmen) nach den Loccumer Richtlinien, Bibelzitate nach der deutschen Einheitsübersetzung. Hebräische Texte werden in Transkription gedruckt.

Anschriften der Mitarbeiter:

David D. C. Braine, High Street 104/106, Aberdeen AB2 3HE, Great Britain

Prof. Dr. Ingo Broer, Klosterstraße 2, D-5901 Wilnsdorf 2

Prof. Dr. Christoph Burchard, Pferchelhang 29, D-6900 Heidelberg-Ziegelhausen

Prof. Dr. I. Howard Marshall, King's College, Aberdeen AB9 2UB, Great Britain

Prof. Dr. Michael Theobald, Schwendenerstraße 31/33, D-1000 Berlin 33

Dr. Franz Weißengruber, Lustenauer Straße 37, A-4020 Linz

Publiziert mit Unterstützung des Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung

Für Abweichungen in der Zitierweise sind die Autoren verantwortlich.

© Prof. DDr. A. Fuchs, Linz 1988. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Bestelladresse:

Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt

A-4020 Linz, Bethlehemstraße 20 / Austria

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

CHRISTOPH BURCHARD

Senfkorn, Sauerteig, Schatz und Perle in Matthäus 13 5

MICHAEL THEOBALD

Gottessohn und Menschensohn

Zur polaren Struktur der Christologie im Markusevangelium 37

INGO BROER

„Der Herr ist dem Simon erschienen“ (Lk 24,34)

Zur Entstehung des Osterglaubens 81

DAVID D.C. BRAINE

The Inner Jewishness of St. John's Gospel as the Clue to the Inner Jewishness of Jesus 101

I. HOWARD MARSHALL

The Christology of the Pastoral Epistles 157

FRANZ WEISSENGRUBER

Zum Problem der Pseudepigraphie und des Kanons 179

FRANZ WEISSENGRUBER

Pax Romana und Pax Christiana 193

REZENSIONEN 205

Alt F., Liebe ist möglich (Fuchs) 218

Bammel E., Judaica (Fuchs) 227

Baudler G., Jesus im Spiegel seiner Gleichnisse (Fuchs) 221

Berger K. — Colpe C., Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum NT (Fuchs) 213

Biser E., Paulus für Christen (Fuchs) 234

Bornkamm G., Studien zum NT (Fuchs) 223

Broer I. — Werbick J., Auf Hoffnung hin sind wir erlöst (Fuchs) 240

Bruce F. F., Zeitgeschichte des NT (Fuchs) 212

Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible (Fuchs) 205

Dommershausen W., Die Umwelt Jesu (Fuchs) 217

Dowley T. u. a., Biblische Stätten im Luftbild (Fuchs) 256

Drane J., Jesus (Fuchs) 216

Egger W., Methodenlehre zum NT (Fuchs) 206

Elliger W., Paulus in Griechenland (Fuchs) 239

Fossum J. E., The Name of God (Fuchs) 247

Holtz T., Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher (Fuchs)	244
Jenkins S., Karten zur Bibel (Fuchs)	255
Junod E. — Kaestli J.-D., Acta Johannis (Weißengruber)	248
Karrer M., Die Johannesoffenbarung als Brief (Giesen)	245
Kellner W., Der Traum vom Menschensohn (Fuchs)	220
Kleine Konkordanz zur Lutherbibel '84 (Fuchs)	214
Kleinknecht K. Th., Der leidende Gerechtfertigte (Oberforcher)	237
Klößner M. — Tworuschka U., Ethik der Religionen (Fuchs)	217
Lampe P., Die stadtrömischen Christen (Fuchs)	251
Lang F., Die Briefe an die Korinther (Fuchs)	243
Levin Chr., Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes (Oberforcher)	210
Lüdemann G., Das frühe Christentum (Fuchs)	232
Lütger W., Die Liebe im NT (Fuchs)	219
Marshall I. H., Biblische Inspiration (Borse)	207
Masom C. — Alexander P., Großer Bildführer zur Bibel (Fuchs)	255
Maurer H., Kleines Register zur Bibel (Fuchs)	214
Millard A. R., Schätze aus biblischer Zeit (Fuchs)	256
Mußner F., Die Kraft der Wurzel (Oberlinner)	223
Neugebauer F., Jesu Versuchung (Fuchs)	222
Orchard B. — Riley H., The Order of the Synoptics (Fuchs)	214
Osten-Sacken P., Evangelium und Tora (Fuchs)	235
Pesch R., Die Apostelgeschichte (Fuchs)	231
Rebell W., Gehorsam und Unabhängigkeit (Weißengruber)	236
Refoulé F., »... et ainsi tout Israël sera sauvé« (Hübner)	241
Schenk W., Die Sprache des Matthäus (Fuchs)	229
Schnackenburg R., Die sittliche Botschaft des NT (Fuchs)	218
Schniewind J., Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze (Fuchs)	228
Schwankl O., Die Sadduzäerfrage (Fuchs)	229
Spiegel E., Gewaltverzicht (Reisinger)	252
Theißen G., Der Schatten des Galiläers (Fuchs)	216
Warnecke H., Die tatsächliche Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus (Fuchs)	233
Wengst K., Pax Romana (Weißengruber)	253
Zahn Th., Die Offenbarung des Johannes (Fuchs)	244

David D. C. Braine

The Inner Jewishness of St. John's Gospel as the Clue to the Inner Jewishness of Jesus

Introduction

- I. *That St. John's Gospel was addressed primarily to Jews*
- II. *The dominance of the Pentateuch in St. John's Gospel*
 - II.1 Background of the Question
 - II.2 The key non-personal concepts from the Pentateuch in St. John
 - II.2.1 The association of Jesus with the Presence and Glory of God: Word, Torah and Wisdom
 - II.2.2 The concept of Truth
 - II.2.3 The concepts of Life and Blood
 - II.2.4 The concept of the Lamb
 - II.3 Personal concepts and proof of Jesus' claims based on the Pentateuch
 - II.4 Closeness of Christian and Rabbinic Messianism
- III. *How could Jesus see his vocation to suffering as part of the meaning of the Pentateuch?*
 - III.1 The Evidence of the Synoptic Gospels
 - III.2 Insights offered by St. John's Gospel
- IV. *How could a Jew reconcile Jesus' Divinity with the worship of one God alone?*
 - IV.a Knowledge of Christ's Divinity has to be compatible with Monolatry
 - IV.b Jesus' humanity in St. John's Gospel
- V. *Concluding remarks*
 - V.1 Exegesis of St. John's Gospel and Comparison with the other Gospels.
 - V.2 Implications for the History of Religions

Introduction

Both exegesis and dogmatics depend for their interest or point on certain relations to history — »history« as an account of what happened in time. Exegesis seeks to interpret the original sense of certain primeval texts, texts which bear upon the answering of certain historical questions. Dogmatics seeks to present and explore Christian witness and tradition in regard to certain claimed matters of history.

My concern in this paper is solely with certain exegetical questions, questions in the interpretation of St. John's Gospel, and with certain historical questions which need to be asked conjointly with these exegetical questions. I have no concern with dogmatic questions as such, although obviously history is pertinent to dogmatics

and, no less obviously, St. John's Gospel could be regarded as an early dogmatic work.

There are four historical questions, questions in the history of religions, which we need to consider in association with these exegetical questions.

Firstly, did there exist in the time of Jesus himself such a thing as »mainstream« Judaism?

By »mainstream Judaism«, I mean a Judaism within which (i) the Pentateuch was pre-eminent within the Scriptures so that its meaning was normative for the interpretation of all other Scriptures, (ii) respect for the Law, including circumcision and marriage restrictions, respect for dietary laws and the Sabbath, and some observance of the Passover, was normative for Jews, (iii) religious Zionism, or adherence to the Davidic city of Jerusalem as to the City of God, the Great King (Ps 48; Mt 5,35), and to the Temple in Jerusalem as the temple instructed in the Pentateuch, was, along with faithfulness to the meaning of the Pentateuch, the hallmark of a Jew's fidelity to Yahweh,¹ and (iv) Semitic ways of thinking about God, truth and knowledge were characteristic in the way made clear in Section II. I do not mean by »mainstream Judaism« any group or sect within Jewry, but just what might be thought of as »normal«, i.e., not special in the manner of the Essenes or the Samaritans, and not atypical in the extent to which it drew on Greek thought-forms (e.g. in Philo), but central either in the manner of the Sadducees or the Pharisees, or by its being undifferentiated.

At the very least the existence of such a »mainstream Judaism« is a plausible hypothesis historically, and it is reasonable at least to explore the consequences for exegesis of supposing this hypothesis to be true. If this approach turns out to be fertile, this may itself lend some corroboration to the historical hypothesis. There is always an interplay of this kind between historical study and exegesis.

Secondly, was Jesus himself a »mainstream Jew«? Or is it the case that one ought rather to regard him as initiating a new religion drawing upon Jewish elements, somewhat as Muhammad might be thought to have initiated a new religion drawing

¹ J. Ashton, *The Identity and Function of the Ioudaioi in the Fourth Gospel*, in: *NovTest* 27 (1985) 40–75 notes towards the end of his article that in Josephus there exists a usage of the term *Ioudaioi* almost precisely to signify what I mean by mainstream Jew, Jews who are faithful to Jewish dietary and Sabbath Laws and to the passover, and attached to Jerusalem not Shechem, and not Samaritans. This observation dispels Ashton's own puzzles as to how salvation can be for St. John »of the Jews« and how »the King of Israel« can be identical to »the King of the *Ioudaioi*«.

on both Christian and Jewish elements? The view towards which this paper opens the way is the view that Jesus was indeed himself a mainstream Jew and that upon this the authenticity of the rooting of Christianity in Judaism depends, the authenticity whereby in the history of religions Christianity can consistently be regarded as an unfolding of Judaism rather than as a new religion. In this way of thinking, »mainstream Judaism«, as the core to which ordinary Jews in the time of Jesus tended, contained within itself the seeds of two rival or co-ordinate unfoldings, the one seen in Rabbinic Judaism from the late first century reflecting the tradition of the Pharisees, marked by the influence of Gamaliel II and the setting down of the Mishnah, and the other opened out by Jesus, perhaps prepared for by John the Baptist.

It will be noted that if »mainstream Judaism« did not exist, this question of the authenticity of the rooting of Christianity in Judaism cannot be raised.

Thirdly, by what hermeneutic of the Old Testament did Jesus see himself as having a vocation to way of weakness, privation and suffering, rather than to a way of power? That is, if he was indeed a mainstream Jew, how did he see this vocation to be true to the meaning of the Pentateuch?

Fourthly, how did Christian Jews in the first century of Christianity reconcile the monolatry definitive of Jewry with the placing of the name of Jesus alongside the name of the Father, above every other name? Or, what may be an equivalent question, when Jesus spoke as if he were Son of the Father in a way peculiar to himself, how did he understand this in such a way as to be compatible with this monolatry? How could Jesus speak in this way, or have been represented by the Evangelists as speaking in this way, without being in truth rightly regarded by Jews as having blasphemed, as having violated the very core of his Judaism? This is the question to which, I shall argue, St. John's Gospel, practically alone in the New Testament, proposes an answer.

Again, in regard to each of these latter questions, there will turn out to be an interplay between historical and exegetical inquiry.

In relation to the exegesis of St. John's Gospel, in Sections I and II, I argue that St. John's Gospel belongs squarely and fully within what I have called mainstream Judaism, addressed to Jews, and treating the Pentateuch as primary and normative within the Old Testament.

In this way I set myself to break the hold of Hellenistic and syncretistic interpretations upon Johannine concepts and vocabulary, interpretations usually imputing to these concepts and vocabulary a Platonistic or proto-Gnostic character. We have increasingly seen the admission by scholars that St. John's Gospel is influenced at

certain points by Jewish ways of thinking and by knowledge of Rabbinic teaching and controversy and the admission that the Gospel contains many historical traditions of an early date from Palestinian sources. But up till now these admissions have usually appeared only as subsidiary qualifications within a Gestalt or over-view which still views the Gospel as a basically Gentile-orientated Hellenistic work.²

My rival exegetical point of view once conceded, or at least viewed as a genuine possibility, St. John's Gospel becomes eligible as a source relevant to the answering of the third and fourth historical questions. It is at this stage that in Sections III and IV we come upon our most notable discovery, namely that St. John's Gospel appears to throw more light on these questions than does any other part of the New Testament. That is, St. John's Gospel throws more light than any other early Christian work on how a Jew might see the suffering of the Messiah and the worship of Jesus as compatible with his faithfulness to Yahweh and to his Judaism.

And this discovery, in its way, confirms the correctness of the view we have formed of St. John's Gospel as fundamentally Jewish in character, indeed as the most inwardly Jewish work in the New Testament, in addressing itself precisely to those two features of Christianity which Jews, on behalf of mankind, have always felt to be most scandalous.

It is not that St. John presents an account of the pre-eminence of the Pentateuch for Jesus, the basis of his understanding of his vocation to suffer, or of his understanding of his unity with the Father, which is at odds with anything we find in the

² Exceptions are worthy of mention. *J. A. T. Robinson*, *The Priority of John*, London 1985 can witness *J. B. Lightfoot*, *W. A. Meeks* and others, and gives, alongside a brief review of the evidence of syncretism within Palestinian Judaism and the importance of the evidence of Qumran, a pertinent critique of *C. H. Dodd*, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge 1968, stating its limitations with unreservedness. *P. Parker*, *The Kinship of John and Acts*, in: *J. Neusner* (ed), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults*, I (SJLA, 12) (= *Fs. M. Smith*), Leiden 1975, 187–205 represents a yet more unqualified exception, regarding the Gospel as adapted to Jewish Christians in the Roman province of Judea. *R. Kysar*, *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel*, Minneapolis 1975 presents earlier evidence of the unbalanced character of *W. G. Kümmel's* remarks on the roots of St. John's Gospel in *idem*, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Trans.), London-Nashville 1975. But *W. A. Meeks's* remark that »In the past half century scholarly opinion has swung – once again – from regarding the Fourth Gospel as the most Hellenistic of the gospels to assessing it as the most Jewish« (*idem*, »Am I Jew?« – *Johannine Christianity and Judaism*, in: *Neusner*, *Christianity*, 163–186, 163) vastly exaggerates. Rather the tendencies expressed in *Dodd* and *Kümmel* remain predominant: although the assumption that it is addressed to Gentiles may be waived, the presumption of Gentile thought-forms is more deeply set and the suggestion of »syncretism« within »Judaism« insinuates this merely in a disguised form.

Synoptics. Rather he presents a Midrash which makes intelligible what, in the Synoptics, is enigmatic in regard to these matters: a Midrash, on the one hand, upon the Temptations or upon the themes in the Pentateuch picked out by the Temptation narratives and, on the other hand, upon those sacrificial concepts highlighted in the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist. I make no suggestions as to the redaction-history of the Gospel, or as to the role of the »beloved disciple« within this, at any stage in this paper since these issues are not my concern. But I find it notable that St. John's Gospel offers us more clues as to how Jesus himself may have thought than the other Evangelists or St. Paul. (I use the word »Midrash« somewhat more loosely than R. E. Brown.)³

In this light it will appear unsurprising that in the early Church there was no stage at which the three Synoptic Gospels were regarded as canonical without St. John's Gospel being accorded the same status, unsurprising that it should have been so widespread, in Semitic as well as Gentile centres, as evidenced by frequent citation and manuscript survival (cf. J. B. Lightfoot),⁴ despite the temptation to give it an alien Hellenistic or Gnostic interpretation.

Thus it will emerge that the most Jewish work in the New Testament is also the most universal. The notion that the Messiah should suffer and that Jesus should be worshipped as Lord were the two key scandals which Christians presented to other Jews. Meantime, these, together with the scandal of particularity and the value placed on the body and on history by all Jewish-influenced thought, constitute precisely the things in Christianity that are »folly to the Greeks«. Only St. John confronts all these issues. In this paper, I highlight his attention to the suffering and divinity of Jesus. But it is only the universal perspective which St. John shares with Genesis that can do justice to the scandal of particularity, equally scandalous whether it be the particularity of this man, or of this Law (the Pentateuch) or this people (the Jews), or of this earthly species or stock (Man), this earth, or this galaxy, a particularity which it is normal to pass by as if unnoticed in the myopia of much theology and preaching.

I. That St. John's Gospel was addressed primarily to Jews

In this, my first section, I wish to establish that St. John's Gospel was primarily

³ R. E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, London 1977, 557–563 (Appendix VIII: »Midrash as a Literary Genre«).

⁴ *Joseph B. Lightfoot*, *External Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel*, in: *idem*, *Biblical Essays*, London-New York 1893, 45–122.

addressed to Jews, contrary to what C. H. Dodd (1968) and others have argued or assumed. Upon examination, as Bishop J. B. Lightfoot, Archbishop W. Temple, W. van Unnik, Bishop J. A. T. Robinson and others in recent times have reminded us, there are many elements in the Gospel which appear to have very little point in relation to a non-Jewish reader.⁵ He does not exclude Gentile readers, indeed many of the key terms of the Gospel might seem to have been chosen for their universal suggestiveness, but his every argument remains Jew-orientated and his every conception shaped by Hebraic tradition. As Lightfoot put it, St. John's Gospel is »the most Hebraic book in the New Testament, except perhaps the Apocalypse«.

To mention one of the more primary examples of this, one has the fact that the whole Gospel (except for two parenthetical occurrences probably arising from the last and most superficial redaction) utilises the word »*Christos*« only as a title and in 20,31 presents itself as being written in order that its readers or hearers »may believe that Jesus is the *Christos* and Son of God, and that, so believing, they may have life in his name«.⁶

⁵ J. B. Lightfoot, *Essays*, 1–44, 123–198; W. Temple, *Readings from St. John's Gospel*, London 1945; W. C. van Unnik, The Purpose of St. John's Gospel, in: *StudEv* 1 (1959) 382–411; J. A. T. Robinson in his posthumously published work *idem*, Priority, and in such earlier writings as *idem*, The destination and purpose of St. John's Gospel, in: *NTS* 6 (1959/60) 117–131 and *idem*, Redating the New Testament, London 1976, 254–311; Parker, Kinship, 187–205.

⁶ The word »*Christos*« occurs as a proper name only twice in the whole Gospel, in 17,3 and in 1,17 in the Prologue, in what appear clearly to be inserted elucidatory parentheses. Reviewing the Gospel in more detail, we note that John the Baptist's first statement is »I am not the Christ«. Andrew tells Peter »We have found the Messiah«. Nathanael confesses Jesus as »King of Israel«, a Messianic title, and »Son of God«. Now, we need to avoid reading into the title »Son of God«, either the implications of sonly intimacy with the Father on which I comment later in the article, or the associations gathered over nineteen centuries of theological exposition and dispute. To a Jew of the first century, as for the Psalmist, »Son of God« was a title not improper to give to the King of Israel, at his entry to kingship or at other times, as God's servant and representative. What was objectionable to the Jewish authorities was not the title, but any connotation of equality with the Father (5,18; 10,33). The apposition of the title »Son of God« with a Messianic title in Nathanael's confession is found in Peter's confession in the Synoptics and in the confession of Martha in Jn 11,27 as well as in the conclusion (20,31) of the Gospel.

Next, in 3,28 the Baptist witnesses to Jesus as the Christ, and in Chapter 4 with the Samaritan woman the titles used are the Messiah and the Christ, along with the more universal »Saviour of the World«. In Chapter 7,25–31.40–43, the chief question amongst the crowd is whether Jesus is the Christ. The Messianic significance of the bringing down of bread from heaven and water from the earth is commented on in Footnote 9. In Rabbinic tradition it is said »Light is the name of the Messiah«. J. B. Lightfoot, *Essays*, 150, and *John Lightfoot*, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae: Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. John*, Oxford 1859), so that Jn 8,12 would allude

It is important to mention some aspects of the working out of this in detail. One finds reference to rival theories of the origin of the Messiah, whether from Bethlehem or whether of no known origin (Jn 7), rival theories later traceable in the Talmud,⁷ and one will find that some of the miracles attributed to Jesus appear to be ones peculiar to Jewish tradition in being supposed to be capable of being performed only by the Messiah after Moses.

to this as well as to Isa 49,6 and the other places referred to when the point is raised in Section IV. And in Chapter 9, the embarrassment in respect of the man born blind did not lie in the healing of a blind person (both Jesus' and the Pharisees' disciples are understood to have often healed the blind and cast out demons, cf. Mt 12,27), but in the healing of a man born blind, a thing (we are told) not known since the world began (9,32), one of (some say) those species of miracles associated by later Rabbinic tradition with the Messiah alone (an issue I review later). That here may have been the rub is suggested by 9,22, »His parents said this because they feared the Jews (that is the Jewish authorities) because these had already agreed than if anyone should confess him (Jesus) to be the Christ, he was to be put out of the synagogue«. (This seems exegetically more plausible than the suggestions in *John Lightfoot*, *Horae Hebraicae*, 326f).

Next, in Chapter 10, we find the title Shepherd, first locatable as title of God in some versions in Gen 49,24 but appropriate not only to God as King, but also to any with rule from God, Moses, Joshua and David, pre-eminent amongst them (cf. Ezek 34, and behind it Num 27,17 on »sheep without a shepherd«). Then we may note the title »He that cometh« used by Martha (11,27) in apposition with »the Christ, the Son of God«, the same as we find in Matthew and Luke when John the Baptist's disciples are sent to ask »Art thou *he that cometh* or look we for another?« Meantime, the crowd is still debating whether Jesus be the Christ in 10,26 and still in 12,34: and the context shows that, when in 12,42, it says that »many even of the authorities believed in him, but for fear of the Pharisees did not confess it, lest they be put out of the synagogue«, it is precisely belief in him as *the Christ* that is referred to.

But now the struggle moves into its final phases. In 12,13 the crowd from Galilee acclaim him »*King of Israel*« on Palm Sunday. Pilate's first question to Jesus is »Are you the King of the Jews?« (18,33). And how does the Evangelist record the apostasy of the chief priests? They say »We have no King but Caesar«, against which Pilate sets the record on the superscription to the Cross »Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews« (10,19–22). In regard to the title »the King of Israel«, *J. B. Lightfoot*, *Essays*, 149 cites W. Sanday's remark (in *idem*, *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, London 1872) »the phrase is especially important, because it breathes those politico-theocratic hopes, which, since the taking of Jerusalem, Christians, at least, if not Jews, must have entirely laid aside. It belongs to the lowest stratification of Christian ideas, before Christianity was separated from Judaism; and there is but one generation of Christians to whom it would have had any meaning«.

⁷ This apparent weak link in the Evangelist's case, namely Jesus being from Nazareth, is not ignored but harped on repeatedly: at 1,46, in Chapter 7,25–43.50–52, and finally in Pilate's superscription to the Cross »Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews«. No reference to Nazareth in the superscription to the Cross is mentioned in the Synoptics. Nor is John unaware of the tradition requiring the Christ to be born in Bethlehem (7,42): either he chooses not to reply to it

The question of whether or not there was any particular connection between the Messiah and the working of miracles or of certain special kinds of miracle has to be viewed in context.

In the first place, the Messiah was never *for the orthodox* conceived of as a merely political figure. Rather, he was to have all the gifts we associate with the word »discernment«, and for this reason the Rabbis, who had never embraced the nationalism which had been embraced by many Jews from the time of the Maccabees and through the Hasmonean period, also lacked unanimity in respect of Bar Kochba. But, in later Jewish tradition, it came to be emphasised that the Messiah was not to be identified by wonder-working (rather, he would establish or initiate a time of wonders) and it is not clear as to how this emphasis, so clear in Maimonides⁸ (and indeed closely in accord with the Gospels), became so pronounced, unless perhaps in a reaction to mis-shapen Christian preaching. Therefore, the need is to get behind the setting of the later Tannaim and their successors to the mainstream Judaism of Jesus' own time. In regard to this, there is no doubt that the Messiah was expected to recapitulate, not only the character, but also the miracles of the Prophets, above all of Moses.⁹

because of reliance on widespread knowledge of Jesus' connection with Bethlehem amongst his readers or hearers, or his reply lies in 7,21 »no-one will know where the Christ comes from, when he appears«, a rival Rabbinic theory. The same stylistic irony appears in references to Jesus as son of Joseph and to his coming from Galilee, 1,45 and 6,42; 7,41 and 7,52. *What is most clear is that none of this could have any importance or weight except to Jews.* (These questions are alluded to in *J. B. Lightfoot*, *Essays*, 152f, *John Lightfoot*, *Horae Hebraicae*, 303f, and in *J. Klausner*, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, New York 1955 (translated from the third edition in Hebrew), where we meet record of the quite common conception that the Messiah might remain without mark or recognition until anointed and announced by Elijah. Maimonides takes it that the Messiah will be unknown before his manifestation.)

⁸ Moses Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Melakhim* (sc. rules concerning Kings) XI, 3; trans. *A. Cohen* in: *The Teachings of Maimonides*, 1927 (= New York 1968), 223.

⁹ The expectation that the Messiah, without destroying but only completing the Law of Moses and the work of Moses, would be like Moses, would be pre-figured by Moses, appears clearly in *Klausner*, *Messianic Idea*, 17f, and *D. Daube*, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London 1956. It was noted earlier as a feature of Rabbinic tradition by *J. B. Lightfoot*, *Essays*, 150ff, who in this himself adverts to numerous previous writers, including Gfrorer, W. Sanday, Bishop H. Browne and *John Lightfoot*, *Horae Hebraicae*, especially in parts about Jn 6–8 (loc.cit. 290–324). *J. B. Lightfoot* here also draws attention to passages in *Josephus* (e.g. *Ant.* XX,5,1 and XX,8,6). *J. B. Lightfoot* and *Klausner* closely overlap in their references to the Talmud. In this way, *W. A. Meeks*, *The Prophet-King Moses: Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (*NovTestSuppl*, 14), Leiden 1967 rather contributes a mass of new and carefully sifted evidence than a fundamentally new idea.

The Evangelist's use of the expression »name« is Jewish. In addition one will find detailed acquaintance in St. John with Jewish law, not only in respect of, e.g., the requirement that there be at least two witnesses, but in respect of extraordinarily many other points. To a Gentile, references to the Law, to the authority of Moses, and to Jesus being greater than Abraham, Jacob (*vide* 1,51; 4,30–40), and John the

J. B. Lightfoot observes, in respect of miracles so far as the Messiah is concerned, the expectation of the recapitulation of (a) the smiting of the waters of the Red Sea, something one may incidentally remark which according to Josephus was promised by Theudas in respect of the Jordan, cf. Zech 10,11, (b) the giving of the manna, the most attested case (the reference to the expectation that the latter redeemer would cause manna to come down like the former redeemer, Moses, in *John Lightfoot*, *Horae Hebraicae*, 293f, is only one of many), and (c) the bringing in or back of the Shekinah, the very presence (as in the wilderness and in the Ark of the Temple) of the Lord Himself. Likewise, such scriptures as Isa 55,1 and 35,6–7 invited the expectation that in the Messianic age (d) water would again spring forth freely as by Moses' action in smiting the Rock; and *John Lightfoot*, *Horae Hebraicae*, 310–311 indicates some of many allusions to the theme of the latter redeemer procuring water for the Jews as Moses, their former redeemer, had done. This is something which St. John understands as fulfilled in the giving of the Holy Spirit just as the giving of manna is fulfilled in the giving of Jesus Himself to be food, the Bread of Life, merely prefigured in the feeding of the five thousand.

The recapitulation of the works of the prophets in other respects, e.g. in, like Elijah and Elisha, restoring the naturally dead to natural life, recur in teaching about Jesus, but do not introduce any new principle, and so do not violate the view of *Klausner*, Messianic Idea, echoing Maimonides and early Rabbinic tradition, as well as the teaching of Jesus himself, that the Messiah would not be distinguished by his miracles, in their natural aspect, surpassing those of Elijah and Moses. And the Messiah (like Moses, cf. Ex 4,20) will come riding upon an ass (Zech 9,9).

Yet, although there may be dispute as to how far previous Jewish tradition conceived even the possibility of Isa 52–53 being fulfilled in the Messiah (I discuss this later), it is scarcely plausible that the possible Messianic reference of Isa 26,19; 35,5–6 and 61,1 was not commonplace in popular mainstream conception. Therefore, there have recurred speculations that, besides such miracles being typical of the age initiated by the Messiah, some would be initiated by him, e.g. if not the healing of blindness then at least the healing of blindness from birth, if not the healing of the deaf or the dumb then the healing of ones who are both deaf and dumb. The prophecies of Isaiah provided evident and fertile ground for first century anticipation within mainstream Judaism, engendering expectations against which since late in the first century both Synagogue and Church, Rabbinic tradition and ecclesiastical magisterium, have ever increasingly felt obliged to hold guard: wonders are not as *such* the mark of the Messiah — but of this all the Synoptists are aware, but none so careful and explicit as St. John.

In these connections with St. John's Gospel in view, it is noteworthy that Mic 7,15 was quoted to prove that the Passover would be the time at which the manifestation of Messianic power would be made (Lightfoot adverts to Gforer), and that Pentecost was by the Jews associated with the giving of the Law, Ps 68 early becoming part of the Jewish Liturgy for Pentecost (*I. H. Marshall*, Luke, 150 fn. 175).

Baptist, as well as subtleties such as the concept of an Israelite »in whom there is no Jacob« (1,47), would have no point. The care with which St. John's Gospel makes it clear that Jesus' body did not suffer *niwuwul*, i.e. disgrace debarring from Jewish burial, would be unnoticed by a Gentile.¹⁰

In the meantime, let us realise that from the beginning to the end of the Gospel, the normal mode of address to Jesus is a Rabbi, just as it is in Matthew (without any disparagement of other Rabbis such as one finds in Matthew's saying »You are not to be called Rabbi, for you have one teacher«, Mt 23,8). No complaint was ever made that he breached any Jewish dietary custom, and social intercourse between Jesus and non-Jews is represented as notable and abnormal (Jn 8,48 and 12,20–28).¹¹ And I surmise that the *porneia* of 8,41 (»we are not born of *porneia*«) meant »we are not born of non-Jewish women« or »we are not born of mixed parentage«.¹²

We shall see later the dominance in St. John's Gospel of essentially Jewish thought-forms and argument, more of a piece with Rabbinic Judaism than with any heterodox variant of Judaism. This I view as arising from the fact that it is primarily addressed to those whom I have called, for convenience, mainstream Jews, i.e. Jews aligned with Rabbinic Judaism and owing allegiance to metropolitan Judaism.

The argument of St. John's Gospel is addressed to what I have called, for short, »mainstream« Jews over the heads of their metropolitan priestly and Rabbinic leaders. The status of these leaders is recognised: They did not lack authority to act on behalf of the people, but, as with the rulers of Jerusalem in the times of Jeremiah, they made false use of this authority, culminating in the apostasy before Pilate »We

¹⁰ *Daube*, New Testament, 301–324.

¹¹ *J. Klausner*, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Hempstead 1925, goes into far more detail in marking unmistakably the Jewishness of Jesus, not only in the respect shown for Jesus in some early Baraitas (sayings of the Tannaim, i.e. those counted as carrying authority, preceding the sayings of the later Amoraim, but happening not to be incorporated in the compilation, the Mishnah, made by Judah the Patriarch out of the sayings of the Tannaim), but also in the details of his life and teaching set forth in the Gospels. Thus, for instance, the »hem of his garment« which the woman touched whereby she was healed, in Klausner's view (*loc.cit.* 364 and n. 7), is unlikely to be other than the »fringes« which marked the dress of an orthodox Jew.

¹² This meaning would fit nicely with Ac 15 and with Mt 5 and 19 about not putting away one's women except in the case of *porneia*. Such a use of the term *porneia* would dovetail with St. Paul's provision that the marriage of a non-Christian to a person who became a Christian could be annulled, and would lend itself to an extension whereby *porneia* meant apostasy. (This is not one of the interpretations of the term *porneia* reviewed by *R. Banks*, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTS MS, 28), Cambridge 1975.)

have no king but Caesar«; in delivering Jesus to Pilate, their sin was greater than his, and it was because of their rejection of Jesus that it could be said »he came unto his own and his own received him not« (Jn 1,11); the Jews, not the Samaritans, were for St. John the »his own« (4,22). It is the feasts and Passovers »of the Jews« associated with Jerusalem, David's city, which count, not anything Samaritan, and it must lie with the Jewish authority in Jerusalem to be the ones who reject him (cf. Lk 9,31.51–53; 13,32–35). The form of debate from Chapter 5 to Chapter 12 is public, making constant appeal to Jewish regulations concerning disputes and trials. And this public debate is preparatory to Jesus being put to actual trial and judgment in Chapters 18–20, and implicitly the Jewish leaders being put to trial before God and men in their action.¹³

Whereas for the chief priest to be represented as saying to Pilate »We have no king but Caesar« would have appeared to any Jew from AD 66 onwards as a mark of betrayal of Jewry and supremely ignominious in the context of the Jewish wars, AD 66–70, which ended in the crucifixion of innumerable Jews and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, to a Gentile such a matter would pass comparatively unnoticed.

II. The dominance of the Pentateuch in St. John's Gospel

However, it is upon the Jewish character of the *theology* of St. John's Gospel that I wish to concentrate in this paper. I shall later exhibit as key instances of this, his understanding of the expressions »the Son« and »the Son of Man« and the light this Gospel throws on the Temptation narratives and the Last Supper. But in this section I wish to show the peculiar Jewishness of St. John's Gospel in one particular respect, namely the dominant place it accords to the Pentateuch within the Old Testament.

II.1 Background of the Question

Let me begin by reviewing St. John's use of the Old Testament in general terms. Looking at this piecemeal, one can note that allusion is made to every general part of

¹³ In a trial before God, God the Father Himself is Judge, and Jesus, perhaps, witness (Chapter 8). And the trial before men (an idea present in Deutero-Isaiah and Hosea, echoed in the Liturgy's »Judge between me and my people«), which is also a trial in front of all creation, is between the Father and the Son together, on the one hand, and their people, the Jews, on the other. Both are distinct from trial before proper Jewish authorities, according to the Mosaic Law.

the Old Testament. From the Pentateuch is drawn reference to Jesus as a prophet like unto Moses, to his being lifted up like the serpent, to Jesus as the Bread from heaven, as a new Jacob or else as the ladder between earth and heaven (Gen 28,12; Jn 1,51), to the Holy Spirit as water (probably with an implicit reference to Jesus as a Rock), to Jesus as the Saviour, as the Lamb and as Temple, while the *I am*-passages recall Exod 3. The conception of the servant of God, the lamb who suffers for the sins of the many, the Rock, the king, the light, the shepherd, and the vine, may be traced also in the Prophets. From the Writings, as R. A. Barbour¹⁴ has notably argued, the notion of wisdom seems taken up in the references to the *Logos* and such remarks as »The Father worketh, and so I work« (5,17); and several recent authors have argued that the Wisdom-motif recurs systematically through the Gospel, but especially with reference to Chapter 6. In addition, as well as many subsidiary references to the Psalms, we have many Son of Man sayings, commonly supposed to be thereby primitive in style and to allude to Dan 7 (a book which Rabbinic tradition groups with the Writings, not with the Prophets).

But this piecemeal approach is misleading and uninformative in two ways. Firstly, it segregates passages in the Old Testament in such a way as to ignore the development of concepts and the natural interconnections arising from their original context and use within the Old Testament itself.¹⁵ Thus the *I am* of Exodus is already given some peculiar import and weight in the Second Isaiah, in the Book of Wisdom (13,1) and perhaps in some Psalms, long before it was used in St. John and in the Mishnah. The concept of God as a shepherd recurs in Ezekiel and the Psalms. The theme of water, present in the Pentateuch, recurs through all the prophets. No theme does not recur in the Psalms.

Secondly, it ignores the structured use made of the Scriptures in Jesus' own time. And it is this that I would locate as the key point. I contend that for St. John, as well as for the rest of »mainstream« Jewry, the Pentateuch had an absolute pre-eminence over all other Scripture. There is no trace of any derogatory attitude towards

¹⁴ It was the discussions of Wisdom in R. A. Barbour, *Creation, Wisdom and Christ*, in: R. W. McKim, *Creation, Christ and Culture* (= Fs. T. F. Torrance), Edinburgh 1976, 22–42, which initiated in me the train of thought of which this paper is a fuller development, and Professor Barbour's constructive criticisms, queries and suggestions have been fertile and encouraging through the whole period of developing the ideas of this paper.

¹⁵ These interconnections are worth noting whether the relevant passages in the prophets were written in fact earlier or later than the corresponding passages in the Pentateuch – i. e. independently of the extent to which the prophets were formative of elements of Pentateuchal tradition, or formed by them.

the Law and no setting of the prophets over against or in contrast to the »Law«; Moses figures as pre-eminent amongst the prophets.

It is often held that the widely claimed and much evidenced pre-eminence of the Pentateuch amongst the Jews was not established in the time of Jesus, and not properly established until late in the first century.¹⁶ It is alleged in effect that all that was required in the use of the Old Testament amongst first century Jews was that the teacher should so allude to the Old Testament scriptures, whether the Prophets, Writings, or the Pentateuch, as to exhibit his teaching as flowing from or belonging to the tradition in a loose associative sense. However, not only would this be quite unable to stand up to examination as the basis for any claim to authority, but in any case it does not do justice to the status of the feasts established in the Pentateuch, above all the Passover, or to the status of Jerusalem and its Temple, and the pre-eminence given to claims to expound the Pentateuch amongst Jews in general. It would seem that in anything one could refer to as »mainstream« Jewry, whether Galilean or associated with Jerusalem, some connection between the exegesis offered of the Prophets or Writings on the one hand and the Pentateuch on the other had to be apparent.

It would of course be wrong to require that the connection be made in the rather verbalistic way supposedly required in later Rabbinic thought. For any »mainstream« Jew it was evident that the Pentateuch portrayed Yahweh as king, one who rules, goes before and fights for his people (1 Sam 8,7–8.20), Shepherd and Rock of Israel, as plain as it was to Samuel and the Psalmist. It would also be plain that Moses was portrayed as a Shepherd of Israel, and a Judge, although these things were said rather of Joshua and the Judges. If the term »king« applied to David, then it *could* seem unnatural to refuse it to Moses, although in general the role of prophet was preeminent over that of king, even in the books of Samuel and Kings; thus Samuel anoints kings and Elijah anoints both kings and prophets.

Thus many ways of thinking could be regarded as implicit in the Pentateuch without being explicit, amongst them the concept of God as one who does not give

¹⁶ Synagogue custom came at some early time to regard the Pentateuch reading as primary, and other readings as ancillary, expository or illustrative (or, it has been suggested, as surrogates when alien power forbade public reading of the Pentateuch). And the sayings of the Tannaim, of which the Mishnah, not itself Scripture, is a compilation and on which the rest of the Talmud is a commentary, are primarily based on the Pentateuch. It would indeed be instructive, not only to make closer study of the Mishnah, but also to know what prophetic and other texts were linked by custom with what Pentateuchal readings, or how much variation or freedom there was in this respect at different much evidenced times between 100 B.C. and AD 200.

his glory to another, and the concept of light as applied to God in association with the concept of glory, and as applied both to God and to his instruction (Torah) as a light to human living. Most notably of all the presumption remains constant, that reference to the Temple and its Holy of Holies refer amongst earthly shrines only to the Jerusalem Temple, the Temple of the Davidic city, despite the lack of mention of David or Jerusalem in the Pentateuch. The internality of the pre-eminence of Jerusalem, the covenant with David, and the Messianic hope, to all orthodox Judaism despite the lack of apparent mention of them in the Pentateuch, presents no new paradox. In St. John the crowd is represented as saying »*the Law* has taught us that the Christ will remain forever«, although verbally the Law does not mention the Christ, thereby making a contrast with »the Son of Man« which is regarded as an obscure expression (12,34). It belongs to orthodox Judaism to suppose that the Pentateuch somehow points to these other things, and to recognise the other Old Testament Scriptures as in these respects constituting a canon for recognising the true line of fulfilment of the covenant with Abraham, Israel and Moses, in accord with the blessing on Judah in Gen 49,8–12.

II.2 The key non-personal concepts from the Pentateuch in St. John

My contention is that St. John always takes one back to the Pentateuch and to the concepts of the Pentateuch, and never relies on ideas that could be regarded only as drawn from the Prophets or Writings alone, and not seen as traceable even implicitly in the Pentateuch. I mean to exhibit this by example. His direct citations may seem to be almost entirely from the Prophets and Psalms, but usually the passages concerned (e.g. Jn 6,31; 19,36) themselves refer directly back to the Pentateuch and, with few exceptions (e.g. perhaps Jn 19,2, although even this is reminiscent of Exod 28,32), the ultimate reference is always to Pentateuchal narratives, persons and conceptions. And reflection upon the *I am*-passages, and upon the examples to which I now turn, leave it plain that the Pentateuchal allusion is constant, warp and woof, throughout the Gospel.

One can, I think, usefully distinguish *expository* concepts and uses of concepts, from *evidential* concepts and uses of concepts. Out of the many concepts in the Pentateuch of which St. John makes expository use, I wish to pick out four of the groups of *non-personal* concepts used for particular comment: the Shekinah and associated concepts; truth; life and blood; and the Lamb of the Passover.

II.2.1 The association of Jesus with the Presence and Glory of God: Word, Torah and Wisdom

There is the conception of the unity, glory and fullness of God, connected with the notion of the Shekinah, His presence.

This conception is strikingly exhibited in the Prologue, which (whether it be added in later draft, or in the Gospel from the first) is a guide to the Evangelists' own understanding of the whole work in our hands. »The Word became flesh and *dwelt* amongst us and we beheld His *glory*«: here we have the conception of the Shekinah, the presence of God, associated with the Ark in the Holy of Holies, the innermost sanctum of the Temple; a conception which underlies the reference to Jesus' body as Temple, and which is with deliberate art resoundingly announced again whenever the formula *ego eimi, I am* (referring to Exod 3 and discussed more extensively with reference to the Passover Haggadah in Section IV), recurs — as finally at his arrest when its use makes those who come to arrest him fall back. »*Full of grace and truth*«: full of grace, not like Mary in Luke's Gospel as the recipient of favour, but as the source of favour; full of truth, i.e. of the steadfastness, reliability, faithfulness, of God in all his covenant dealings. »*No one has ever seen God*«: only Moses of the prophets spoke with him face to face (Exodus, Deuteronomy), but not even Moses saw his glory, but only his back-parts (Exod 33,17–33); this theme of no man having ever seen God is often adverted to in the Gospel. »*But the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has made him known*«: as we are told later the Son, Jesus, speaks only what he directly sees and hears from his Father. So the Son is, with the Father, source in relation to us, sharing one glory with the Father before the world was.

In what may be an editorial intercalation, we are told »The law was given through Moses« (Moses is here servant only), »grace and truth (that is, the favour and reliability of God) through Jesus Christ« (not as servant or intermediary only but as source and so the source even of the law and ancient covenants). But whether or not this seemingly Pauline intercalation comes from St. John or the »Johannine school«, the uniqueness and unity with God of Jesus are made plain enough in other verses, e.g. »Before Abraham was, I am«, »the Word was with God and the Word was God«, »I and the Father are one« (cf. Chapter 17), and »The Father worketh, and so I work«.

To the puzzle as to how the Evangelist reconciles the monotheism of the Pentateuch with the divinity of Jesus I shall return later. My present point is the limited one of advertising the Jewishness and even the Pentateuchal origins of all the concepts in terms of which the problem is raised, and to indicate the homogeneity of the Prologue with the rest of the Gospel in the relevant respects.

The reference to Jesus as the light of the world is of a piece with this being regarded as the enshrinement of God's glory. And here we may remark as an aside that the Semitic character of the Gospel is exhibited in the Evangelist's avoidance of any abstract terms in regard to the Father or in regard to God as such. Unlike the writer of the first Epistle of John, the Evangelist never says God is love or God is light although he says that God so loved the world that He sent His Son, and refers to Jesus as the light.

The reference to »the *Logos*« in the Prologue has usually been presumed to indicate a very Greek orientated exposition or apologetic. However, it appears that what St. John has in view in these references to the Logos is very much what was meant by »Wisdom« (R. A. Barbour)¹⁷ conceived of as involved in creation in Proverbs and in others of the Writings. The preference for the term »*logos*« could be explained either in terms of an intention to bring the concept of a creative word or command in Gen 1 into remembrance or in terms of a desire to avoid the Hellenism which had become associated with the word *sophia* (the word *phronesis* might be less distant from the Hebrew conception, although this sometimes seems even to embrace *techne* or »art«: the non-theoretical bent of the Son's knowledge of the Father, seeing what the Father does and shows him, is often apparent in St. John).

It is also likely that the Evangelist means us to envisage the identification of Jesus as the Word with the Torah. The way the Word is conceived of in relation to God is very close to the way the Torah has often been conceived of in relation to God in Jewish tradition. The Torah, one may remark, may be thought of as including the ground plan of the whole of creation, but in relation to mankind and in particular in relation to Israel, the Torah takes the form of the instruction of the Father to His people. The identification of Jesus with the Word and thereby with Wisdom will then dovetail with his identification with the light of the world, which lights every man, since the instruction or »Torah« of the Lord is often spoken of in the Psalms and elsewhere in Jewish tradition as the light.

Creation itself, the act of God the Father, through the Son as His Wisdom, was set in the context of the brooding of the spirit over the waters. Indeed in a less analytical vein one may remark that alone, amongst the Evangelists, St. John extends »salvation-history« (as the history within which Jesus, the Saviour of the world, is at work) back beyond Abraham or Adam to the very beginning of creation, including the Greek »Chaos« and »Cosmos« within history. In the Old Testament, this con-

¹⁷ Barbour, *Creation*, 22–42.

ception of an all-embracing history is most clear in Genesis (in the Psalms and Prophets, it is indeed the master of the earth, the heavens and Sheol who acts in the history of mankind, but it is less clear that history embraces all things). And to this same universal perspective, the theme of the Spirit belongs: the Spirit who brooded over the waters in Genesis is breathed into the New Creation in Jn 20; as *psyche* had been breathed into man in Gen 2, so that He who thus breathed the Spirit, He who called Himself the Resurrection and the *Zoe* (Life), might thereby give life, and Himself abide in those who believe in Him as Christ and Son of God (Jn 20,31). And in the Son, the Spirit is not given by measure (Jn 3,34), as occurred in Num 11.

But let us return to a more analytical and demonstrative approach.

II.2.2 The concept of Truth

I consider next the concept of truth. Here I put, not a new thesis (cf. the references to »doing the truth« in discussion of the Qumran literature), but highlight some striking corollaries of the way of thinking concerned.

Today, we think of truth as a matter of thought or speech corresponding to the facts, cohering with what is the case. This way of thinking makes Jesus' reply to Pilate at 18,37 very puzzling: »You say that I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth hears my voice«. There appears to be a switch of subject, a total *non sequitur*¹⁸ — even if Moses prophet, shepherd and judge, *par excellence*, be conceived as kingly, it can hardly be alleged that all prophets of truth are as such kingly.

But suppose the concept of truth is that of Old Testament Hebrew: reliability, faithfulness, trustworthiness (cf. 3,33). Then, the *non sequitur* is removed. »You say that I am a king. For this I was born . . . to bear witness to the *steadfastness of God to his covenant*. Everyone who is *faithful to the covenant* hears my voice«. Jesus as the Christ is king because he is the spearhead, representative or sealing embodiment of the faithfulness of God: God does not flinch from the uttermost in the exercise of *His* kingship, *His* role as shepherd (cf. 1 Sam 8, especially VV. 7–8). Indeed this line of interpretation invites an interesting reconsideration of the sense of the witness of

¹⁸ Except for the association of being of the truth with heeding the voice of the true king, as of the good shepherd: and for a Jew to claim to be the Good Shepherd would suggest a claim to Davidic Kingship and even to Divinity, since Yahweh was *par excellence* King and Shepherd of Israel: cf. »My sheep hear my voice« in Chapter 10.

Mark and Luke to Jesus. If in Mark or Luke Jesus is a prophet, he is above all a prophet who preaches of the kingship of God. The notion of a Messianic vocation realised in preaching or witnessing to the kingship of God is present in the Synoptics but not often noted in its paradoxical character: a king whose kingship consists in witnessing to the kingship of God.

Let us now go back to that other strange *non sequitur*, the one which occurs in the dialogue with the woman of Samaria, 4,23–24. »The true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth . . . God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and in truth«. What is the term »true« adding here? Does it mean merely that the genuine worshippers must worship the Father in genuineness? This would seem either mere rhetorical flourish, or banally obvious, and would obtain whether the worship involves obedience to God-given laws tying the worship to a perpetual place, or whether it is worship as free as the Spirit makes it, breathing with Her entire freedom. I have always been puzzled by this passage. But if the »worship in spirit and truth« means »in spirit and covenant-faithfulness«, then the unfolding of argument or exposition becomes perspicuous, as well as the relation to Jerusalem in the context of the covenant with David.

In some subordinate occurrences of the word »true«, e.g. 5,31, »If I bear witness of myself, my testimony is not true«, obviously the word »true« cannot mean »conforming with the facts« but must mean either »trustworthy«, »reliable«, or else, and most likely, »lawful«. 8,13–18 uses the word »true« in the same meaning, although seemingly differently applied.¹⁹

Jesus is also described as the »true light« and the »true vine«. St. John's conception is not Platonic (as if to say that Jesus was the Sun, the Form of which all lesser lights were similitudes, and from which they derive their light as emanations or by reflecting it) even though such a doctrine might seem wholesome. Rather, Jesus is the »true light« as the genuine, original, steadfast (not overcome) and universal Light, and the »true vine« as the whole and *only* Vine which the Father is occupied in caring for: for by his activity or nature he pre-empted the role of all lesser claimants

¹⁹ 8,50.53–55 may offer some harmonisation, or it may be that a different trial, of the Jewish leaders, not of Jesus is concerned (cf. Footnote 13), or in a more carefully considered view, it may be that, while the rules prescribed by Moses and the Rabbis' are not violated, in fact relationship of Jesus to his Father brings with it an authority that transcends the rationale of the law of Moses so far as that law concerned human witnesses without contradicting its judgements. It would mark that He who was the very Son of the Father, while satisfying every demand of the law in Himself had an authority (of the authority of the Father) which did not stem from Moses, although in concord with what came from God to Israel through Moses.

to authority or uniqueness. Thus the conception of genuineness involved fits into the Jewish better than into the Greek perspective.

But it is more striking to concentrate upon the freshness of understanding which a Semitic mode of interpretation throws upon the high or climactic statements of the Gospel, e.g. 14,6, »I am the Way, the Truth and the Life«.

Of course, each of these terms can be interpreted in several highly edifying ways; and more than one edifying explanation can be given of what could bring this assortment together. But suppose that »Truth« means »God's unconditional faithfulness to his covenant«, then what might we anticipate that »Way« and »Life« mean?

More naturally interpreted, »the Way« will mean »the law or Torah« or else »obedience to the Torah« as the way to God, and the »Life« will be that which is signified by blood, when the making of the covenant is sealed by sacrifice. So what we have is really the following: »I am the Torah, the Covenant, and the Life-blood which seals the working of the Covenant«, or, more accurately, »I am the Way or Law of the Covenant, the fixed steadfastness of God to His Covenant, and the Life which seals the Covenant«. J. Galot²⁰ argues that Jesus identifies himself with the Covenant, in saying in the words of institution »This is the blood of me, of the Covenant«. This seems over literal since in Exod 24 the animal whose blood is the Blood of the Covenant is not itself the Covenant. But I have here located in St. John a more accurate expression of the same insight which Galot was attempting to fasten upon.

The Spirit of truth (14,17; 15,26; 16,13) is the spirit of faithfulness who guides men in what faithfulness to the Covenant requires. In this way the theme of 4,23–24 is unfolded. Sin, righteousness and judgment, the three things of which we are told that »the Spirit will convict the world« (a seemingly heterogeneous collection), are connected through being correlative to the Covenant God makes (16,8). The conception of the Holy Spirit as Paraclete is entirely Jewish or Iranian: the converse of the concept of Satan as the Adversary or Prosecutor in the Heavenly Courts, active in the world to bring about its condemnation, evidenced in the Book of Job. I.e. the Holy Spirit is the Supporter of the faithful both on earth and in heaven, keeping them true to Christ and giving them the rights of fellow-sons, friends, or children of

²⁰ J. Galot, *Who is the Christ?*, Rome 1980, 105–108.

God.²¹ The concept does not derive from ecclesiology, contrary to a quite fashionable view.²²

At this point we are in a position to make the observation that there is nothing Gnostic or even proto-Gnostic or even markedly Hellenistic in St. John. He never says that God is Light, or Love, or Life, or Truth, or Wisdom. That is, he never speaks of God as such, or of the Father, in abstract terms, unlike even the rather orthodox Philo. There is no trace of any notion of God as most real and other things as mere shadows or similitudes. There is no dualism between spirit and matter, let alone any association between being material and being either evil or being more shadowy or less real. That is, there is in St. John no metaphysical or epistemological dualism of gnostic kind. There is no dualism between law and prophet, action and faith, matter and spirit in St. John. The earthly is indeed perishable, but not in any way unreal and shadowy or evil or associated with darkness. There is indeed an opposition between God, along with that which is of God, and what is closed to

²¹ In Jesus being our Advocate and the Spirit »another Advocate«, St. John is not espousing tritheism, even of subordinationist kind. The »we« who will abide in the believer includes the Holy Spirit within the unity of Father and Son, in rejection of the angelology which J. Daniélou describes from within early Jewish Christology — an angelology which on occasion could make Jesus and the Holy Spirit two angels amongst other angels. We have not two or three Advocates but one Advocate, God Himself, exercising his faithful love through the Son and Spirit. (One notes the explanation »mercy-seat«, of God's throne, the place of the Shekinah above the Ark.)

²² C. K. Barrett, *Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel*, in: JTS 1 (195 01–15 and G. Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (SNTS MS, 1 2, Cambridge 1976 present this very common view: that the role of the Spirit *qua* Paraclete in St. John is as that which constitutes and binds the Church, as if St. John's Gospel was the most ecclesiastically-minded of the Gospels. To my mind, on the contrary, it is much more natural to locate the use of the word »Paraclete« within the context of that early Jewish Christology described by J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, London 1964, wherein both Jesus and the Spirit were at times spoken of as angels. This tradition continues amongst the Fathers of the Church who always consider the Son and the Spirit as represented, as in the well-known icon, in two of the three angels with Abraham at Mamre, and the Son as spoken of whenever »the angel of the Lord« is spoken of. In early Jewish Christology the Son and the Spirit are even identified respectively with Michael as the adversary of Satan and Gabriel. To conceive first Jesus and then the Spirit as first one adversary and then a second adversary of Satan, both in the heavenly courts and on earth, would seem less simple-minded as a piece of exegesis.

St. John's Gospel indeed provides the richest basis in the New Testament for a cosmically conceived ecclesiology, but the Spirit is not brought in like a *deus ex machina* in order to achieve the trick of transforming a congregation into a body. Indeed certain concepts used in regard to Jesus, for instance the concept of the Vine, are much more straightforwardly ecclesiological than the concept of the Spirit.

God or closes itself against God, i.e. between light and darkness, truth and infidelity, life and death. But the contrast between the earthly or perishable and the heavenly is not the same. The earthly is not as such closed to God — that death to which life is opposed is not just the perishing of the body, but closedness to the Spirit.

The exposition which I have given of the concepts of wisdom, light and truth removes the theoretical or epistemic bent commonly associated with these terms in Greek thought, and removes any notion that for St. John redemption is concerned with an escape from shadows or from matter. Thus, what I have said removes any colour of plausibility from the attribution to St. John of any quasi-Platonic or quasi-Gnostic way of thinking. The home of St. John's Gospel is not in any imagined proto-Gnostic Jewish circle in Palestine or elsewhere,²³ any more than it is in some imagined Samaritan influenced circle,²⁴ or any other heterodox, sectarian or outlandish form of Judaism.

I turn now to consider two key sacrificial concepts, i.e. concepts of *things* being made holy or set apart to God or for sacred use. In my discussion I assume here, as I do later on, in Section III, that a view akin to that of J. Jeremias²⁵ is more correct than

²³ *Robinson*, Priority, 40–45. 327f is right in repudiating any association of John with quasi-Gnostic roots such as *Kümmel*, Introduction, seems to favour.

²⁴ As to the allegation of a Samaritan heterodox theology shared by John and by Stephen in Ac 8, this supposition of Cullmann's seems far-fetched. True, *Daube*, New Testament, sees John as aware of the Rabbinic prohibition in AD 65 against sharing drinking vessels with Samaritans; John like Luke has Jesus passing through Samaria, not making detours to avoid it; and the »Jews« at 8,48 say »He is a Samaritan and has a devil«. But it is simply false that St. John's Gospel shares Stephen's view that Solomon's building God a house was a kind of apostasy: on the contrary, Jesus regards the Temple in Jerusalem as his Father's house (2,16) and he corrects the Samaritan woman by insisting »Salvation is of the Jews« (4,22). All relevant special ideas about Moses, e.g. a supernatural birth, lack of honour in his own country, and an intercessory and redemptive role not shared by other prophets, are evidenced by *Daube* from within Rabbinic tradition, so that if John alludes to them at all (which is doubtful) he would not need to go to a Samaritan theology to look for them. Moreover, John shares the attitudes of St. Paul to the status of the high priest in Jerusalem (Jn 19,19–23; Ac 23,1–5). In any case, the conception of Jesus as the prophet like unto Moses seems to be one of the hallmarks of Peter's sermons in Acts, not special to Stephen, and it is also a key presupposition of Matthew. Nor can any argument be drawn from John's referring to Israel (as in the title »King of Israel«), mainly because it is plain that the »his own« who rejected him *are* Israel and *are* the Jews, and secondarily because, even in Matthew, »Israel« excludes the Samaritans, »Go not into any city of the Samaritans, but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel« (Mt 10,5–6).

²⁵ *J. Jeremias*, Eucharistic Words of Jesus (trans.), London 1966.

that of J. Betz²⁶ in regard to the background of the Synoptic narratives of the institution of the Eucharist. I.e. I take it as more natural to Jesus and the Jewish mind to take »this is my Body« and »this is the Blood of the Covenant, of me« as carrying with them a deliberate remembrance of Exod 12 and 24, than in a merely personalistic, i.e. not also sacrificial, meaning (contra Betz who is followed by A. Heron).²⁷ It is an entirely secondary question in what sense for Jesus and the disciples, or for the various evangelists and St. Paul, the Last Supper was a Passover Meal²⁸ – whether it was such or not, it could and would still have reference to the Passover internal to its meaning.

II.2.3 The concepts of Life and Blood

The Life, signified by the Blood of that which is given by or offered to God, is a conception which permeates the Gospel; but, if the work is written by an author permeated with Jewish ways of thinking and proposing to address Jews, we must observe its more scandalous occurrences.

To us, the institution of the Eucharist under both kinds, so that Jesus is present and received under the form of bread and under the form of wine, has come to seem a matter of history and of Jesus' command.²⁹ But to a Jew, whereas to eat the flesh of the Son of Man whether in symbol or reality might be conceptually of a piece with eating the Passover Lamb, to be commanded to drink his blood, whether in symbol or reality, in whatever sense, involved a dramatically different and more scandalous symbolism – as is very evident if we consider the place of *kosher* regulations in Jewish life, precisely designed to exclude the consumption of the animal's blood, thought of as representing or enshrining its life, and attributed to the Covenant with Noah (Gen 9,4, cf. 1,29–30, where it is only plants, in the original creation, that are

²⁶ J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter, I/1: Die Aktualpräsenz der Person und des Heilswerkes Jesu im Abendmahl nach der vorexotesinischen griechischen Patristik, II/1: Die Realpräsenz des Leibes und Blutes Christi im Abendmahl nach dem Neuen Testament*, Freiburg 1955 and 1961.

²⁷ A. Heron, *Table and Tradition*, Edinburgh 1983, 8–16, cf. 23–33.

²⁸ Thus, *Robinson*, *Priority*, 150 concludes that Jesus deliberately ate a non-Passover meal with some Passover characteristics.

²⁹ It invited the Hussites to the materialistic conception that the reception of Jesus under one kind only was an incomplete reception, as if he were one part here (his body) and one part there (his blood) to which the Roman Catholic *magisterium* responded by saying that he was not thus divided or distributed, so that, though reception under both kinds was perhaps *better* practice (thus Cardinal Cesarini in the 1430's and 1440's), it was not *necessary*, all the while that, for unexplained reasons, for the memorial or *anamnesis*, the priest had to use both kinds.

given to man and animal to eat). It is no accident that the parts of the Passover ritual which Jesus transmuted into the Eucharist are quite disconnected in that Passover ritual context.

Moreover, Jesus' intended reference in the institution of the Eucharist under the form of wine seems to be, not to the Passover or the manna, but to Exod 24 in the words »my blood, the blood of the Covenant«,³⁰ although the meaning may be linked via Isa 42–53 with the lamb whose blood is *given for many*.

In the Eucharist, we take wine and it is transformed into the blood of Christ which signifies and enshrines the Life he gives. No use is made of the concept of wine as a figure either for what we take or for what we are to receive whether rooted in the Old Testament or not. The situation is quite different with the term »bread« which indicates firstly a certain locus in the Old Testament (the manna of Exod 16), secondly the common bread or loaves we take for use in the Eucharist and thirdly the one Bread of Life, Jesus himself as the food whereby we are nourished with eternal life. But we have in play also a second concept in regard to the bread of the Eucharist, namely, the concept of the Lamb of the Passover. To this I now turn.

II.2.4 The concept of the Lamb

The concept of the Lamb of the Passover must be in play in respect of the bread of the Eucharist as soon as this bread or food is spoken of as »my flesh for the life of the world« (Jn 6,51).

The first testimony of John the Baptist to Jesus is to Him as the »Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world«. This, clearly enough, makes reference to the servant of God who in VV. 52–53 suffers for the sins of many and is led like a lamb to the slaughter, and it could be argued that the Passover lamb was not a sin-offering and could not be in view also. However, the Passover lamb also has to be unblemished (cf. Jn 19,36), is put apart for sacred use, turns away wrath (saving from death) and is a memorial at the time and for ever of deliverance from bondage. Plainly St. John views Jesus' death as for the sake of salvation from sin and death, drawing all men into life (he is to be lifted up like the bronze serpent, and to die like the grain of wheat in order to bear fruit). It is implausible that St. John has a sin-offering *rather* than the Passover lamb in mind. Indeed, St. John provides us with no more of a theory of the atonement or of a propitiatory or expiatory sin-offering than does St. Luke in his Gospel and in Acts — and indeed neither, unlike Hebrews and the First

³⁰ Cf. Galot, *Who is the Christ?*, 46f.105–108.

Epistle of John, draw on any parallelism with the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement. Yet, for both St. John and St. Luke, Jesus' death still is »for our salvation«.

Jesus is Lamb of God by His giving of His flesh for the life of the world to be food. It is almost incredible that St. John should not have intended to connect the two ideas: of the Lamb dying for many, now given as food; and of the Passover lamb given as food in connection with the saving of the firstborn of Israel from death. Again, if St. John's making the day of the crucifixion, not the day of the Last Supper, the day of the Jewish Passover has any theological, and not only historical, significance, this has the same implication. Thus the discourse on Jesus as the bread of life which seems a kind of Midrash on the words of the institution of the Eucharist is necessarily linked with the Passover, either through the Last Supper's being a development of the Passover meal or through its being intended to signify Jesus' death on the cross as the archetypal Passover lamb, or both. Thus the discourse in Jn 6 unmistakably refers back to the Pentateuch, but not only to the passages about the manna, but also to the institution of the Passover, the occasion for the Passover Haggadah (cf. A. Heron).³¹

II.3 Personal concepts and proof of Jesus' claims based on the Pentateuch

I have enumerated the principal non-personal conceptions and images which John takes from the Pentateuch in order to *expound* the role of Christ: the Lamb of sacrifice (made sacred or set apart: *sacri-ficium*); the Bread from heaven; the source of the water of life (the Rock); the Temple where the Glory and Shekinah of God are to be found; the Word whereby God creates and works; the Light; the Torah or Way of the Covenant; the fixed faithfulness of God to the Covenant; the life-blood that seals the Covenant; the brazen serpent lifted up to give life to others.

But I have not yet drawn attention to the personal images or conceptions³² which might be thought to be implicit or explicit in the Pentateuch: the conception of the servant of God, exemplified in Abraham, Israel or Moses; the conception of

³¹ Heron, Table, 17–23.

³² It has been argued by some that, when St. John speaks of Jesus as the Lamb of God, he does so in virtue of the existence of an Aramaic word, which could be construed as meaning »Son« or as meaning »lamb«, and, by this means, intends to make a bridge between the Servant-Son prophesied by Isaiah and recognised by John the Baptist and the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. If this speculation is correct, then in St. John's Gospel and in the Apocalypse »Lamb« may count as both a personal and non-personal concept.

king or shepherd; the conception of a prophet like unto Moses. With all these latter we may have the conception of one who at the same time, as one raised up by God, is the embodiment and seal of God's faithfulness to us, and also the (God-secured) embodiment of our (man's) response and faithfulness to God. The concepts of »Messiah« and »the Son« have the same double aspect. Now all of these personal concepts can give rise to the problem I will discuss later, in Section IV, as to whether they involve God's giving his glory to another, so there is not just one name above, but also a second name beside it also above every name: Israel, the Chosen, the Anointed, the Son.³³ The tendency in the Old Testament, e.g. the genealogies and the Prophets, to personify collectives is also found in Rabbinic thought and in St. John. As working out the vocation of Israel, the Servant of God, Jesus himself is the true Vine (Jn 15) which the Father cultivates and prunes. Rabbinic thought also pictures the people, Israel, as having something of the intimacy with God that a son has with his father, as well as following the prophets in identifying Israel with a vine.³⁴

However, the key image, on which the application of any of the other images of the Pentateuch to Jesus himself turns — the one needed, if we are not just to *expound* Jesus' person and role, but to *prove* him to be the *Christos* from the Pentateuch — appears to be, according to St. John, the concept of the prophet like unto Moses, found in Dt 18,15ff. The identification of Jesus with the prophet like unto Moses is presaged in the Baptist's denial that he, the Baptist, is »the prophet«; it is announced by Philip to Nathaniel, present whenever the expression »*the* prophet« is used of Jesus, and is implicit wherever Jesus is represented as the true light or the source of truth as in the Prologue, but only first made explicit in public in Jerusalem in the key passage 5,39.45–47, in its most natural interpretation,³⁵ and also later in the same

³³ All these terms can be applied both to select individuals or to a whole people.

³⁴ This example of the Vine shows how the personal images or conceptions offered by the Pentateuch can later themselves be unfolded in non-personal terms, e.g. so that the people of God will later be thought of, in its turn, not only as a Vine, but as a City, Temple, or Body.

³⁵ »If you really believed Moses you would believe me too since it was I that he was writing about«. (Jn 5,46). My later argument will suggest Jesus' understanding the whole of the Pentateuch, received as the instruction of Moses to God's people, concerned him as a fulfilment of every promise, type or image, it proposes: whether spoken to the serpent or to Abraham or Jacob; whether the seed of Abraham, the people of God, the covenant, the temple or the law, light or instruction itself; or whether the lamb or blood made holy in sacrifice in the sacrifices establishing the covenant.

But, for the system of hermeneutics which, in Section III, I thus envisage to be adopted and conceived of as focusing on Jesus of Nazareth, that is, on that particular historical person, it is necessary, not only that there should be some fitting or beautiful way of seeing (as it were *a priori*) all

dialogue (5,30–47) in Jerusalem, as it is continued in Chapter 7, leading up to 7,40 and 7,52. (That it is the same dialogue is shown by 7,21, referring to the miracle in Chapter 5). The same identification of Jesus with the prophet like unto Moses, is made by Peter in the sermon in Ac 3 and is strongly evidenced in St. Luke's Gospel.³⁶

There is a problem here: V. 46: »If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me«. How, one might ask, is Jesus to be recognised as the one of whom Deuteronomy spoke? The answer seems to be this: that Jesus is not recognised differently from other prophets. Recognition is by the work of the Father making us recognise the prophet and who he is. In particular it is this alone that enables us to recognise Jesus as the Holy One of God (6,69). »He who is of God keeps the words of God« (8,47), and therefore hears the words of Jesus as uniquely possessed of authority as Rabbi (*exousia* or *reshuth*) directly received, and as recognised as speaking through the Father's own witness to him. The sheep follow the shepherd, because they know his voice (10,4). The signs *witness* to him, but do not compel belief. They do not compel recognition from those who are not of God, who are not children of Abraham and of God, but of the devil (8,39–47). The Resurrection *pro-*

these types and images as realised in Jesus, but also that there be some *less a priori* and more particular based reason for identifying Jesus as the focus. The instruction of Moses must not only present an Idea which some idealist or other man can (by his own powers or by graces or both together) recognise as realised in Jesus, but an ostensive or historical pointer to none other than this Jesus. Therefore, while all the thought of the Pentateuch may enlarge or bring to its full consummation or breadth our understanding of Jesus, it nonetheless remains crucial that Pentateuchal and mainstream Jewish tradition anticipated a successor and completer of the work of Moses. Such is the prophet like unto Moses.

³⁶ This identification is suggested in the Synoptics by the appearance of Moses, archetypal prophet, and of Elijah, popularly expected to return to recognise the Messiah, at the Transfiguration, and the command on that occasion, »Listen to him«, reminiscent of Dt 18,15b, just as Jn 12,49 is reminiscent of Dt 18,18b. Luke also says that Moses and Elijah spoke with Jesus of the *exodos* Jesus was to accomplish in Jerusalem. The restoration of life to the son of the widow of Nain recalls the miracles of Elijah and Elisha (Lk 7,11–16), and makes the people speak of Jesus as a »great prophet« (cf. Lk 7,39), and it is this, in St. Luke's presentation, that immediately precedes the question from John the Baptist »Art thou he who is to come, or look we for another?« (Lk 7,18–23; cf. Mt 11,2–6). In the tradition Luke received, Jesus was a prophet and the one who was to redeem Israel (Lk 24,19–21). (cf. *J. A. Fitzmyer*, *The Gospel according to Luke, I* (AncB, 28), Garden City 1981, 213–215). *Marshall*, Luke, 124ff also sees Luke, in his understanding of Isa 61, as envisaging Jesus as the Messianic prophet.

ves Christ but in a different way, not merely as a sign witnessing to him,³⁷ and moreover, although it embodies the Father's vindication of his Son, it is not in the public forum.

The prophet is *He that cometh*, and in St. John's way of thinking is no different from *the Messiah*, nor different from *the Son* (identified implicitly with *the servant of God* spoken of by Isaiah and referred to as *the Son of Man* by St. John himself). In respect of these titles, St. John alludes to proof from the Scriptures only in respect of the title of the prophet. The references to the Psalms in connection with the Crucifixion are presented merely as confirmatory or consistent, not as part of the main line of argument. Therefore to priest and rabbi, Sadducee and Pharisee alike, and their followers, the appeal is to the Pentateuch.

True, within Rabbinic thought the identification of the prophet like unto Moses with the Messiah, the Anointed One, the *Christos*, i.e. the heir to the promises made to David (2 Sam), the Davidic King and Shepherd (Ezek 34), was not normal. Rather the prophet like unto Moses was supposed either to have already come, e.g. in Jeremiah (the existence of this Rabbinic view of Jeremiah is interestingly reflected in Mt 16,14 although not in Mk 8,28), or else, normally in the person of Elijah, as the forerunner, and perhaps recogniser and anointer, of the Messiah.

However, no need of argument is felt by St. John, or by St. Luke, for the identification of the prophet like unto Moses with the *Christos*. Nor is this surprising, for while later Rabbinic thought did not uniformly³⁸ develop the idea of Moses as

³⁷ Aquinas says that Christ's death is the *whence* of our justification and the Resurrection is the *whither*. That is, the Resurrection is not just a sign of the presence of God, working out our salvation, but is internal to that salvation itself, is internal to that central working of which other things are signs. It is a sign and does embody a vindication but that is not its main role. (*Summa Theologica III*, Q. 62, Arts. 5 and 3).

³⁸ *Meeks*, Prophet-King has exhibited the extent to which the concept of Moses as king finds some development even within relatively mainstream Rabbinic thought, rather than belonging to more sectarian or outlandish traditions. He also develops, as does *Daube*, New Testament, and as had earlier *Lightfoot*, Essays, 150ff, and *Klausner*, Messianic Idea, 17ff, other themes introducing a parallelism between Moses and Jesus, or Moses and the Messiah, according to Rabbinic tradition.

However, granted the background of parallelism in ideas about Moses, the prophet like unto Moses and the Messiah, the question of the identification of the latter two roles was bound to become unreal or academic once there arose in actual existence a candidate for both. One may further remark that it is thoroughly in accord with the Pentateuchal traditions, realised in the idea of Samuel anointing kings, and Elijah anointing both kings and prophets, that the role of prophet was in select cases pre-eminent over that of kings.

kingly, and rarely identified the prophet like unto Moses with the Messiah, it instead did what is more significant: it regarded the Messiah as consummating the work of Moses, so that, without the Messiah promulgating a new Torah or inaugurating any new purposes not embraced already in Jewry (the Mosaic dispensation is somehow for the sake of all men), he nonetheless in some way is pre-figured by Moses, so as (e.g.) like Moses to bring down bread from heaven, shepherd and rule them. Thus, such an identification constituted a natural development and did not introduce any extra new controversy between Christians and other Jews. Always the main divide between Christians and Rabbinic thought as they became distinct (roughly between the death of Christ and the dividing of the ways which followed the failure of Bar Kochba) related to the two different matters, fundamental from the first, viz. (i) the double coming of the Messiah, the first coming being a coming to suffer and die, associated with his kingship not, in his first coming, being a kingship of this world, and (ii) the divinity of this Messiah who had come and who was to return, according to the Christian view.

Yet, in St. John's Gospel is this claim that Jesus is the prophet like unto Moses, but surpassing Moses so as not to be merely the forerunner, recogniser or anointer of the *Christos* but to be the *Christos* himself, proved? We are led to understand that Jesus, like Moses, is a prophet of truth, kingly and a shepherd, an advocate or intercessor for his people, supremely servant and son of God. But whereas Moses brought down bread from heaven, perishable bread, Jesus repeats the miracle in a different style: he brings bread that does not perish, and eating which men do not die, and is himself the bread given. Moses brought forth water from the rock, water that did not remain, but Jesus is the one from whose inward parts living water gushes; i.e. Jesus is represented as himself the rock from which living water that does not need renewal flows.

Then, finally, the claim that Jesus is the *Christos* is proved not by any witness of Jesus to himself (indeed he is represented as himself discounting this); nor by the signs, even the raising of Lazarus, for Elijah and Elisha had already raised the dead to a renewal of temporal life; *but by Jesus' own Resurrection*. This is understood to have a different character from the resurrection of Lazarus, a character involving the Spirit, and involving a removal of the power of death, constituting what was indeed in orthodox Judaism a sign of the arrival of the last days and a vindication by God's power of his servant, Jesus. Against this background we should recognise the passages in which Jesus claims authority and power in respect of the general resurrection, or eternal life, as Messianic (3,13–14; 4,13–14; 5,25–9; 6,37–40.44.50–51.56–58; 8,51; 10,18.18–19; 11,24.26) and all the references to the theme of the Holy Spirit

as coming from Jesus as Messianic. Moses wished that God would send his Spirit on all the people but did not himself confer the Spirit on anyone (Num 11,19).³⁹

The theme of the Holy Spirit is present whenever the symbolism of water or the conception of being born of God appear: the being born of God in the Prologue recurs as the being born of the Spirit in the discussion with Nicodemus; it is with the Holy Spirit that Jesus will baptise according to John the Baptist, the word »baptise« involving implicit reference to water; and the discourses on living water, in Chapter 4 with the Samaritan woman and after 7,37, prepare the way for the discourse on the Holy Spirit at the Last Supper, and the actual *breathing* of it on the Apostles in Chapter 20. There is nothing of course peculiar to St. John in any of this. St. Paul has us all drinking of the same Spirit and Jesus as the spiritual Rock from which Israel drank (1 Cor 10,4); Luke has been called the Theologian of the Holy Spirit, and has St. Peter representing the prophecy of Joel about pouring the Spirit on all flesh as Messianic. And the Messianic connection between the Resurrection and the giving of the Spirit can be noted in the Epilogue of Mark, Luke, and Acts as well as in Paul.

II.4 Closeness of Christian and Rabbinic Messianism

If we prescind from the scandals of the divinity and the suffering of the Messiah, and from the subsidiary matter of the identification of the prophet like unto Moses with the *Christos*, then we find in all other respects, a striking identity between (i) the Messianic expectation portrayed in the Gospels as common in Jesus' time, (ii) the Messianic features regarded by the Gospels as fulfilled in Jesus, (iii) the mainstream of Messianic expectation, in the time of Jesus, so far as this can be discerned from other sources, and (iv) the shape of Messianic expectation perpetuated in orthodox Judaism. This last is signalled as integral to Judaism by its inclusion in the Thirteen Principles of Faith, listed by Rabbi Moses Maimonides in the 12th century, a formulation received by Jews as normative for all time.

Christian exegetes have looked in every strange place, in apocryphal works of every kind, in Hellenistic sources, in Essenism and in Samaria⁴⁰ for interpretations

³⁹ *Klausner*, Messianic Idea, 17ff is at pains to insist that Messianic Age is distinct from the World To Come, since (e.g.) there will still be sin and the Temple; but the Messiah brings the Shekinah which makes the distinction of the two ages seem rather a piece of 2nd century Scholasticism.

⁴⁰ See footnote 24.

of key ideas on the New Testament, and have sometimes presented the Messianic expectation portrayed in the New Testament as a Christian construction, erected against a background of a scatter of Jewish opinions, none carrying special authority, and some even yielding two Messiahs, a priestly and a kingly.⁴¹

For me, it seems very noteworthy that the Messianic expectation in which orthodox Jews have remained fixed from the first century until the present coincides with that portrayed in the Gospels: such an expectation is unlikely to have developed in the political context of Judaism subsequent to the ignominy to which they were subject at the hands of the Romans in AD 70 and AD 135. The nationalism from the time of the Maccabees up until AD 70, from which the orthodox Rabbis distanced themselves, was succeeded by a period of renewed politico-theocratic Messianic hope amongst the most orthodox (the Rabbi Akiba being most noted), only disappointed in the deeper and longer term degradation initiated in AD 135, when all Jews were expelled from Jerusalem. Therefore, this alone is the period within which the kind of ambiguity in Messianic conceptions which is evident both in the Gospels (in their early witness to early first century Jewish hopes and anticipations) and in Rabbinic tradition could have arisen — spiritual/political ambiguity.

(After this, the spiritual re-captured its unqualified priority over the political for orthodox Judaism, in this way paradoxically making evident again, in a key respect,

⁴¹ One finds in Ben Sira (Sirach commonly called the book of Ecclesiasticus) the conception that both the Davidic Kingship and the priesthood of Aaron would continue forever (45,6–7; 47,22) and this idea recurs in Tannaitic sources (*Klausner*, *Messianic Idea*, 254.513–516), authoritative for Judaism, but do not involve any far-fetched idea of there being two Messiahs, in the sense of the title »Messiah« constant through and canonised in Judaism in their expression in the Principles of Maimonides.

Such far-fetched ideas may spring from the ambiguities inseparable from the word »anoint«, since it is not only kings but also prophets and elsewhere priests that are anointed. References to more than one singular anointed functionary have been traced in the Pseudepigrapha, e.g. *The Testament of Levi* (Chapter 18) and *of Judah* (21,2–5 and 24) and the *Book of Jubilees* (31,12–20) and in Qumran documents, e.g. 1QS 9,11 and CD 12,23. But because of the ambiguities in the idea of »being anointed«, none of these suggest any confusion of the kind sometimes surmised (e.g. in *R. H. Fuller*, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, New York ³1969) in first century Judaism. And such ideas have no connection with the idea of there being a military Messiah Ben Joseph destined to suffer and die to be followed by the Messiah Ben David, a figure who would exhibit both a spiritual and temporal fulfilment of the hopes of Judaism, fulfilment in every aspect or overall and without failure: the speculations about a Messiah Ben Joseph are not normative for Judaism and derive most of their vigour from the intellectual challenge presented to the Rabbis by the failure of Bar Kochba (*Klausner*, *Messianic Idea*, 391–407.483–5 0).

the deep ever-underlying community between Christianity and Judaism, central to the religion of John as it had been to Jeremiah. Always, the political hope has remained amongst Jews, reaching renewed heights in the time of the Emperor Julian in the late fourth century⁴² and again since the Second World War, and always integral to Christianity, sometimes appearing in a Milleniarist form, but always remaining in the fixed faith in »a new heaven and a new earth«.)

Thus, the portrayal of first century Jewish Messianic expectation traceable in the Talmud can hardly be conceived to have developed in any epoch marked by a desire for differentiation from Christian tradition. If there is any discrepancy between the Gospel witness in regard to the shape of mainstream Jewish expectation and later Rabbinic doctrine, it is in regard to whether or not the Messiah would be a worker of signs. In respect of this, it is more plausible that normal Judaism anticipated signs (an anticipation criticised by Jesus, before being set aside by the Rabbis) and that the Rabbinic aloofness from (say) 50 AD onwards from wonder-working was a reaction to the witness of early followers of Jesus⁴³ than that mainstream Judaism was already fixed in the traditions canonised under Gamaliel II and Judah the Prince. Accordingly, the shape of Rabbinic tradition presents the most conclusive and irrefragable available external evidence, firstly of the historicity of the Gospels in certain key respects, and secondly of the rootedness of Christianity, not in heterodox but in orthodox Judaism.

While this coincidence of Rabbinic with Christian traditions provides striking evidence of the earliness of both, as it were fossilising a moment in a people's thought, it leaves yet more starkly in view the point at which the traditions divide. The Jews, on behalf of mankind, set to Christians the challenge to understand their Christian belief in a way compatible with monotheism, or else to know themselves guilty of blasphemy as well as betrayal of their roots. To this, following in the steps of St. John, I attend in section IV. But in the meantime the Jews leave standing the no less stark question as to why and how it can be that the Messiah should suffer, a view scandalous to Jew and in later times to Muslim, and at odds with the fundamental

⁴² *R. L. Wilken*, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, Berkely 1983, 138ff, explains how the restoration of support to ancient religion by the Emperor Julian, commonly referred to as »the Apostate«, created an extended period of expectation amongst the Jews.

⁴³ *Klausner*, *Jesus* (cited earlier) portrays the Tannaim as scarcely influenced at all, positively or negatively, by Jesus himself and his first followers, as if he had been a Messianic pretender even less noticed by them than by Josephus, a Messianic pretender known as a teacher and whose teaching were known a little (and with some respect) through the friendly intercourse of the Rabbi Eliezer and Jacob (the James, spoken of as »brother of the Lord«, in the New Testament).

human recognition of the evil in suffering and revulsion from it, of which again the Jews in relation to Christianity stand peculiarly representative of mankind as a whole. To this I now turn, in Section III.

*III. How could Jesus see his vocation to suffering
as part of the meaning of the Pentateuch?*

Up until now I have directed my attention primarily to questions of exegesis, the exegesis of St. John's Gospel and not to questions of history as such.

Yet two things appear little open to dispute historically in regard to Jesus. Firstly Jesus acted, spoke and prayed as if there was something peculiar about his person, so that he could speak not just as a prophet, but as in some special sense »son« of the Heavenly Father. In section IV, I shall consider how this was possible for a Jew without blasphemy being involved, and the unique light thrown by St. John's Gospel upon this question. However, secondly and, if possible, historically yet more undisputedly, despite this sense of prophetic authority of a peculiar kind, Jesus deliberately avoided the ways of worldly power and kingship, of proof by wonders, and of solving his people's earthly problems (»changing stones to bread«): instead, he chose a path of poverty, privation and weakness, which in a situation of confrontation with the powers of this world was to be expected to be consummated in death.

In this Section, I mean to concentrate upon this second historical question: how was it that Jesus, a Jew, could conceive suffering as a key or, as it were, strategic element in the vocation of one who was the Chosen Servant, the prophet, the Messiah or the Son, sent by the Father in heaven into the world? (The first question is as to whether there is any function for the suffering of God's people, and then within the context of any answer given to this first question there is a second question as to whether the Messiah is to suffer. Both are mysterious within Jewish tradition, and I discuss the differential responses to them, e.g. echoed in Klausner, in Sub-section 3 below.)

Let us be clear. Jesus was a Jew and in the first age of the Church, Christianity appeared as a variant of Jewish religion.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ The Jewishness of Jesus, extending to dietary laws and respect for the Sabbath is undoubted by *Klausner*, *Jesus*, 363–368.411–414, cf. 212–228.369–376) and even the orthopractice of

St. Paul characterises Jesus as born of a woman, born under the law. Jewry passes via the woman: it is not accidental that St. Paul should link these elements in Jesus' roots.

It is singular that in none of the Gospels is there any trace of any accusation against Jesus that he departed from Jewish law in respect of the eating of unclean meats⁴⁵ or of meat with the blood in it. The limitations in his intercourse in practice with non-Jews are evident from the accounts of the relation with the Roman centurion (Lk 7,1–10), his dialogue with the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk 7,24–30) and the difficulty – adverted to in Section I – felt by Greeks (not, I believe, Greek Jews) in approaching him: they are portrayed as first seeking Philip who then seeks Andrew, before they gain access to Jesus,⁴⁶ who regards their coming as a sign that his hour has come (Jn 12,20–28). It is also evident from the practice of the apostles, notably Peter, as evidenced in Ac 10 and Gal 2. It is not very credible that the apostles underwent a revolution in practice, from being violators of the law when in the company of Jesus, to being strict adherents of it afterwards.

St. Jerome held that the apostles practised the law in simulation only but was persuaded by St. Augustine to change his view.⁴⁷ Modern exegetes sometimes⁴⁸

the first apostles in James, who appears, on a reasonable view to have been sought after by the Rabbi Eliezer and others as a respected coreligionist and witness to the teaching of Jesus, conceived of as a respected though not centre-line teacher, in the age of the Tannaim (loc.cit. 34–47), described by Maimonides as preparer of the way for the King Messiah (*Klausner*, *Yeshu* [4th Hebrew edition only], 462, n. 2).

⁴⁵ When in Mark 7:19 we are told »Thus he made all meats clean«, the Evangelist by his form of expression makes it plain that he is stating what he understands to be a plain implication of Jesus' teaching, not quoting Jesus' words or describing Jesus' practice. It is plainly an implication which was lost on St. Peter (Acts 10) and therefore not an implication envisaged by St. Luke who reports the events of Acts 10 as fresh.

⁴⁶ Cf. the reference to Klausner and his remarks on the expression »the hem of his garment« in Footnote 11.

⁴⁷ *Augustine*, *Letters*: Letter 82.

⁴⁸ *Banks*, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, appears correct in saying that Jesus never taught, or is never represented as teaching in Matthew or Luke, any systematic disobedience or any disregard of the Jewish Law, but rather as regarding himself as like others of God's prophets and special servants, as exempt from the Law when their special service required it. However, he does nothing to justify his claim that Jesus conformed to the Law or Jewish custom only in similitude or for the sake of advantage, e.g. in order to participate and teach in synagogues.

It should be noted that the only accusations in respect of the Law itself made against Jesus himself by the Pharisees were of sabbath-breaking and blasphemy. Although St. Mark says that Jesus

portray Jesus as practising the Law in simulation only or only for the sake of advantage, e.g. for the sake of access to synagogues in order to preach. This picture runs contrary to the whole tenor of the teaching of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, and the historical tradition they embody. Jesus is not represented as founding a new religion but as bringing to fulfilment the already given revelation to the Jews, centred on the Pentateuch and on the Davidic city of Jerusalem. As Jesus is represented as saying to the Samaritan woman (4,22), for early Christians it remained that »Salvation is of the Jews«.

Accordingly, let us take it that we have a man, born of woman, circumcised on the eighth day, brought up in a large household,⁴⁹ at his twelfth year attested as coming to adulthood as a Jew, and thereafter accompanying his parents each year to the Passover in Jerusalem, and meantime reared in his home, in the synagogue, and in the Haggadah at Passover, in knowledge of the Scriptures. We have this man, already as a boy aware of the Father in a peculiarly intimate way, so as thereby to know without doubt his authority from the Father as His Father's Son sent into the world, and therefore knowing, without uncertainty, that He must be »the prophet«, »the Messiah«, »the Chosen Servant«, as he discovers these spoken of in the Scriptures or in Rabbinical tradition, so that whatever is written in these sources in respect of the bearer of these titles falls on him. How does this man know what, as this prophet, this Anointed One or Messiah, this Servant, he must do? By what line of reflection upon the Scriptures can he see, let alone others see, that the Christ must suffer and only thus enter into his glory?

As an orthodox Jew, by what line of reflection can it become *evident* to him *even from the Scriptures* that the Messiah is not called to an earthly kingship, freeing Israel from the Romans, and establishing it, paramount among the nations (albeit para-

implied that all meats were clean, Jesus is never represented as saying this and was never accused of any violation of dietary regulations, and we observed earlier, in Section I, other aspects of the Jewishness of Jesus made so unmistakable in Klausner (see Footnote 11).

⁴⁹ In speaking of Jesus as belonging to a large household, I am taking the view of *J. McHugh*, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*, London 1975 according to which the brothers and sisters of Jesus spoken of in the New Testament were foster children in the household, presumably as the result of the death of their fathers. James and Joses appear to be sons of a Mary, described sometimes as of James, sometimes as of James and Joses, and sometimes as of Clopas. It appears from Hegesippus that the Simon concerned may have been a cousin of the James described as the brother of the Lord, head of the church in Jerusalem before his martyrdom in AD 62, when this Simon succeeded him.

mount in representing peace and honour), proving his role and Israel's role by extraordinary signs, and using power from God to fulfil men's temporal needs? Every Jew indeed should assent to the principle »Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all things shall be added to you«, and recognise failure to put God first as bringing with it Divine vengeance and punishment, not in man's power to escape. But how, from the Jewish Scriptures, could any man come to envisage it as certain that he who seeks first the Kingdom of God will first suffer, a suffering mysterious, and not a punishment for his own sins or those of his fathers: suffering as the necessary path to be followed, a suffering that is not a punishment, but which even has a positive function in relation to the salvation, not only of Israel, but of mankind as a whole?

Once such a thing is discerned as deep to Scripture as a whole, then after this he and any other true followers in Jewish tradition can discover a multitude of proof texts and individual parts of Scripture illustrating, confirming or highlighting it. But unless these things can first be discerned as deep to Scripture, I mean Old Testament Scripture, as a whole, there is no way in which a Jew or any man can know that the suggested interpretation of these proof texts and individual sections (e.g. of Isa 52–53; Zech 13,7; various Psalms and Job) is acceptable. If a tradition is given establishing this way of interpretation, the scribe or steward can apply the texts in accord with it (Mt 13,52), but in Jesus' time, this tradition was not yet given, or at least not yet established in clarity.⁵⁰ How then could a man, a Jew, discern this way of interpretation as the authentic one, and other men, Jews and non-Jews, recognise it as thus authentic?

Therefore, the Messianic interpretation of such passages as I have instanced could, as I argued in Section II, only be viewed as true to the main thrust of God's teaching to the Jews, rather than merely quirkish, if they were capable of being viewed by a Jew as proper unfoldings of the teaching of the Pentateuch.

III.1 The Evidence of the Synoptic Gospels

Let us begin by considering the tantalisingly scanty evidence to be found in the Synoptic Gospels as to the basis of Jesus' understanding of the style of his mission.

The passages illustrative of Jesus' understanding of himself as having a vocation to privation and suffering, include the references to his having no place to lay his

⁵⁰ Oscar Cullman's account of development: *idem*, *Salvation in History*, 88–92, 97–100, 122–125.

head, the predictions of his passion, his reference to his death as a baptism (Mk 10,39) the passages referring to his giving his life as a ransom for many, to accomplishing a death in Jerusalem (Lk 9,31; 9,53; 13,33), and striking the shepherd (Mk 14,27). All these presuppose rather than vindicate the suffering servant conception as does the »shed for you and for many for the remission of sins« in the institution of the Eucharist. It has been alleged that the concept of Son of Man was intended by Jesus to bring together the ideas of Israel as the elect of God and the suffering servant, but this is little evidenced outside the Gospels in the first century and therefore could offer no proof for a Jew that the lot of the Messiah included suffering. The »Get thee behind me, Satan«, spoken when Peter rebuked Jesus for declaring that he was to suffer and die, presupposes the Temptation narrative in the background, and also presupposes, what is yet to be explained, that the Messiah »needed to suffer in order to enter his glory« (Lk 24,44–47; cf. Ac 3,18–24; 17,3; 26,24–25; 28,23; 1 Pet 1,11). As we have said what is required is some indication of this, not just from the Prophets and the Psalms or other Writings, but also from the Pentateuch or »Law« itself. In any case, the suffering servant passages in Isaiah, do not, in isolation, do anything to explain why suffering should have a positive function, or to set it in an adequately wide perspective.

The only clues offered by the Synoptic Gospels as to how Jesus *precisely qua a Jew* came to see the suffering either of God's son, Israel, or of the Messiah, as rooted in the meaning of the Pentateuch is provided by the Temptation narratives and by the words of institution of the Eucharist. (See my comments in Section II. 2.2, 2.4, arising from A. Heron).⁵¹

Now, if we look at the Temptation narratives, we find in each case Jesus' reply to Satan turns on a proof-text from Deuteronomy. But I have said that what matters for the rightness of the interpretation of a proof-text is the extent to which this interpretation can be seen as penetrating to the root Scripture as an organic whole, organic (that is) in relation to the structured way Israel or the Covenant-community holds it. In respect to the matter of the whole shape of the vocation of him who is sent by the Father, this is obviously of key importance. Jesus is not to be understood as sniping at the Devil with isolated texts, but giving expression in his using of these texts to a whole interpretation of Sacred History. But what such an interpretation might be the Synoptics do nothing directly to tell us.

The other key passages in the Synoptics in relation to Jesus' vocation to suffering are in the words of institution of the Eucharist. The words »my body given for you«

⁵¹ Cf. Footnote 27.

have no sense but are unintelligible, *unless* it be supposed that Jesus in using them intended to apply *to himself* the image of the Lamb of the Passover (referring to Exod 12) and to present himself in the form of bread, thereby bringing a reference to the manna from heaven (Exod 16). The sacrifice of the Lamb was connected with the saving of the firstborn of Israel and the rescue of the whole people from bondage to the Egyptians. Jesus' death is to save the world from the empire of sin and death. The words »my Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for you and for the remission of sins« unmistakably derive their sense from a reference to the sacrificial blood which sealed the covenant between God and His people (Exod 24), and not only to Isa 53. The Blood of Jesus is the Life sealing the Covenant between God and His new people, and the universal people indwelt by the Spirit.

It appears that, if Jesus did not, himself, in his own thinking, use as an hermeneutical principle, the principle that the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch is to be understood as presenting figures of the sacrificing of the true Israel to bring about the salvation of all men, the narrative of the Last Supper makes no sense. However such a principle is never stated in the Synoptics. Jesus is represented as making rich use of the Pentateuch, in his summary of the Law, in his deepening of the sense of Ten Commandments, in his teaching on divorce and the resurrection, as well as in the Temptation narratives. But, if an identification of his body with the temple is implicit, it is not explicit in the Synoptics. And no such general hermeneutical principle as I mentioned is ever deliberately pointed to by the Evangelists.

III.2 Insights offered by St. John's Gospel

Against this background, let us now consider St. John's Gospel.

What we meet with includes, let us pick this out first, the conception of the bread that perishes and sustains those who eat it temporarily, so that the next day they will need some more, and which in any case only sustains mundane life; then consider the water which needs replenishing, and again does not give eternal life; and so with everything of the flesh — even the Temple is destructible, indeed had been destroyed twice, and would in a short time be destroyed again. And, of a piece with this, let us note next, we have the statement »my kingship is not of this world«: that is, it is not like earthly kingship which changes hands when men die, and which rests on the security of human power, so that kings' servants fight for it (18,36), and on human fidelity, neither adequate nor reliable, an earthly kingship to be rejected as in Jn 6, and referred to in these terms to Pilate »If my kingship were of this world, then would my subjects fight«.

Now all this can be seen as a line of reflection upon the Old Testament — the temporariness of the manna, and the water from the rock, the oppression of the Egyptians being followed by those of the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the successors of Alexander, and the Romans: to that the Exodus did not secure Israel from exile. Note the saying of God to Samuel when the people asked for a king: »They have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them« (1 Sam 8,7). God relents and lets them have a king, and then goes further than they anticipated — disclosing His underlying plan, ever understanding man through and through — in promising to David that this kingship would have a role in His, God's, final plan, not to be superseded. But this will not be the place in His plan that kingship might have for those who desired to be like other nations — because He does not mean the Jews to be as other nations.

So the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, placing the future of the true servants of Israel, not with the kings or the people at that time in Jerusalem, but with the exiles, are of a piece with this saying to Samuel — and of a piece with the meaning of the Pentateuch, for Yahweh himself is the Rock and Shepherd of Israel who governs them, goes out before them, and fights their battles (1 Sam 8,20). So, the kingship which is not transitory, limited, and yielding anyway only temporal benefits, is only the kingship of God Himself.

Next, let us observe the care with which St. John represents Jesus as avoiding the way of compelling belief by wonders and speaks of miracles only as signs. The signs wrought by Jesus are the works whereby the Father witnesses to His Son, each sign having several levels of significance, none being wrought simply in order to cause belief, none compelling belief, none being wrought for its own sake, without a context, prepared by the Father, inviting it. A sign is a manifestation of Jesus' glory, a glory inseparable from his Father's glory. There can therefore be no miracle or sign which attests Jesus without there being an underlying purpose intrinsic to it, namely the manifestation of the Father.⁵² The signs performed in Jerusalem are few and peculiar — first, those associated with the cleansing of the Temple, and after that only, the healing on the Sabbath (Chapter 5, referred to as »the one deed« in 7,21), the healing of the man born blind, and the raising of Lazarus — all geared to the role

⁵² It is because of this that there is no recurrence to the idea, occurring in the Synoptics as one of the three Temptations, of Jesus throwing himself down from the temple, an idea which recurs in the accounts recalled by Eusebius of the martyrdom of »James the Just«, the James who is noted by Klausner as respectfully sought after in the period of the early Tannaim as a witness to the teachings of Jesus (cf. Footnote 44).

of Jerusalem as the locus of the trial on authority, and all of them loaded with possible Messianic significance.⁵³

In this way, St. John offers a striking Midrash on the Temptations or on the points on which the Temptation narratives turn, making intelligible and even exhibiting the appropriateness of each of Jesus' terse answers to the devil. The refusal to turn stones into bread is backed by the whole discourse on the bread that perisheth; the refusal of earthly power represented by Matthew and Luke as in Satan's hand to offer is filled out by St. John's references to Satan as the ruler of this world, to Jesus' refusal to be made king by the crowd, and to his answer to Pilate. Indeed, the whole Gospel could be considered as a commentary or Midrash on the text »thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve«. Indeed, as I observed earlier, it puts a new light on the phrase »the kingship of God« as it occurs throughout Mark and Luke. Mark and Luke represent Jesus as the Messiah, inheritor of the promises to David: this Davidic king is one who preaches precisely, not his own kingship, as such, but the kingship of God.

And what is the Satanic sin? It is refusal to trust God and his covenants, and preferring to trust that which is fleshly or in one's own control: the apple which Eve and Adam took for the sake of a knowledge in their own hands; the manna kept overnight, lest there be no manna the next day; the reliance on the largeness of one's earthly political resources, rather than in having God on one's side by being on His side, faithful to Him. The Evangelist St. John or (as Dodd suggests in his Commentary on the Epistles of John) a Greek disciple of his in the first »Epistle of John« (2,15–17) gives this comment or Midrash on the temptation to Eve (Gen 3,6): »Do not love the world or the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, love for the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passes away, and the lust of it; but he who does the will of God abides for ever«. The name Satan occurs in Zech 3,1–2 and otherwise only in the Writings, primarily in Job and Chronicles, but everything is there *in genotype* in the Pentateuch: in the serpent, the temptation, the fall, the implication of redemption, in the promise that the seed of the woman would not be ruled by the serpent but at enmity with him.

But now against the background of the recurrent poverty, privations, afflictions and persecutions of Israel and especially the just of Israel, clearly a reflective Jew

⁵³ For the Lord to come suddenly to His Temple (Mal 3,1–2), for the ultimate meaning of the Sabbath to be recalled, for the born blind to receive sight, and for the dead to be raised, are each of them in context thus loaded.

might ask: to what purpose, these sufferings, these exiles, this pilgrim existence, beginning with Abraham's leaving and living as a wanderer, the famine which takes Israel to Egypt, the oppression by the Egyptians, their wandering forty years in the wilderness? In the providence of God, these things arise not primarily as punishments, whether for the illtreatment of Joseph or for infidelity to the covenant, but as things permitted in order that God's people be tested, consolidated, and instructed. God uses the sins of Joseph's brothers in order that Joseph be there in Egypt to succour them in time of famine, and in order that, in the righting of things, as in the healing of the man born blind, God should be glorified.

But to what purpose this people, thus tested, consolidated and instructed -- in order that in Abraham's seed *all* the nations of the world be blessed? But how? By what means? In what way? Now, if one followed the thought of Isa 52-53, one might say that the nations of the world would be blessed through Israel, through Israel's suffering on their behalf. And, as when ritual sacrifice is made to God it is to be of that which is without blemish, so it is to be the suffering of the just of Israel which is for the hallowing of God's name, is to His glory, and is not for the sake of a rescue from human oppression, but for the sake of the rescue of the world from »the sin of the world« and from Satan, »the ruler of this world«, the tempter to sin.

What we have here goes beyond the idea that Jewish ritual sacrifices are intended not only for the sake of the Jews, but for the sake of all peoples, and idea met with in the Talmud, e.g. »You should love us, for we have presented seventy sacrifices for you; but you did not love us, but rather hated us -- and yet we pray for you« (Midrash Yalkut -- Shim'oni on Psalm 109,4).⁵⁴ Rather what we have is that the non-ritual sacrifices of God's people and God's servant, i.e. their sufferings, have this universal function for the sake of all men.⁵⁵

Klausner traces a positive attitude to the acceptance of suffering because of the iniquities of others (attributed, he supposes, only by late Jewish misconstruction, to the Messiah) in the Talmud, where he recognises it as attributed to Moses (referring

⁵⁴ Cf. *H. J. Schoeps, Jewish-Christian Argument*, London, 17.

⁵⁵ Indeed both Christian and Jew, looking retrospectively, can now see this as part of the meaning of the suffering of the Jews, precisely as Jews, i.e. »for the sanctification of the Name« as Jews say, as it has reached a new clarity in this century, bringing them into association with Jesus, as well as with earlier Jews who had died in the time of the Antiochene persecution and the Maccabees.

to Berakoth 32a, and at length in Sotah 1, 14a).⁵⁶ But, although Klausner sees Moses in a certain way as prefiguring the Messiah, and ideas about each as significantly shaping ideas of the other, and although he recognises the significance of the suffering servant passages in Deutero-Isaiah as the key element within that prophet's understanding of the role of the Jewish people as a whole, he still insists that »in the whole Jewish Messianic Literature of the Tannaitic period there is not trace of the *Suffering Messiah*«, and constantly reiterates that the Kingdom of the Jewish Messiah is a Kingdom of this world, so that the saying »My kingdom is not of this world« for him exactly encapsulates one of the two key elements divorcing Christian from Jewish Messianism.⁵⁷

But we have seen that it is only if a theme is seen in the Pentateuch, as well as in the Prophets and the Writings, that a Jew can properly regard it as inner to Scripture as a whole. But how can the suffering of God's servant, Israel, on behalf of the world be seen as part of the meaning of the Pentateuch? — only if one adopts, as a principle of interpretation, the hermeneutical principle I enunciated before, taking the earthly realities described in the Pentateuch as figures of God's global plan.

It will be recalled that it was consideration of the figures of the Lamb of the Pasover, the manna or bread from heaven and the Blood of the Covenant which, in connection with the words of institution of the Eucharist in the Synoptics, drove us to attribute this principle to Jesus himself. But now, is it not notable that the concepts invoked, of Lamb, Bread, Blood and Life, as what is enshrined in blood, are highlighted in St. John's Gospel? And not only does St. John make his Midrash extend back to Gen 1 and 2, and embrace Exod 3; 34 and 35, but also, he extends the application of the idea of prefiguring from the purely immolatory sacrificial conceptions of the Pentateuch to others. Thus, the Temple, the manna and the rock from which water flows and the bronze serpent which, when lifted up gives life, are all taken as prefiguring Jesus — and even the Torah, faithfulness to it, and the life-blood which

⁵⁶ Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, 18 (on Moses and the Messiah in respect of suffering). 157f. 162–168 (on Deutero-Isaiah). 405.459 (on the absence of the idea of the suffering Messiah in the Tannaitic period). 392, cf. 104ff. 418.517 (on the worldliness of the Kingdom of the Jewish Messiah); cf. as well *idem*, *Jesus of Nazareth* (Book 8, especially Chapter 3).

⁵⁷ Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, is especially emphatic that the kingship of the Messiah is the kingship of this world, in this respect in stark contrast with the kingship which is not of this world spoken of by Jesus to Pilate in St. John's Gospel. The key passages are loc.cit. 465f. 519–31.

seals it.⁵⁸ Always, there is something earthly and literal which is itself a real gift or appointment by God, with its own place integral to Salvation-History, right objects of value or attachment for every Jew and for respect by mankind — the first pass-over, the manna, the water from the rock, the law of Moses, the city of Jerusalem, and the Jerusalem Temple — but always these prefigure something greater.

Thus, upon examination, St. John not only does much to fill out the conceptions underlying the words of institution of the Eucharist, but he does this in a setting in which not just some, but all these symbolic and ceremonial elements from the Pentateuch are conceived of as intended by God as figures of the Christ and his work (cf. the discussion of St. John on the Eucharist in Heron).⁵⁹

IV. How could a Jew reconcile Jesus' Divinity with the worship of one God alone?

I wish now to pass from my consideration in Section III of the roots in Jewish thinking of the conception that the way of the Messiah was a way of suffering to a consideration of the person of Jesus, of who he was, and, if he was the Messiah, of who and what this Messiah was. This is the subject of this, my final section.

The consideration of the historical question of who and what Jesus conceived himself to be, and of how the Apostles conceived these things in their early preaching, needs to be set within the context of the historical character of Judaism in and before the time of Jesus and the Apostles.

Judaism in the time of Jesus had already long contained a certain inner dialectic. This obtains frequent statements in the Old Testament. It is God before all others, who is King (1 Sam 8,7; Isa 43,15; 44,6; Ps 47 and 48), before all other Shepherd of

⁵⁸ This hermeneutical principle is not carried by St. John, and possibly was not carried by Jesus himself, as far as the author of the First Epistle of John, and, before them, St. Paul took it. These writers apply the symbolism of the Day of Atonement to Jesus, and there is no implication of this in St. John or in the words of institution of the Eucharist, since the notion of sin-offering in Isa 53 is associated with a lamb, not a goat. The other new element in St. Paul, also found in Luke, is the suggestion that Jesus set up a *new* covenant, doing away the old. The words of institution of the Eucharist in Matthew and Mark suggest only one covenant, and the thought of St. John's Gospel places the workings of God towards the Jews in a structured strategic relation to his plan for »every man that cometh into the world«, without the legalistic thought of a succession of different covenants.

⁵⁹ Heron, Table, 42—53.

Israel (Ezek 34; Isa 40,11), Light (Exod 13,21–22; Isa 60,19–20, Ps 27,1), Rock (Isa 44,8), Saviour (Isa 43,3; 45,15; 49,26), Redeemer (Isa 41–59), and Israel's Holy One (Isa 40–54), God, and no other beside Him. The theme of Yahweh as a jealous God is echoed in all the strains that entered into the completion of the Pentateuch. The same theme figures in the conception that David, Hezekiah and Josiah, after David, were alone amongst the kings in being faithful to Yahweh, a faithfulness expressed in eliminating all rival cults, even on the hill-places, and even removing the bronze serpent from the temple, making all worship centre on the worship of Yahweh alone, and this in Jerusalem. It was accentuated in the restoration of the Temple in Jerusalem after the Exile and in the whole priestly and scribal development, as the Jews found it necessary to react against any tendency derived from Iranian religion to worship angels or to set the personification of evil, Satan, on a par with God. The attachment to ritual exactness, evidenced in the Books of the Maccabees and elsewhere, was conceived of as a derivative expression of the worshipping of Yahweh alone.

There is no single uniquely eloquent expression of this monolatry. The rhetoric of Isa 40–59, insisting that God will do everything Himself and not give His glory to another (42,8; 48,11), finds a rival in eloquence in the Passover Haggadah in the Mishnah on which Daube gives the following comment:⁶⁰

The Credo from Deuteronomy contains the declaration: »And the Lord heard our voice, and the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand and with an outstretched arm and with great terribleness and with signs and with wonders.« The authors of the Passover Haggadah see in the repetition of »the Lord« — »the Lord heard our voice and the Lord brought us forth« instead of simply »and he brought us forth« — an indication of God's personal activity; and, as usual, they support their contention by other texts from Scripture. This is what they say by way of comment: »Not through an angel, and not through a seraph, and not through a messenger, but the Holy One in His glory and Himself; as it is written (in Exodus 12:12), For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and I will smite all the firstborn, and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment, I the Lord«. Then they go on to explain that each of the four clauses of the supporting text is intended to announce the carrying out of these deeds by God himself: »For I will pass through Egypt — this means, I and not an angel; and I will smite all the firstborn — this means, I and not a seraph; and I will execute judgment — this means, I and not the messenger; I the Lord — this means, *I am* and no other«.

⁶⁰ Daube, *New Testament*, 326.

The conception which debars even angels from any divine status, and which therefore allows them, but not God himself, to be seen by men (cf. Jn 1,18) is traceable in the successive stages of compilation of the Pentateuch and in the Septuagint. It did not wait until the period after AD 70, although it continued in full force both in Rabbinic Judaism and in Christianity (e.g. within the latter in the Apocalypse and in the rejection as inadequate of Christologies relying on the notion of Jesus or the Holy Spirit as angels).⁶¹

Within this context, in which God is in every respect preeminent, there arises in all Judaism a secondary role for the chosen of God beginning crucially with Abraham. The chosen of God becomes Israel, the elect people personified in the figure of the servant of God, and thought of, as a people, as having God as its father, and, as a people, personified in the »Son of man« in Dan 7, given an everlasting kingdom. Within this context a role arises for uniquely functioned servants of God, above all Moses and David, and at least one figure to come in the future, the Messiah, inheritor of the promises to David, presaged in Genesis 49,8–12, who is to redeem and restore Israel and all things.

These figures of a creaturely nature, Israel, the Servant of God, and the Messiah, the Servant of God, all sometimes appear as if they were regarded as having attributes normally attributed to God alone. The Messiah is uniquely a king, a shepherd (Ezek 34,23), a redeemer who brings nations into Israel's dominion, and a light. (That the Messiah should be conceived of as »the Light« is unsurprising: Isa 9,1 and 42,6f, along with Mal 4,1ff or 3,19ff in some versions, were interpreted within the Talmud, where it is said »Light is the name of Messiah“,⁶² as well as within Christian tradition, *vide* Lk 2,32, as reckoning »Light« as a Messianic title.) Israel is destined to a universal kingship, as well as to be a light to the nations, possessed of glory, and with an everlasting name, not to be cut off.

It is characteristic of later Rabbinic tradition, and of Christians following Ebionite or Arian teaching, and of Islam, all alike, to insist on the solely creaturely nature of all God's servants, not only Moses and David, but also Jesus and Muhammad, any past or future prophet or Messiah, and to insist on the purely creaturely nature of God's people even as such, so that all attributions of such divine titles as I have instanced are secondary, derivative and metaphorical. This is made dramatically clear in the expositions of J. Klausner.⁶³

⁶¹ See Footnote 21.

⁶² See Footnote 6.

⁶³ *Klausner, Messianic Idea*, 465ff.520–531 (Appendix).

By contrast the characteristic Christian response to this dilemma presented by the inner dialectic of pre-Christian Judaism has been to insist that Jesus was indeed himself king, shepherd, light, Redeemer and Saviour, but that God did *not* thereby give His glory to another because Jesus was God and in him God was acting Himself. Accordingly, the key Christian claim is that, in Jesus, one and the same person was at the same time: one with his Father, inseparable from the Father, as radiant light is imaginatively inseparable from the source of light, the wisdom and glory of God from God Himself; and truly man, descendant of Adam, fellow-servant and prophet with others before and after him, albeit perfect in his human expression of prayer and obedience to the Father.

The divergence between the tendencies of later Judaism and the Christian development of Jewish ideas is perhaps most clearly seen in attitudes to the propriety of the use by Jesus of the expression *I am* as an announcement of the Messianic presence portrayed in the Gospels but especially in St. John's Gospel.⁶⁴

Against this background of later controversy we have a key *historical* question: did Jesus himself speak, pray or act in such a way so that, if he were not indeed himself God in action, then it could rightly be complained that he spoke or acted as if God had given His glory to another?

Our first question must be as to what answer to this question is to be gleaned from a critical estimate of the Synoptic Gospels. To this we must note first that Jesus was regarded by the Jewish authorities as guilty of blasphemy, the offence in view whenever he was in danger of being stoned. He incurred this accusation when he claimed to forgive sins, from his style of interpreting the Law as if authoritatively cognisant of the purposes of the law-giver, God, his application of Ps 110 to himself, his claim to be greater than the Temple, and his peculiar way of speaking of God as

⁶⁴ It has been suggested (i) that the announcement *I am* was a peculiar mark of the uncovering or baring of the Divine Presence, an uncovering signalled by »great terribleness« and associated with His coming Himself to redeem; (ii) that, because of this, early Christian writings expect Jewish readers to interpret it as announcing the presence of the Messianic redeemer; and (iii) that, perhaps as a result of this, over the centuries the use of this phrase in Judaism has become ever more guarded so as to survive almost only in the liturgy (*Daube, New Testament*, 325–329). In this way, an openness in Judaism to regard the presence of the Messiah as enshrining in itself an act of God engaged in redemption, still there in the time of Jesus' ministry, would appear to have become increasingly hidden in later Judaism. Whether this is an historically true account of the history of the expression *I am*, so dramatically used in St. John's Gospel, and the significance of such a development is a matter for further enquiry.

his Father. The claim he made to an authority that transcended the authority of Moses, David or John the Baptist was rooted in this claim to be in a peculiar way »the Son« (cf. Mk 12,6), a claim evidenced also in his style of prayer. Upon reflection, although it would take another paper to establish it beyond reasonable dispute, there is enough in the Synoptic Gospels alone to make clear that either he was in some peculiar way one with his Father, or he was guilty of blasphemy, implying that God had given His glory to another.

If we look at St. John's Gospel, we find that the picture he offers dovetails exactly with this critical distillation from the Synoptic Gospels.

In the first place Jesus is represented as regarded as guilty of blasphemy »because he made himself equal with God« (Jn 5,18; 10,33), i.e. he is portrayed as using the expression »Son« of himself in a peculiar way such as to imply this special relation with the Father. J. Jeremias, despite certain qualifications, recognises the historicity of St. John's Gospel in this respect⁶⁵ and recognises that it was above all the Johannine writings which led to »the Father« becoming *the* name of God in Christendom (an observation in which he notes concurrence with T. W. Manson).

In the second place, one has to recognise that in St. John, the roles which Jesus is represented as filling are distinctively supernatural, and, upon examination, one will discover reference to the same or other likewise still unmistakably supernatural roles in the Synoptics. In St. John, the roles concerned include the exercise of judgment, the raising of the dead to eternal life and the baptising of men with the Spirit. In the inner dialectic of Judaism, unless Jesus and his Father were indeed one, it would indeed be the case that the jealous God of the Pentateuch would have given His glory to another.

We can sum up the situation like this.

If the institutions and events enacted in the Pentateuch presage anything more complete than what is described within the Pentateuch itself, something different in kind as spirit is from flesh, something alive in such wise as to be imperishable and not in need of renewal, so that there is indeed some further function still left for a successor to Moses, then the logic of monotheism requires that this prophet, this Messiah, this Servant, or this Son, who brings things to consummation and completion, be not other than the Rock and Shepherd who was Israel's Redeemer, stay and guide in the Exodus from Egypt and in the journey to Israel. If the role of this prophet or this Messiah is supernatural, is associated with the redemption and renewal of the whole

⁶⁵ J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, London 1967, 53.

man, and with the establishing of the Law in the hearts of men, and not just of some men but of all men of every nation, and if it is thus associated with the giving of the Spirit not by measure, then either God has given His glory to another, or it is none other than He that has thus shown Himself.

The instinct of Athanasius that the giving of the Spirit to men was a divine and not just a human work, enshrined in the assertion of the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed in AD 690 by the Council of Toledo in order, as it were, to drive a final nail into the coffin of Arianism (still alive in Visigothic Spain), seems a correct one.

The Synoptics, even or especially in the light of modern critical approaches, give us no reason to reject or even be suspicious of the way Jesus speaks of himself as the »Son« in St. John's Gospel. Rather, upon examination, St. John's Gospel throws light upon the meaning of the expressions »Father« and »Son« as they occur in the Synoptic gospels. The Son, who prays to His Father, »Abba«, is one who lives in knowledge of the Father in the sense of personal intimacy with the Father. Thus, he is one to whom the Father shows things (we are intended to be reminded of the way a human father may show his human son, as it were, as an apprentice, how he does things), so as to be one who sees the Father and sees the Father working. Nowhere, outside St. John's Gospel, do we find so much light thrown on the understanding of the word »son« as used by Jesus of himself. The use of the expression »son of God«, to refer to kings and servants of God, e.g. on occasions in which they take up a role in relation to the whole nation of Israel, does very little to explain Jesus' way of speaking.

However, precisely this way of speaking generates the problem I have described: as to how a man, Jesus, can be thus one with the Father, without the Father having given His glory to another. In Judaism, what is fundamental is monolatry, that there is only One, One Name, to be worshipped. Monotheism, whereby God has no equal in power, no metaphysical equal, and even the powers of evil derive from Him, although He is not author of their evil choice and deed, arises from the exploration of the presuppositions of monolatry, of there being One only to be worshipped.

Accordingly, the so-called »exaltation-Christology«, whereby Jesus is represented as only a man, only coming into existence late in time, after his Passion exalted to the right hand of God and to a name above all names, fits well only with pagan ways of thinking, accustomed to the deification of pharaohs and emperors, and offers some palliative to the metaphysical instinct that a man could not be or become *by nature* divine. But this »exaltation-Christology« offers no help whatsoever to the Jewish mind. On the contrary, it exacerbates the abomination and blasphemy by

making it more explicit. If St. Paul had offered an exaltation-Christology, as he did not, then this would have constituted the consummating insult to his Jewish antecedents and fellow-Jews.^{66/67}

In the New Testament, only St. John makes any moves pertinent not only to the recognition, but to the resolution of the Jews' problem. Jesus is the Word, Torah or Wisdom of the Father, the two inseparable as the source of radiance is inseparable conceptually from radiance, or as glory from the One who has glory. St. John explains that Jesus' body is the Temple of God, the place of Shekinah, i.e. the place where at once the Word tabernacles amongst us and thereby the Father Himself with him and in him: it is because the Father is present in Jesus that Jesus is able to give the Spirit. St. John's Gospel uses only concrete terms of the Father, while, of Jesus, it uses both concrete terms such as »Son«, »Messiah« etc., and abstract terms such as »Word«, »life«, and »truth«, in this way following the same path in the rejection of polytheism which was later followed by Athanasius and the Councils of the Church.⁶⁸ Athanasius is especially Johannine in refusing to concede to the Arians any real distinction of *ousia* between God and His Wisdom.

⁶⁶ It is integral to any Christian Christology that Jesus passed, in his humanity, through a series of stages, and underwent a growth, wherein his humanity, through obedience, became enlarged and an ever fuller expression of his divinity. Humanity, through obedience, expressive of love, is made capable of enlargement to enjoy glory, and capable of a fecundity whereby others share this glory. More particularly, it is peculiarly explicit in St. John's Gospel that Jesus' giving of the Spirit had to wait until his death, and indeed that the main purpose of his death was to make this giving of the Spirit possible. In St. John, he passes from a stage of humility wherein the Spirit is not yet given except to Jesus himself to a state of glory wherein it is given to all those who »believe on him«.

⁶⁷ Of course, this popular »exaltation-Christology« is ultimately useless, not only for the purpose of doing justice to Jewish monolatry, but also for the purpose of providing any real palliative to the reflective mind, represented supposedly by the Greeks.

God is not the subject of a box of properties, some of which, like »eternity«, »omniscience« and »omnipotence«, are especially odd to attribute to a man, and others of which, such as »goodness«, »truthfulness«, »mercy« and »fidelity«, belong to God in just the same sense and manner as they belong to human beings, except that He is »perfect«. Rather, God possesses none of these moral attributes in the same sense or the same manner as men possess them, but only in a way that makes them inseparable from His being and His nature as Creator, the source of all being. Creation is not the work of a different love than salvation.

⁶⁸ In discussion of the Holy Spirit there tends to be much confusion. In the Old Testament it is natural to treat »the Spirit« as a concrete term, the subject of concrete predications, i.e. especially predications of speech and action. It is not, like »wisdom«, »truth«, and »life«, an abstract term. Therefore, Luke, in his Gospel and in Acts, and St. John's Gospel follow in a thoroughly Semitic tradition in speaking concretely of the Spirit, i.e. speaking of it as an *hypostasis*. It is as

IV.a Knowledge of Christ's Divinity has to be compatible with Monolatry

We need to distinguish three questions: (i) how the Apostles became able while Jesus was with them, before the inception of their preaching at Pentecost, to know and confess Jesus as Lord and proper to be worshipped, as witnesses of Jesus' glory, not speculators; (ii) how men of later times, e.g. the Church of the IVth Century Councils and we ourselves today, can know and confess Jesus as thus fully Lord, in virtue of the Apostles' witness; and (iii) how Jesus knew himself to be the Son, uniquely one with the Father, and not wrongly addressed as fully Lord, possessed of the glory of his Father, i.e. how he knew his »divinity« *in the sense of* intimacy and unity with the Father, which transcended in its effects anything any possible special commissioning might achieve inasmuch as what he did God did Himself, *and in no way had given to another to do in place of Himself.*

Thus, as to (iii) it would not make psychological sense to suppose that Jesus waited upon experiment or human testimony before knowing of his authority to teach, his capacity to raise the dead, and his situation as the one who would give the Spirit and draw all men to himself, or, in general, before knowing that he was the one looked forward to in prophecies from Moses until John the Baptist; rather he must have known it from some peculiar intimacy, *as man*, with the Father. But it still remains that he must know it in such a way as never to violate the monolatrous character of Judaism: indeed, it is this consideration that lies at the root of the dogmatic insistence on his intimacy *as man*, and not only as God, with the Father. That is, it must not be that as man, he prayed as a separate person or I-centre to God, Father, Word and Spirit, but that he *as man*, knew himself as one with his Father, as Word, as inseparable from his Father.⁶⁹ However, the point of my last observation is not to move

natural to speak of the Spirit of the Lord hypostatically as to speak of the Angel of the Lord hypostatically, although there is less temptation or invitation to suppose that in so speaking one is speaking of a *hypostasis* distinct from the Lord himself.

What is new in Christianity is the apparent intrusion of the Son in between the Father and the Spirit. This is the first thing which forces upon Christians the understanding of the Spirit as a distinct *hypostasis*, third in the Trinity, sent upon men by the Father and the Son. And it invites theologians attempting to explain the unity of God to use abstract terms of the Spirit also as well as of the Son, e.g. so that the Spirit is the brightness of the radiance of the Father, or the breath breathed upon men to enliven and unify the church or people of God, or the Love within the Godhead which overflows in Creation and the New Creation.

⁶⁹ K. Rahner, Current Problems in Christology, in: Theological Investigations, I, strangely imagines it to be a dogmatic datum that Jesus, in his humanity, was an attitude of creaturely adoration to the Logos, and unsurprisingly proceeds from this mistake to develop a theory of a distinct human »I-centre« in Christ.

out of the fields of exegesis and history into the field of dogmatics, but merely to insist that whatever theory⁷⁰ one holds of Jesus' human knowledge of his Father, this knowledge must be understood in a way that respects the monolatry I have portrayed.

However, whereas Jesus himself must *know his »divinity«, in the sense which I specified*, and therefore as having no separate glory or being (*ousia*) from the Father, *through his own mode of human knowledge of the Father*, by contrast, neither the Apostles, nor any others for whom monotheism of Jewish character is a datum (e.g. the church in each later generation), can confess his divinity without blasphemy, except in accord with some such dialectic as I have outlined. By this I mean a dialectic which begins by insisting that God does not give His glory to another, and then proceeds to insist that the Messiah can act or receive worship in ways appropriate to God alone, but only because, when the Messiah acts or is present, it is God Himself who acts and is present, He Himself who redeems and receives glory. Hence the confession of the Messiah's divinity becomes in itself an expression of that ultimate monotheism wherein God does not give His glory to another, but out of love acts Himself with all that this involves.

Thus Jesus' mode of knowledge of his unity with the Father must be compatible with, and even invite the dialectic I have outlined. But, by contrast, the knowledge which the Apostles and the later Church have of Jesus' divinity must be, not just compatible with, but based upon this dialectic.

⁷⁰ *Galot*, Who is the Christ?, concedes that Jesus' mode of knowledge of the Father must have been *sui generis*, unique to himself, but rejects the Scholastic and Patristic theory of the Beatific Vision by Jesus of the Father from the time of his conception. The Beatific Vision has been supposed to imply, in a person enjoying the perfection of charity with the Father, completeness of knowledge even in the human mode, and to be alien to the pilgrim or slave (cf. Phil 2,5ff) state of Jesus, tempted or tried like us (Heb 4,15).

But the inference here depends on supposing that the vision of God must in all cases imply the state of glory, as in Heaven after Jesus' Ascension, and this inference is ill-justified. Moreover, considering John of the Cross's exposition of contemplation as a »loving unconceptualised knowledge of God«, it seems that, since Jesus' knowledge of his Father surpassed that of contemplation by such mystics in not being based on, and in its direction dependent on, the pointing made possible by testimony (and faith, as belief upon testimony), it is not clear that he lacked the Beatific Vision, but only clear that this did not imply a normal or verbalisable conceptual human knowledge of all things. His knowledge of the things of this world was as with other human beings, in his preglorified state, empirical or prophetic in character, except insofar as it arose directly from his non-conceptual knowledge of and relationship with his Father — arose directly in the way that knowledge of his identity and authority in judging of his mission and knowledge of the corollaries of his Father's power, mercy and righteousness must arise directly or be inseparable from this knowledge and relationship.

IV.b Jesus' humanity in St. John's Gospel

It is a plausible historical view that the expression Jesus himself used to refer to himself by preference in his public utterances was »the Son of Man«. This view has been suggested to many by critical study of the Synoptic Gospels. However, the meaning of the expression is mysterious. At this point there seems to be something further to be learnt from St. John's Gospel.

St. John's Gospel constantly refers to Jesus as the Son, meaning Son of the Father, but, if it expands the expression »the Son«, it more often expands it as »the Son of Man« (e.g. 1,51; 3,15; 5,27; 6,27.53.62; 8,28; 9,35–39; 12,34; cf. 3,31; 6,38.50; 7,33; 8,14) than as »the Son of God«, although the latter does occur naturally and crucially in 20,31. The expression »the Son of Man« seems to be used, not in order to allude to Daniel, but as an expository concept, the person sent from or come from heaven, always in the act or situation of intimacy with the Father, the heavenly man, being contrasted with all that is of the Earth, earthly, perishable, possessed only of indirect knowledge, and needing to be born again (cf. Chapter 3). The nearest we come in the non-Johannine writings to this conception may be in St. Luke, where Jesus, Son of God, conceived of the Virgin Mary, is thereby *set beside Adam*, son of God, as well as being a *descendant of Adam*, and in this dual role enters into the Temptations, and thereby takes the first steps on the path towards the *exodos* he was to accomplish in Jerusalem (Lk 9,31). It is as if the only-begotten who is in the bosom of the Father was made flesh and dwelt amongst us in order thereby to reconstitute the role of man in intimacy and apprenticeship to the Father, the role from which Adam fell back – or, in Athanasius' terms, he became man in order to recreate man after the image of God. It is noteworthy that the strategically most important occurrences of the expression »Son of Man« in the other Gospels and Acts are either in connection with the vocation to suffer or else involve a reference, not primarily to Dan 7, but to Ps 110 (viz. Mk 14,62 and Ac 7,56). The unity of Jesus *as man* with the Father, and the fact that it is *as man* that the Son of God, co-eternal with the Father, is priest is supremely expressed in St. John's Chapter 17.

V. Concluding remarks

V.1 Exegesis of St. John's Gospel and Comparison with the other Gospels

In Section I, we saw how St. John's Gospel appeared to be addressed to Jews. In Section II, we exhibited how St. John's Gospel was peculiarly Jewish in the pre-emi-

nence in its thought patterns of the Pentateuch and what could be regarded as Pentateuchal concepts; we saw how interpretation along these lines removed any basis for the supposition that it enshrined a Gnostic or Hellenistic epistemology or metaphysics; finally, I showed the pre-eminence of the Pentateuch for St. John even in proving Jesus to be *He who was to come*. In Section III, I established that St. John threw more light on the historical question as to how Jesus and the Apostles, *as Jews*, could have envisaged *from the Scriptures* God's Appointed One as having a vocation to suffering and death. In Section IV, I have marked out how John alone amongst New Testament writers takes cognisance of the absolute demands upon Christianity made by the monolatrous character of Judaism.

Thus, in St. John's Gospel we have what may fairly claim to be the most inwardly Jewish of all the writings of the New Testament. St. Matthew's Gospel is adapted in style and detail to a Jewish audience, but reaches less far into the deeper demands of Judaism: *viz.* faithfulness to the Pentateuch; explanation of how it could be that the Christ *must* suffer; explanation of how putting the name of the Son next to the name of the Father fails to violate the principle that God retains to Himself the glory of being Himself the Redeemer of His people. The Synoptic Gospels, for a large part, represent adaptations and reorganisations of material integral to Christian catechesis, *viz.* sayings of Jesus, accounts of his miracles, and accounts of his Passion and Resurrection. St. John's Gospel shows knowledge of the same types of catechetical material, while incorporating many distinctive historical traditions, but is of a quite different literary genre. It uses a small number of narratives, dialogues and discourses to present a kind of Midrash, a Midrash on one hand on select parts of the Pentateuch, and on the other hand, on the Temptation narratives and the words of institution of the Eucharist.

It is remarkable that in the use within St. John's Gospel of the expressions »the Son« and »the Son of Man«, we seem to be, not at a stage of elaboration and of construction, constituting a development of earlier usage and thought, but rather at a stage of earlier insight, rendering less puzzling what in the Synoptics has already become enigmatic. This is also true in subsidiary matters such as the strange references in the Synoptics to Jesus as greater than the Temple (Mt 12,16) and the garbled accounts given by the false witnesses at Jesus' trial of some saying of Jesus about rebuilding the Temple.

It is remarkable that St. John's Christology should turn out to be so close to the supposedly most primitive Christology, which some scholars have located in the sermons in the Acts and in St. Mark's Gospel, whose theology O. Cullmann attri-

butes to St. Peter⁷¹ but which, at least in respect of Acts and St. John, may, it has been suggested,⁷² be alike referred to the form of Jewish Christianity practiced in the province of Judea.

It might seem that amongst many theologians in the earliest Church, we have two giants, Paul and John, and, if Cullmann be right, these two with Peter a runner ahead. But there seems to be this difference between Paul and the author of St. John's Gospel, that the inner Jewishness of St. John's Gospel, as I have delineated it, is such that one cannot be certain that its key conceptions are original. Rather, it seems plausible that it gives us the most direct access we have in the New Testament to the thought of Jesus himself, in the days of his flesh: firstly in regard to his hermeneutic of the Pentateuch, particularly as this is relevant to the Temptations and the Eucharist; secondly in regard to his understanding of his mission to suffer and die; and thirdly, in relation to his character as the Son of the Father.

V.2 Implications for the History of Religions

It is vital to clear thinking that one should recognise that the same questions can arise both in dogmatics and in historical studies. For instance, to take the most obvious case, it is a requirement of Christian dogmatics that Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew and that he was crucified: these facts figure as elements in Christian teaching and the Christian exposition of salvation-history. But whether Jesus was a Jew and whether he was crucified are not only questions for Christian dogmatics, but also questions of history.

In a parallel way, the question of the extent to which Christianity was an unfolding or a proper development of earlier Judaism and of the extent to which it has to be conceived of as involving a violation of its Jewish roots is not only a question of dogmatics but also a question in the history of religions.

The relevant issues have to be seen in the light of our argument in Section IV. If doctrinal development in the early Church was creative in respect of the divinity of Jesus, and not a making explicit of what was already implicit in the preaching and witness of the Apostles, then either it amounts to a new revelation whose credentials are dubious, or it has no more than the status of human speculation. Likewise, if the Apostles' preaching of Jesus involved anything which Jesus himself, so far as he was faithful to his Jewish inheritance, would have regarded as foreign to his own selfun-

⁷¹ O. Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple, Apostle and Martyr*, Philadelphia 1953.

⁷² Parker, *Kinship*, 187–205.

derstanding, in respect of who he was, his mission, and its groundedness in the Pentateuch, then it will also amount to nothing more than a possibly inspired human speculation. If Jesus' selfunderstanding left worship of him alien, then any later worship of him would be thus foreign. There can be for a Jew, or to anyone faithful to what is essential to Jewish religion, no passing from the worship of the one God of Israel to the worship of another beside Him, without this passing being noticed.

Now, true, this has clear implications for dogmatics since it is a requirement of Christian dogmatics that the religion of the New Testament be a consistent development of the Revelation made to the Jews in the Old Testament. But, quite independently of the question of the validity of the religion of the Old Testament and the separate question of the validity of Christianity, questions of Jewish and Christian dogmatics on which the history of religions takes up no stand, there remains the question in the history of religions whether in its origin Christianity represented a development, specialisation or determination of ancient Judaism or whether, on the contrary, it constituted a new religion as Islam constituted a new religion relative to the Judaism and Christianity of its time.

In order to give a determinate sense to this question in the history of religions, one needs first to establish the extent to which Judaism in the time of Jesus was already »closed«: to this preliminary query I return the answer that, on the one hand, it was not yet »closed« or determined in the direction of later Rabbinic Judaism but that, on the other hand, there did exist an already established »core« or »mainstream« with the marks I enumerated at the start of this paper. And one needs secondly to clarify the question of the extent to which any relevant distinctions are to be made between what Jesus' own understanding of his relationship to the Father actually was and the portrayal of this understanding in the Gospels: and it will be here a matter for inquiry how much turns on so-called »redaction-history« and how much on exegesis — in general it is the exigencies of exegesis which determine how much »redaction-history« has to be postulated and drawn into the debate.

What our argument in section IV has shown for the history of religions is the following. It is an historical requirement on the possibility of regarding Christianity as in its origin not a new religion, but a development of Judaism, a requirement arising from the nature of Jewish monolatry, an historical requirement quite independently of its being a requirement of dogmatics:

(i) that the Church's confession of Jesus' divinity should be compatible with Jesus' own self-understanding;

(ii) that this self-understanding should have included that Jesus, in the days of his ministry had an actual human knowledge of his divinity; and

(iii) that he had this in a way compatible with Jewish monolatry.

Any other account involves a gulf, either between Judaism and Jesus, or between Jesus and the Church at some later stage (whether the Church of the Apostles or the Church at some later date), a gulf over which no bridge is possible.

What we have shown in this paper as a whole is how it is St. John's Gospel, properly understood, which more than any other part of the New Testament shows that there is no such gulf.