

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1965

The Concept of "Oneness" in the Fourth Gospel

Leon Gilbertson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gilbertson, Leon, "The Concept of "Oneness" in the Fourth Gospel" (1965). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 299.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/299>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE CONCEPT OF "ONENESS" IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Short Title

"ONENESS" IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

by Leon C. Gilbertson S.T.M.

This is presented to the Faculty
of Catholic Seminary, St. Louis,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Leon Gilbertson

May 1965

35743

Approved by: Paul H. Butcher
21 April 1965 Advisor

Victor Bentley
28 April 1965 Reader

EV
4070
CJ
MB
1965
10.5
c.2

THE CONCEPT OF "ONENESS" IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Leon Charles Gilbertson

May 1965

35743

Approved by: Paul W. Spetscher
28 April 1965 Advisor

Victor Barling
28 April 1965 Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1965
no. 5
c.2

35743

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	A CLASSIFICATION OF $\epsilon\iota\zeta$ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	5
III.	THE ONENESS OF FATHER AND SON IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL	17
IV.	THE ONENESS OF THE CHURCH IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL	51
V.	CONCLUSION	71
	APPENDIX	72
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	A CLASSIFICATION OF $\epsilon\iota\sigma$ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	5
III.	THE ONENESS OF FATHER AND SON IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL	17
IV.	THE ONENESS OF THE CHURCH IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL	51
V.	CONCLUSION	71
	APPENDIX	72
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the numeral $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$ in the Gospel of John. At the heart of the study was the desire to come to an understanding of the oneness of the church (John 17). It was not possible, however, to proceed directly to such an interpretation. As the second chapter will show, the word for one ($\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$) in John 17:11,21,22,23 is normally an adjective but in John 17 it is used as a substantive. The full meaning of what the substantive describes can be determined only on the basis of a study of the text and context. Furthermore, in John 17, where Jesus prays that all future believers may be one, He compares this oneness to the oneness which exists between Himself and the Father. Therefore it was found necessary to determine first of all what was meant by the oneness of the Father and the Son before an attempt could be made to understand what it is meant by the oneness of the church.

An understanding of the oneness of the church is of vital importance today. An understanding of John 17 is of particular importance because of the use to which this chapter is put today. The Roman Catholic Church claims that she has the unity for which Christ prayed and that it is only as those outside the Roman Communion

join the Roman Catholic Church that they will be partakers of this oneness.¹ But also leaders of the World Council of Churches appeal to John 17 to justify the existence of the World Council. At times John 17 is also used as a prime reason for consummating organic unity between Protestant churches. In addition to the claim of the Roman Catholic Church that it possesses the unity for which Christ prayed, and to the quest of the World Council of Churches for unity, the voice of Eastern Orthodox Churches has been raised in recent times. Eastern Orthodox Churches make a claim similar to that made by the Roman Catholic Church. In a statement made by representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the United States of America at Oberlin, Ohio, they too claimed to be the one true church. They said:

The Orthodox Church teaches that she has no need to search for a "lost unity," because her historic consciousness dictates that she is the Una Sancta and that all Christian groups outside the Orthodox Church can recover their unity only by entering into the bosom of that Church,² which preserved its identity with early Christianity.

¹R. Matzerath, The Prayer of Christ for Unity (John 17:20-24), Dissertatio ad Lauream in Facultate Theologica Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana (Romae: 1950), p. 15. It is worthwhile noting that in the schema De Ecclesia adopted by the Second Vatican Council in Rome on Nov. 21, 1964, no direct appeal is made to John 17; however, the schema does claim that the organized Roman Catholic Church, and it alone, is the one Church of Christ spoken of in the Nicene Creed. Cf. Constitution on the Church (Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, [Latin text published Nov. 25, 1964]), p. 8.

²Paul S. Minear, editor, The Nature of the Unity We

The present study seems justified in view of the quite widespread use made of John 17 and the relative dearth of any thorough exegesis of John 17. To the best of my knowledge no one has sought to investigate John 17, in particular against the background of a detailed study of John 10:30. In the second part (Chapter III) the

This investigation has sought to limit itself strictly to the Gospel of John. The writer attempted to understand the Gospel of John on its own terms. In some ways this effort has limited the study, especially since it precluded a thorough investigation of the nature of the church as delineated in the Pauline Epistles. Yet to understand John 17 the present approach is the only feasible one. The Gospel of John must be understood first of all on the basis of the book itself.

In this thesis the author of the Fourth Gospel is sometimes referred to simply as John. This procedure in no way is intended to enter into the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel but is used only because tradition has labeled the Fourth Gospel as the Gospel according to St. John.

The present thesis is divided into three parts. In

Seek (St. Louis, Missouri: The Bethany Press, 1958), p. 160. This book is the official report of the North American Conference on Faith and Order, Sept. 3-10, 1957, at Oberlin, Ohio.

the first part we examine every occurrence of the numeral $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in the New Testament. Our examination compelled us to conclude that the only valid way to arrive at the true meaning of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in John 10:30 and in John 17:11,21,22,23 is to study carefully the entire Fourth Gospel. In the second part (Chapter III) the relationship between Father and Son is considered. In the third part (Chapter IV) the concept of the oneness of the church is examined. Finally, in Chapter V the conclusions of Chapter IV and V are briefly presented. The reader is referred to Chapter V for a summary of the findings of this thesis.

Matthew, 0; Mark, 0; Luke, 0; Philimon, 0; Hebrews, 5; James, 3; I Peter, 0; II Peter, 3; I John, 1; II John, 0; III John, 0; Jude, 0; Revelation, 25; making a grand total of 337.²

Studies have been made showing the tremendous theological significance of the numeral $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in some of its occurrences in the New Testament.³ The purpose of this chapter, however, is not to show the theological meaning but rather to seek to classify the uses of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$.

²Robert Mergenthaler, Statistik Des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes (Zürich-Frankfurt am Main: Gotthelf Verlag, 1955), p. 92.

³Ibid.

³Schubert Stauffer, " $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch des Neuen Testaments, herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 432-440. In this article Stauffer has a section dealing with the oneness of the church. Stauffer's chief interest, however, seems

6

CHAPTER II

A CLASSIFICATION OF $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Greek word for "one," $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, and its feminine form $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, and its neuter form $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, occurs some 337 times in the Greek New Testament.¹ The frequency of occurrence in each of the New Testament books is as follows: Matthew, 66; Mark, 37; Luke, 44; John, 39; Acts, 21; Romans, 20; I Corinthians, 30; II Corinthians, 3; Galatians, 8; Ephesians, 15; Philippians, 4; Colossians, 2; I Thessalonians, 3; II Thessalonians, 1; I Timothy, 5; II Timothy, 0; Titus, 2; Philemon, 0; Hebrews, 5; James, 3; I Peter, 0; II Peter, 3; I John, 1; II John, 0; III John, 0; Jude, 0; Revelation, 25; making a grand total of 337.²

Studies have been made showing the tremendous theological significance of the numeral $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in some of its occurrences in the New Testament.³ The purpose of this chapter, however, is not to show the theological meaning but rather to seek to classify the uses of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$

¹Robert Morgenthaler, Statistik Des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes (Zürich-Frankfurt am Main: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958), p. 92.

²Ibid.

³Ethelbert Stauffer, " $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 432-440. In this article Stauffer has a section dealing with the oneness of the church. Stauffer's chief interest, however, seems

in the New Testament and to consider significant occurrences in the Gospel of John. The basic tools for this present study will be the standard Greek concordance⁴ and Greek-English lexicon.⁵

Walter Bauer has classified the New Testament occurrences of εἰς into five different categories, some of which are subdivided. Bauer's five major headings are: (1) literal, (2) emphatic, (3) indefinite, (4) perhaps Hebraistic, (5) special combinations.⁶ Bauer has not cited every occurrence of εἰς and so an attempt is made in this chapter to classify every New Testament occurrence.⁷

It also seems that Bauer has not recognized certain New Testament references which should form a separate category. In the following classification such passages

to be centered more upon occurrences of εἰς in Ephesians and he has given little attention to the relevant passages in the Gospel of John.

⁴W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek Testament (4th edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 299-303.

⁵Walter Bauer, "εἰς," A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, a translation and adaptation by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 229-231.

⁶Ibid.

⁷In this study the author has reworked all the New Testament references. Not every reference included in Bauer's lexicon may appear in exactly the same category in this study. The original guidelines were laid out by Bauer but the responsibility for the present classification belongs to the author.

will be grouped in a sixth category.

The Greek word εἰς, in its various genders and forms is used in the New Testament in the following ways:

I. Literal.

A. in contrast to more than one.

i. as an adjective.

Matthew	5:41	Acts	12:10
	13:46		21:7
	18:5		28:13
	25:15		28:25
	25:24	Romans	12:4
	27:15	I Corinthians	12:14
Mark	15:6		12:26
Luke	15:7	II Corinthians	11:2
	15:8	Colossians	3:15
	15:10	Titus	3:10
	16:17	Revelation	6:1
	17:34a		9:12
John	17:21	John	17:12
	10:16a,b.		6:8

ii. as a noun with partitive genitive.

Matthew	5:19	Matthew	18:6
Mark	5:29		18:10
	5:30		18:14
Luke	10:42		18:28
	16:14		20:13

John	20:24	Revelation	13:13
Matthew	25:40	Mark	14:66
Acts	11:28		15:17
	25:45	Luke	5:3
Revelation	5:5		17:1
	26:14		15:15
	26:47		15:19
	26:51		15:21

iv. as a noun but with meaning clear from immediate context.

	6:15		17:2
Matthew	18:16	Romans	17a,b
	8:28		17:22
	25:18		18a,b
	9:37		22:47
John	18:39	I Corinthians	23:39
Acts	1:24		19:27
	12:28	John	12:4
	13:1	II Corinthians	11:24
Romans	5:15a	Galatians	2:24
	14:10		19:34
	14:20	Hebrews	11:12
	14:43	Acts	23:17

iii. as a noun with ἐκ (It should be noted that the meaning is very similar to the previous section-- noun with partitive genitive).

Matthew	18:12	John	1:40
	22:35		6:8
	26:21	Ephesians	6:70
	27:48		6:71
Mark	9:17		12:2
	14:18		13:21
Luke	15:4		13:23
	17:15		18:26

John	20:24	Revelation	13:13
Acts	11:28		15:7
Revelation	5:5		17:1
	6:1		21:9
	7:13		

iv. as a noun but with meaning clear from immediate context.

Matthew	18:16	Romans	5:17a,b
	25:18		5:18a,b
John	18:39	I Corinthians	4:6
Acts	1:24		14:27
	4:32b	II Corinthians	11:24
Romans	5:15a	Galatians	4:24
	5:16a,b	Hebrews	11:12

B. as a modifying adjective used in contrast to the parts of which a whole is made up.

Matthew	19:5	I Corinthians	6:16
	19:6		6:17a,b
Mark	10:8		12:12
Romans	12:5		12:20
		Ephesians	2:15

C. with negative following εἰς . . . οὐ (μή),
stronger than οὐδεῖς .

Matthew	5:18		
	10:29		
Mark	8:14		

	11		
	10		
I Corinthians	10:8	Hebrews	12:16
Luke	11:46	James	2:10
	12:6	II Peter	3:8
Galatians	3:14	Revelation	17:13
Matthew	5:36		

(Here the negative occurs first but the result is the same).

II. Emphatically.

A. One and the same.

	1:6		
Luke	12:52	I Corinthians	12:11
Hebrews	10:12		
Acts	4:32a		12:13a,b,c
	10:14		
Romans	9:10	Ephesians	2:18
C. Alone.			
	15:6		4:4
i. as an adjective.			
I Corinthians	10:17		4:5
John	20:7		
	11:5		4:6
ii. as a substantive noun or a predicate			
	12:9	Philippians	1:27a,b
adjective with substantive force.			
	19:17	Revelation	17:17
Matthew		John	3:23

B. Single (only one).

Matthew	6:27	Romans	3:10
	20:12	John	8:41
	21:24		11:50
Mark	10:19		18:14
	23:15	I Corinthians	8:4
	26:40	Acts	1:22
	27:14		19:34
	10:42	II Corinthians	5:14
Luke	11:29	Galatians	3:16
Mark	12:6	Romans	5:12
	14:37		5:15b
	14:18	Philippians	5:19
	6:22	I Timothy	2:3
Luke		I Corinthians	8:6a,b
		James	2:19

I Corinthians	10:8	Hebrews	12:16
	12:19	James	2:10
Galatians	5:14	II Peter	3:8
I Timothy	3:2	Revelation	17:13
	3:12		18:8
	5:9		18:10
Titus	1:6		18:17
Hebrews	10:12		18:19
Mark	10:14		21:21b

C. Alone.

i. as an adjective.

John 20:7

ii. as a substantive noun or a predicate

adjective with substantive force.

Matthew	19:17	John	9:25
	23:8	Romans	3:10
	23:9		3:12
Mark	10:18		3:30
	10:21	I Corinthians	8:4
Matthew	12:29	Luke	9:24
	12:32	II Corinthians	5:14
Luke	10:42	Galatians	3:16
	18:22		3:20a,b
	23:17	Philippians	3:13
John	1:3	I Timothy	2:5
	6:22	James	2:19

James 4:12

III. Someone=classical $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, whereby $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ can mean exactly the same thing as the indefinite article.

A. Someone, anyone (there is some similarity between this group and some of the references under I. A. iv.).

Matthew 18:24

19:16

Mark 10:17

Luke 24:18

Often used with the partitive genitive following:

Matthew 6:29

Luke 5:12

5:17

8:22

12:27

13:40

20:1

B. As an indefinite article.

Matthew 8:19 Luke 22:59

9:18 Revelation 8:13

12:11 9:13

21:19 18:21

26:69 19:17

Mark 12:42

C. used with $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. 24:40 Mark 15:27

Mark 14:51($\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ is used only in certain manuscripts and is not included in the text by Nestle). 10:37 I Thessalonians 5:1

B. Used with the partitive genitive following:

Mark 14:47

Luke 22:50

John 11:49

IV. Hebraic (perhaps Hebraistic in its use with expressions denoting time instead of the ordinal number).

Matthew 28:1 Ephesians 4:7

Mark 4:8, 20⁸ 4:16

Acts 16:2 Colossians 4:6

Luke 24:1 I Thessalonians 5:11

John 20:1 II Thessalonians 1:3

20:19 Revelation 21:21a

Acts 20:7

V. Special combinations. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$, the one . . . the other.

A. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$. . . $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ (Classical $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. . . $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$).

Matthew 20:21

16:13a,b

⁸If $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$ 17:34 is to be read it is probably to be considered an Aramaism--thirty fold. Cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, a translation and revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 130, par. 248,3.

Matthew	24:40	Mark	15:27
	24:41	John	20:12
	27:38	Galatians	4:22
Mark	10:37	I Thessalonians	5:1

B. εἷς . . . εἷς . . . εἷς , one, another, a third.

Matthew	17:4
Mark	9:5
Luke	9:33

C. εἷς ἕκαστος , every, single--strengthening ἕκαστος .

Matthew	26:22	I Corinthians	12:18
Luke	4:40	Ephesians	4:7
	16:5		4:16
Acts	2:3	Colossians	4:6
	2:6	I Thessalonians	2:11
	17:27	II Thessalonians	1:3
	20:31	Revelation	21:21a
	21:26		

D. ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἕτερος , the one . . . the other.

Matthew	6:24a,b
Luke	7:41
	16:13a,b
	17:34b
	17:35
	17:36
	18:10
Acts	23:6

Hebrew E. ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἄλλος , the one . . . the other.

Revelation 17:10

I John F. καθ' ἑνα , καθ' ἑν .

In the last category John 21:25 I Corinthians 16:2

without an antecedent Acts 21:19 Ephesians 5:33

designator I Corinthians 14:31 Revelation 4:8

read G. εἷς κατὰ εἷς , one by one.

instances Mark 14:19

John 8:9 (This is a reading found in some manuscripts but not included in the text of Nestle).

VI. εἷς used as a substantive without an immediate antecedent.

John 10:30 ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμεν

the nature 11:52 ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ
can be ascertained διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγη εἰς ἑν.

takes into 17:11 ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς

the Gospel 17:21 ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσιν, καθὼς σὺ
Jesus and the Father πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν σοί, . . .

17:22 ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν,

disciples 17:23 ἵνα ᾧσιν τετελετωμένοι εἰς ἑν.

Acts 17:26 ἐποίησεν τε ἐξ ἑνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος
the Father and the Son ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν . . .

I Corinthians 3:8 ὁ φυτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτιζόμενος ἐν ἑσιν.

Galatians 3:28 πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἓστε
ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Ephesians 2:14 ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν . . .

Hebrews 2:11 ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ
 ἁγιαζόμενοι εἰς ἑνὸς πάντες
 I John 5:8 καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσὶν

In this last category, εἰς used as a substantive without an immediate antecedent, the concept which is designated cannot be arbitrarily assumed. It seems reasonable to conclude that the meaning of εἰς in such instances can be learned only by a careful study of the entire book in which the word occurs. It is on the basis of such a conclusion that the remainder of this thesis proceeds.

Jesus says in John 10:30 and 17:22 that He and the Father are εἷ . The following chapter will explore the nature of this oneness. The nature of this oneness can be ascertained only on the basis of a study which takes into consideration the statements made throughout the Gospel of John concerning the relationship between Jesus and the Father. In John 17:11,21,22,23 Jesus prays that His present disciples and also His future disciples might be εἷ . The fourth chapter will seek to apply the conclusions reached concerning the oneness of the Father and the Son to show what is meant by the oneness of the believers and also then in a derived sense, the oneness of the Church.

CHAPTER III

THE ONENESS OF FATHER AND SON IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Introduction

In John 10:30 Jesus says to the Jews, *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἑσμέν.* In this cryptic verse John has recorded a claim by our Lord whose full meaning is anything but obvious, in spite of its seeming simplicity. A correct understanding of this verse is all the more important because this verse is basic for the right interpretation of the prayer of our Lord for His disciples, both the disciples who stood with Him and those who would become His disciples, that they might be one (Jn. 17:11,21,22,23). In John 17:22 Jesus prays that "they might be one even as we are one." Here He makes no claim which might be contradicted. In praying to the Father Jesus speaks of this "oneness" as a relationship well known to both His Father and to Himself. But the thought of this verse (17:22) obviously builds upon the public claim made by Jesus and recorded by the author of this Gospel in 10:30.

The claim made by Jesus (10:30), that He and the Father are one, aroused a violent reaction. Jesus' opponents, who in the Gospel are referred to as

οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, took strong exception to what Jesus

claimed for Himself. They picked up stones to stone Him because they understood these words of Jesus to be a claim to deity. Yet the full meaning of the claim made by Jesus is not to be found in the reaction of the Jews. In order fully to understand the sense of $\epsilon\gamma$ ^{c/} as used in 10:30, it will be necessary to examine the scope of the entire Gospel of John to see what picture it paints of the relationship between Jesus and the Father. The author of this Gospel, who alone of the Gospel writers has preserved this claim by Jesus, has much to say of the relationship which exists between Jesus and the Father. A valid interpretation can only be made on the basis of material presented by the author of the Fourth Gospel.

The relationship which exists between Jesus and the Father is portrayed in the Gospel of John in several different ways. Some of the names which are used for Jesus are highly descriptive of the relationship. Some of the forms of address used by Jesus to address the Father further add to the picture of the relationship between Jesus and the Father. In addition to the titles of Jesus and the way in which Jesus addressed the Father some of the statements made by Jesus as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, help to fill in the total picture of what is meant by the claim, "I and the Father are one."

The writer of the Gospel applies many titles and

epithets to Jesus. They appear in the address of men to Jesus, or as titles used by Jesus of Himself, or they appear as titles given to Jesus by the author of the Gospel. Some titles are used in all three manners. A fairly comprehensive listing of titles, with no claim to complete inclusiveness, would include the following: the Logos (1:1,14); the only Son (3:16,18);¹ the Son (3:17,35,36; 5:19,20,21,22,23,26; 6:40; 8:35,36; 14:13; 17:1); the Son of God (1:34,49; 5:25; [9:35 in the footnote in Nestle's text]; 10:36; 11:4,27; 20:31); the Son of Man (1:51; 3:13,14; 5:27,53,62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23,24; 13:31); the Lamb of God (1:29,36); Rabbi, Teacher (1:38; 3:2; 6:25; 11:28; 13:13,14; 20:17); the Messiah [the Christ](1:41; 4:29; 7:26; 11:27; 17:4; 20:21); Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph (1:45); the King of Israel (1:49; 12:13); the Lord (4:1; 6:23; 11:2; 20:18,20,25,28; 21:7,12); the Savior of the World (4:42); the Prophet (6:14; 7:40); a Prophet (4:19; 9:17); the Holy One of God (6:69); the Bread of Life (6:35,48,51); the Light of the World (8:12; 9:5); the Door (10:7,9); the Good Shepherd (10:11,14); the Resurrection and the

¹If the Western texts were followed 1:18 would also be included here. Nestle rejects this reading and accepts as most probable the reading found in p⁶⁶ and the Hesychian or Alexandrian tradition. In this choice Nestle has likely chosen the correct reading.

Life (11:25); the Way and the Truth and the Life (14:6); the True Vine (15:1,5); Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews (19:19); the unqualified $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$ (8:24,28,58; 13:19).²

Several of these terms are especially important for understanding the relationship between Jesus and the Father. These are: the Logos, the Son, the $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ Son, the Son of God. The terms Logos, and Son, denote a relationship with the Father, and as they speak of this relationship with the Father they also tell us something of the person of Jesus.

The Logos

The term Logos in its peculiar sense appears only in the Prologue of the Gospel of John. While it is true that there is no direct identification of the Logos with the person of Jesus Christ in the first four verses of the Prologue yet in the context of the entire Prologue

² $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$ as spoken by Jesus is recorded in John's gospel four times in addition to the references cited in the text (6:20; 18:5,6,8). Barrett says that the term as used in 6:20 is merely self identification parallel to the use of $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$ by the man born blind (9:9). He is inclined to place the occurrences of $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$ found in chapter 18 in the same category (18:5,6,8) but he does say that the usage in chapter 18 may have overtones similar to those associated with the usage of $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$ in 8:24,28,58; 13:19. Cf. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (London: S. P. C. K., c.1958) pp. 234,434.

this identification seems inescapable. The Logos of whom John speaks (1:1-4) became flesh (1:14).³ Furthermore, John says that this Logos who became flesh was full of grace and truth. The identification is made complete when it is asserted that grace and truth came into being through Jesus Christ (1:17). There can hardly be any doubt that John is speaking of Jesus Christ when he speaks of the Logos, except that in 1:1-3 he thinks of Him in His pre-incarnate state.

But to understand what John means when he calls Jesus the Logos entails a consideration of the meaning of this term. There can be no doubt that the term is used in a special sense in John's Prologue. C. H. Dodd distinguishes between four usages of the word Logos in John.⁴ (1) Logos is used in the plural (λόγοι), in the obvious sense of "words" spoken by Jesus or by others. In this form it is interchangeable with ῥήματα. (2) Logos is used in the singular for a "saying," "statement," or "discourse" (2:19-22; 4:39; 12:38; 15:25).

³σάρξ is likely used in 1:14 in the same sense as in 1:13 referring to humanity as opposed to divinity. Here John expresses the paradox of the person of Jesus. The verb ἐγένετο is difficult to translate precisely. Barrett suggests its meaning in 1:14 is the same as in 1:6. He would then translate 1:14 as follows: "the Word came on the (human) scene as flesh, man." Cf. Barrett, p. 138.

⁴C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953), pp. 265-267.

(3) λόγος is used, summarily for the whole of what Jesus said, His "message," conceived as revelation and as a "command" to be obeyed (5:24; 15:3). (4) λόγος, qualified by αὐτοῦ, that is, "the Father" or τοῦ Θεοῦ is used of God's self-revelation to men. This Word of God is thought of as being embodied in the Old Testament (5:37,38; 10:35). Furthermore, in the Gospel of John the thought is presented with striking force that the Word of the Father is to be found in the λόγος of Jesus Christ (14:24; 17:14,17). This means that the word of Jesus is the word of God. The Prologue goes even a step further and identifies the Logos with Jesus. This assertion is without parallel in the New Testament.⁵ This fact, coupled with the fact that the "Logos" was a term widespread in Greek and Judaic thought (especially in the writings of Philo) has led to a great deal of discussion as to the origin of John's usage of the term Logos in his Prologue.

Oscar Cullman sketches the background of the "Logos" concept in both Hellenism and in Judaism.⁶ He points

⁵I John 1:1 and Revelation 19:13 are similar to the prologue. In both instances, however, λόγος is qualified by an adjective and so neither of these occurrences are full parallels to the Prologue in John's Gospel.

⁶Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 251-258.

out that this term occurred in the earliest period of Greek Philosophy in Heraclitus, and then especially in Stoicism. In Stoicism Logos is the cosmic law which rules the universe and at the same time is present in the human intellect. It is an abstraction, not a hypostasis. The term is also used in Platonism, but the Platonist did not identify its understanding of the Logos with John's incarnate Logos. C. K. Barrett says:

The word [logos] lent itself also to pantheistic use, and the earlier Stoics had no other god than *λόγος*, the rational principle in accordance with which the universe existed, and men, endowed in varying degrees with *σπερματικοὶ λόγοι*, were bound to frame their lives. In the fusion of Stoicism and Platonism which forms a diffuse but significant element in the background . . . a compromise was reached; the rational principle of the Stoic universe was the *λόγος* of God.

While the term "Logos" was widespread in philosophic circles, most commentators rightly call attention to the Old Testament background of this term \aleph \aleph \aleph . In later Judaism this Old Testament concept was further developed. In the Septuagint, the word *λόγος* occurs frequently. C. K. Barrett sees two groups of passages in the Septuagint.⁸ In the one group the word of God is creative (Gen. 1:3,6,9; Ps. 33:6). In the other, the

⁷C. K. Barrett, p. 127.

⁸Ibid.

word of the Lord is the prophet's message, the means¹² by which God communicates His purpose (Jer. 1:4; Ex. 1:3; Amos 3:1). Cullmann correctly notes that when one reflects upon the powerful effect of the creative word of God the idea emerges that every creative self-revelation of God to the world happens through His word.⁹ In the Old Testament it seems possible to notice a beginning of the personification of the word of God (Ps. 107:20; Is. 55:10). Cullmann however, maintains that a real hypostatic form of Logos is first found in Alexandrian Judaism.¹⁰ This personification of the word of God, he believes, may be due to the influence of a mediator figure found in pagan mythology,¹¹ yet Cullmann maintains due allowance must be made for the expressions in Genesis 1 about the operation of the word of God. Alexandrian Judaism came to speak of "the Word" and not of "the word of God." Yet Cullmann says that common to both the Old Testament concept of דבר and that of later Judaism

⁹Cullmann, p. 255.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 256.

¹¹This is the position of R. Bultmann, Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (12. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), pp. 8f.

(ὁ λόγος) is the concept of divine revelatory action.¹²

It would seem that the relationship between the first words of the Gospel of John (Ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ) and the first words of Genesis (בְּרֵאשִׁית, Ἐν ἀρχῇ) is significant. This verbal agreement would seem to indicate that the author is seeking to establish a direct connection between the life of Jesus and the Genesis story. It is possible that the writer of the Gospel was also influenced in the choice of the term "Logos" by its current use. But when John comes to say that this "Logos" became flesh in the person of Jesus Christ he leaves behind all philosophic speculations. By establishing a verbal link with Genesis John may be suggesting that the word of God which called the world into existence is the same as that which speaks to us in the life of Jesus. Cullmann claims that then "creation and the life of Jesus have the same denominator, 'Word', 'Revelation'."¹³

While there may be debate about the influence of various philosophic usages of the term Logos on John's meaning of the term it seems certain that John used the term "Logos" to emphasize not only the incarnate character

¹²Cullmann, p. 257.

¹³Ibid., p. 262.

of the Logos but also the revelatory nature of the person of Christ. In His person He reveals God. Both Barrett and Cullmann agree at this point. Cullmann says:

Nevertheless this title expresses very forcefully an important aspect of New Testament Christology--the unity in historical revelation of the incarnate and the pre-existent Jesus.¹⁴

Barrett says:

the term Logos is seen to describe God in the process of self-communication--not the communication of knowledge only, but in a self-communication which inevitably includes the imparting of true knowledge.¹⁵

This two-fold meaning in John's usage of Logos in his Prologue is significant for our understanding of the relationship between Jesus and the Father. In the Prologue we are told that this "Logos" who became flesh in the person of Jesus is Himself divine (καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος), He is God. Barrett says that θεός without the article is predicative and describes the nature of the Word. The absence of the article in John 1:1 indicates that the Word is God, but the Logos is not the only being of whom this is true. If ὁ θεός had been written the implication would have been that no divine being existed outside the second person of

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 258.

¹⁵ Barrett, p. 61.

the Trinity.¹⁶ Now at an historic moment (1:14) God's revelation came to man clothed in flesh. John 1:1 says much about the pre-existence of Christ, His relation to God and His role in Creation (without Him was not anything made that was made). But the Prologue asserts just as emphatically that in Jesus men are confronted by the revelation of God (Jn. 1:18 ἐξηγήσατο). Cullmann writes:

The word of Jesus--the word he preached--plays such an important part in the whole Gospel of John that one can hardly assume the evangelist did not think also of this 'word' when in the prologue he identified Jesus himself as the Logos. The supposition that he did so is suggested even more strongly by the basic Johannine thought that Jesus not only brings revelation, but in his person is revelation. He brings light, and at the same time he is Light; he bestows life, and he is Life; he proclaims truth, and he is Truth. More properly expressed, he brings light, life and truth just because he himself is Light, Life, and Truth. So it is also with the Logos: he brings the word, because he is the Word.¹⁷

The very person of Jesus is revelation, revelation of the Father. Jesus stands in such a relationship to

¹⁶Ibid., p. 130. The omission of the definite article may also be purely grammatical. E. C. Colwell has established the rule that definite predicate nouns which precede the verb normally omit the article. Cf. E. C. Colwell, "A Definite Rule for the use of the Article in the Greek New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, III (April 1933), 12-21. This rule seems to have found acceptance in the latest Greek Grammars. Cf. Nigel Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Syntax (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), III, 183.

¹⁷Cullmann, p. 259.

the Father that everything He says and does reveals the Father. The stress thus falls upon a functional relationship between Him to the Father although the Prologue does not rule out an ontological relationship. Here again Cullmann has a significant comment.

Although the prologue begins by referring to the being of the Word with God even before the time of creation, the evangelist is already thinking of the function of this Word, his action. The essential character of the Logos is action; God's self-revelation consists in action. Even if the author does make several marginal references to the being of the Logos, he nevertheless knows that there is such a being only in view of his action, that in the final analysis by his very nature the being of the Logos is his action.¹⁸

It may safely be said that the Gospel of John was written from the vantage point of mature theological reflection. The choice of the term "Logos" was no doubt deliberate, and may have been suggested by contemporary speculations about a divine hypostasis. Nevertheless the point which the author also wished to make was that all divine revelation centered in the person of Jesus Christ.¹⁹ Such an understanding of Logos agrees with a statement made by Jesus toward the close of His ministry, "he that hath seen me has seen

¹⁸Ibid., p. 265.

¹⁹In a book published in 1894 George Stevens makes exactly this point. He says that to emphasize the pre-existence and union with God, and to present the thought that, as the eternal Son, Jesus was the medium of divine revelation in all ages, John employs the term Logos. George Barker Stevens, The Johannine Theology; a study

the Father" (14:9).

The Son

Two basic phrases in John's Gospel describe Jesus as a son; the one speaks of him as the Son of God, and the other as the Son of Man. In addition to these two terms Jesus is spoken of simply as the Son or the only Son. These last terms, however, "Son" and "Only Son" are related to the term "Son of God." Often when the term Son is used of Jesus in the Gospel of John, John makes immediately clear that he is speaking of the Son's relationship to God (Jn. 3:16,17,35; 5:19,25).

The Son of God

Rudolf Bultmann traces the origin of the term "Son of God" to Hellenism. He asserts that the term "Son of God" was applied to Jesus by Hellenistic Christianity which accepted the Hellenistic term.²⁰ In this sense, so Bultmann claims, it was intended by the early church

of the doctrinal contents of the Gospel and Epistle of the Apostle John (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1894), p. 101.

²⁰Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 128-130.

to assert the divinity of Christ.²¹ But both Vincent Taylor and Oscar Cullmann point out that the term "son of God" appears in the Old Testament.²² Its use in the Old Testament provides a valuable clue for an understanding of the New Testament term, "Son of God."

In the Old Testament God's people are alluded to as "Son of God." In Exodus 4:22f. Moses is commanded to say to Pharaoh, "Israel is my first born son." In Hosea 11:1 Yahweh says, "Out of Egypt I called my son." The Israelites as a people are called "sons" in Isaiah 1:2; 30:1, "faithless sons" in Jeremiah 3:22. Cullmann concludes that all the Old Testament references to Israel as God's Son use the title Son of God to express "both the idea that God has chosen this people for a special mission, and that this his people owes him absolute obedience."²³ In the Old Testament the King, too, was addressed by God as "Son;" "I will be his father and he shall be my son" (II Sam. 7:14); "You are my son, today I have begotten you" (Ps. 2:7); "He [the king] shall cry unto me, 'Thou art my Father, my God,

²¹Ibid., p. 129.

²²Cullmann, pp. 272-275. Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1953), pp. 52f.

²³Cullmann, p. 273.

and the Rock of my salvation'" (Ps. 89:26). The king is "son" because he was especially chosen and commissioned by God. Cullmann concludes that the Old Testament concept of the Son of God

is essentially characterized, not by the gift of a particular power, nor by a substantial relationship with God by virtue of divine conception; but by the idea of election to participation in divine work through the execution of a particular commission, and by the idea of strict obedience to the God who elects.²⁴

In the Synoptic gospels the term "Son of God" seems to be applied to Jesus more in the sense of the Old Testament concept rather than in the sense of Hellenism. According to Bultmann a familiar Hellenistic accent in the term "Son of God" was the application to men of the mythological idea of being begotten by a god; especially to men "who seemed by their heroic deeds, mental accomplishments or benefactions to humanity to transcend ordinary human proportions."²⁵ On the contrary, the Synoptics picture Jesus as the Son of God because of his obedience to the Father and never in connection with miracles in which His power was manifested. Cullmann remarks with reference to the temptations recorded by Matthew:

²⁴ Ibid., p. 275.

²⁵ Bultmann, I, 130.

It is highly significant that Jesus rejects as satanic also the suggested 'Hellenistic' conception of his divine sonship in the sense of miraculous powers. The point of the first two temptations is not whether Jesus believes that God's miraculous power is present in the Son, but whether he will be disobedient to his Father by attempting to use that power apart from the full filial to his specific commission as the Son.²⁶

Of chief importance for this study, however, is the significance of the term "Son of God" in the Gospel of John. For John Jesus is the Son of God in a unique manner (1:14,18; 3:16,18). In these verses he uses the term *μονογενής*. Bultmann says that this designation is to be understood on the basis of its use in the Septuagint as a epithet of value meaning "beloved above all," and is synonymous with *ἀγαπητός*.²⁷ Bauer says the basic meaning of the word is "only" (Josephus, Antiquities 1, 222; Judges 11:34; Luke 7:12; 9:38). Bauer says that it also has the meaning of unique, or only one of its kind (Cornutus 27, p. 49,13 *εἰς κ. μονογενής ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ μονογενῆ μόνα ἐστίν*). He says that the meaning "unique" or "only" may be quite adequate for the occurrences in John.²⁸ Stevens, in

²⁶Cullmann, p. 277.

²⁷Bultmann, II, 35.

²⁸Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature, translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 529.

his theology rightly observes:

It [*μονογενής*] is not used in the sense of the Athanasian creed, to denote an eternal process of generation as contrasted with an act of creation. It is employed to add emphasis to the idea of Christ's unique relation to God as the perfect object of the divine love and the perfect representative of the divine will.²⁹

Because Jesus has this unique relationship with God so too He, as the Son of God, executes the Father's will here upon earth (5:25,26). It is true that implied in this term is the claim to identification with God. This is what caused such a reaction by the Jews (10:33,36). Nevertheless, Jesus as the Son of God is presented by John as the one who does the Father's work here upon earth (7:16; 8:28). There is a oneness of will and work which exists between Jesus and the Father which extends even to the participation of the Son in the restoration of physical life (11:41-44).

Though this title does describe the Messianic office of Jesus and speaks of His unique relation to

²⁹Stevens, p. 125. In an article in The Journal of Biblical Literature, Dale Moody summarizes an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Francis Marion Warden, "Monogenes in the Johannine Literature" written in 1938. Moody says that Warden demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that Monogenēs means "uniqueness of being, rather than any remarkableness of manner of coming into being. . . ." Cf. Dale Moody, "God's Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXII (1953), 214.

the Father,³⁰ yet the observation of Cullmann must also be kept in mind, indeed it deserves prominence. He says that the two themes which appear in the Synoptic gospels, that of obedience and unity in revelatory action are present also in the "Son of God" concept in the Gospel of John.³¹ He writes:

Similarly, the unity of the 'Son of God' with the Father is based on the fact, expressed also by Jesus himself, that he is the only and beloved Son just because he obediently fulfils the Father's commission for the world: 'I can do nothing on my own authority; . . . I seek not my own will but the will of the one who sent me' (John 5:30). A oneness of essence exists because there is a complete oneness of will. 'My food is to do the will of the one who sent me, and to accomplish his work' (John 4:34).³²

The Father-Son concept.

The concept of Sonship is so dominant in the Gospel of John that it demands further consideration. Some of the material to be considered now has been alluded to briefly in the preceding consideration of the term "Son of God," but its meaning must be explored further by considering the "Father-Son" complex in John. In a consideration of this concept close attention must be

³⁰ Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated by John Marsh (New York: Macmillan, 1955), p. 113.

³¹ Cullmann, p. 299.

³² Ibid., pp. 299f.

given to statements made by Jesus about Himself as Son and about His Father.

Even as the word *μονογενής* speaks of the unique and distinctive nature of the sonship of Jesus, so, too, does the emphatic manner in which Jesus refers to the Father as "my Father." In this Gospel Jesus speaks of "my Father" (ὁ πατήρ μου) twenty-four times. In an article by Harold Greenlee attention is directed to this peculiarity. Greenlee says that it is apparent that Jesus sometimes says "my Father" with an intentional emphasis, and purposely avoids using such a phrase as "our Father" which would have been acceptable to the Jews (5:17; 6:32,40; 8:19; 14:2,7).³³ Earlier in his article Greenlee had observed:

Although Jesus commonly refers to God both as his father and as father of the faithful, nowhere does the New Testament quote him as referring to God as "our Father" in a sense which includes himself together with other people. The only New Testament instance of Jesus' use of the phrase "our Father" is the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:9); but in this instance he is not including himself, but only teaching the disciples what they should say when they pray.

John 20:17 gives Jesus a seemingly ideal opportunity to say "our Father". He could have said, "I ascend to our Father, and to our God". Yet here Jesus significantly avoids classing his relationship to the Father with that even of his disciples,

³³Harold Greenlee, "'My Father'. The Significance of the manner in which Jesus refers to God as Father," The Bible Translator, VI, 3 (1955), 121.

saying instead, "I ascend to my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God".³⁴

There can be little doubt that the Jews understood Jesus to be claiming some special relationship to God by his use of the phrase "my Father." On one occasion the Jews themselves claimed that God was their father (Jn. 8:41). But already in John 5:18 John records that the Jews reacted violently when Jesus referred to God as "my Father."

Jesus is the Son of God in the unique and distinctive sense of being the *μονογενὴς υἱός*. But the question remains to be answered, "What relationship exists between Father and Son?" It has already been advanced³⁵ that in the term "Son of God" there is a twofold thrust, that of obedience and of revelatory action. A further consideration of the Father-Son concept re-enforces this premise.

Jesus, as the Son, was sent into the World by the Father. John uses two verbs both of which mean "to send" (*ἀποστέλλω*, *πέμπω*). Karl Heinrich Rengstorf has an extended study of *ἀποστέλλω* in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.³⁶ He traces the meaning

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 120f.

³⁵ Supra, p. 34.

³⁶ [Karl Heinrich] Rengstorf, "*ἀποστέλλω*," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,

of ἀποστέλλω to the Septuagint and the Hebrew נָשַׁל . In the Septuagint ἀποστέλλω is a technical term for the sending of a messenger with a special task; the messenger himself does not have to be named (Gen. 31:4; 41:8,14). Rengstorf says in secular Greek ἀποστέλλω was used to describe one sent with a commission. However, in the Gospel of John we are confronted with the fact that these two verbs, ἀποστέλλω, and πέμπω are used in close proximity (5:23,24,30,33,36,37; 6:29,38; 7:28,29). Rengstorf says of this phenomenon:

Eine deutliche Sonderstellung nimmt das Johannes-evangelium ein. Hier scheint ἀποστέλλειν wirklich völlig promiscue mit πέμπειν verwendet zu werden; denn wie Jesus zur Kennzeichnung seiner Vollmacht den Juden gegenüber ebenso wie vor seinen Jüngern das Wort ἀποστέλλειν benützt und damit ausdrückt, dass hinter seinen Worten und seiner Person Gott selbst steht und nicht etwa sein eigenes Begehren, und wie er darum auch gerade im Gebete mit diesem Worte sein Verhältnis zu Gott umschreibt, so finden wir doch in engster Verbundenheit damit auch πέμπειν verwendet, und zwar keineswegs so, dass ein Bedeutungsunterschied sich von selbst nahelegte. Bei näherem Zusehen fällt aber auf, dass der johanneische Jesus, wenn er von seiner Sendung durch Gott spricht und dabei πέμπειν gebraucht, das so tut, dass er von Gott als dem Πέμψας με redet. Dieser Sprachgebrauch ist bei Jesus ganz ausschliesslich [in John] auf Gott beschränkt, wobei die Formel $\alpha\tau\ \tau\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\psi\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ erweitert wird; umgekehrt gebraucht Jesus andere Formen von πέμπειν wenn er es von sich sagt.³⁷

herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), I, 397-448.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 403f.

Rengstorf concludes:

Der zunächst recht seltsame Tatbestand findet seine Erklärung darin, dass im Johannesevangelium ἀποστέλλειν von Jesus da gebraucht wird, wo es sich um die Begründung seiner Autorität in Gottes Autorität als der Autorität des für seine Worte und Werke Verantwortlichen und sich für ihr Recht und ihre Wahrheit Verbürgenden handelt, dass dagegen die Formel ὁ πέμψας με (πατήρ) dazu dient, die Beteiligung Gottes am Werke Jesu eben in der actio seiner Sendung festzustellen--eine Deutung, die völlig mit der joh Anschauung von Jesus als dem harmoniert, dessen "Werk aus Gottes Werk entsteht" und durch den "Gottes Wirken . . . sein Ziel herstellt".³⁸

It may be that Rengstorf has drawn a little too neat a distinction between ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω in John. The fact, however, cannot be ignored that John speaks of Jesus as one who has been sent by the Father to execute the Father's work here upon earth.

In several key passages the concept of Father-Son plays an important role. In these passages the emphasis of being sent is to be noted. But what is more important is that these passages tell us a good deal of what is involved in the fact that Jesus is the Son.

John 5:19-39

In this passage the word υἱός appears some nine times, the word πατήρ appears some eleven times, πέμπω appears some four times, and ἀποστέλλω

³⁸ Ibid., p. 404.

appears twice. The significance of these words comes to light when the entire passage is analyzed. In this section John states that the Son does not act independently of the Father but He does the same works as the Father because the Father has shown Him all that He does (vv. 19,20). The Son is given power to give life, a work of the Father (v. 21), and the Son has been given all judgment by the Father (v. 22). Therefore it is of utmost importance for all to hear the words which Jesus speaks if a person is to escape judgment and come into eternal life (v. 24). These above thoughts are underscored in the next section (vv. 25-36). In the judgment which Jesus renders He does not act independently but in accordance with the will of the Father (v. 30). The works which Jesus does, therefore, bear witness that He has been sent by the Father (v. 36).

The Son does not act independently but in full harmony with the Father. Furthermore, the way to believe in the Father is to hear the words of Jesus (v. 24). Conversely, men will never hear the words of the Father except by believing in Jesus who has been sent by the Father. The Son, as the one who has been sent, is the vehicle of revelation. Through Him the Father is revealed. Man by himself cannot see the Father or hear the Father or receive the Word of the Father except

through the One whom the Father has sent (vv. 37,38).

John 6:25-71
 The statements made in this section are again made

in the setting of the Father-Son relationship. In verses 25-34 Jesus speaks very pointedly of "my Father." At the same time Jesus speaks of the work which His Father has given Him to do; He is to bestow eternal life upon those who believe in Him (vv. 27,40,54,68). Jesus calls Himself the bread of life (v. 35,48) which men must partake of if they are to receive eternal life. Finally the thought culminates in an eschatological picture as Jesus says that He is the one who will raise up the believers at the last day (vv. 39,40,44,54). This work of Jesus has been entrusted to Him by the Father (6:40; compare 5:19-24).

Jesus fulfilled the function intended by the Father. He came not to do His own will but the will of the Father who sent Him (v. 38). No one can see the Father (v. 46), therefore the will of the Father can only be known as revealed in the word and work of Jesus (compare 7:16,17 28,29).

In this section the theme recurs that eternal life comes to men through Jesus (8:51; compare 6:27,40,54,68).

John 8:12-59
 In this section Jesus claims that He is the light of life He does not act independently of the Father but in

of the world. Such a claim immediately arouses the enmity of the Pharisees who assert that Jesus is bearing witness to Himself. This reaction of the Pharisees led Jesus to explain in greater detail the implications of His claim that He is the Son and that God is His Father. Throughout this chapter Jesus claims that He has been sent by the Father (v. 16,18,26,29,etc.). Jesus, as the Son who has been sent, claims that He is the Father's organ of revelation. Jesus declares only that which He has heard from the Father (v. 26); He does nothing on His own authority but speaks as the Father taught Him (v. 28); He always does what is well pleasing to the Father (v. 29). The revelation which Jesus brings is sure and certain because it is not based upon speculation; Jesus speaks of that which He has seen when He was with the Father. It was not His own idea to come into the world but it was the Father's will that He should come into the world. Jesus acted in obedience to the Father's will (v. 42). The claim is implicit in verse 47 that when Jesus speaks God the Father speaks, and that whoever rejects the words of Jesus, rejects the words of God.

In this section the theme recurs that eternal life comes to men through Jesus (8:51; compare 6:27,40,54,68). It is to be noted that Jesus emphasizes that in giving life He does not act independently of the Father but in

obedience to the Father. Jesus has one aim; He desires to do the will of the Father. As Jesus does the work which has been given him by the Father and speaks the words of the Father, He reveals the Father to the world. As men come to know the Son they are also led to a knowledge of the Father.

The thought that Jesus by His words and work reveals the Father, as noted in chapters 5-8, first appeared in the Prologue (1:18). It is true that there is a textual problem as to the correct reading, whether it should read the only God or the only Son. Nevertheless it is clear that the reference is to Jesus. John declares that He who is in the bosom of the Father has interpreted the unseen God. Jesus has made the Father known to men.

The claim that Jesus is the revealer of the Father reaches its climax in the farewell addresses which Jesus directed to His disciples in the Upper Room on the night of His betrayal. In the course of the evening Philip asked, "Lord, show us the Father and we will be satisfied." Jesus replied, "Have I been with you so long, and yet you do not know me, Philip? He who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, 'Show us the Father'? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I say to

you I do not speak on my own authority; but the Father who dwells in me does his works" (14:9,10; compare 12:44,45).³⁹

John 10:22-39

During the feast of the Dedication observed in Jerusalem, Jesus was again confronted by the Jews and challenged to tell them plainly whether or not He was the Christ. They charged that He had been keeping them in suspense. Jesus suggests that their persistent refusal to believe the works which He had done was the cause of their suspense. Jesus had performed many works which bore witness to who He was. Jesus then charged that the reason they did not believe was that they did not belong to His sheep. Jesus said, "The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness to me; but you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and

³⁹Bultmann's comments are worth noting. Bultmann says, "In the person of the man Jesus---and only in him---is God Himself to be met. . . . In the work of Jesus, therefore, God appears, but God is not perceptible, as Philip's request implies, to the gaze of an observer. He is perceptible only to that man who has the openness to let himself be reached by the work of Jesus" Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), II, 49f.

they follow me; and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand" (10:26--28). The sheep are secure in Jesus' hands because He and the Father, who is greater than all,⁴⁰ are one (10:29,30). No one can snatch the sheep

⁴⁰There is a textual problem in John 10:29 which is very confusing. The phrase "who has given them to me, is greater than all" (RSV) is the translation of a Greek text which is one among five possible readings. The correct Greek text could be one of the five following:

- (a) ὁ δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μετῶν B (it vg) boh;
- (b) ὁ δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μετῶν ἰ' W sah;
- (c) ὁ δέδωκέν μοι μετῶν πάντων W sin pesh hl p⁶⁶ p⁷⁵
- (d) ὁ δέδωκέν μοι μετῶν πάντων A ④
- (e) ὁ δέδωκώς μοι πάντων μετῶν D

Nestle's Greek text has the (a) reading. Bernard also says that this reading has the better textual tradition. Cf. J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), II, 347. There are, however, grave difficulties with this reading in spite of its acceptance by such renowned men with whom Westcott also agrees. Cf. Brooke Foss Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John ([a reprint of the 1898 edition]; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), II, 67,76. The neuter reading would throw the thrust upon the sheep--that which my Father has given me is greater than all. If we read the masculine relative ὁ δέ, the emphasis falls upon the Father as the one who gave the sheep into Jesus' hand and is thus greater than all. Barrett says that if we accept the masculine readings the argument runs: No one shall snatch them out of my hand; my Father who has given them to me is greater than all others; no one therefore can snatch them out of his hand. This is straightforward and makes good sense. Cf. C. K. Barrett, p. 317. It would seem that the addition of two of the latest papyri, p⁶⁶ and p⁷⁵

out of the hand of Jesus because this power of the Father which transcends all other powers, visible and invisible, is also His power (Cf. I Jn. 4:4). By stating that the sheep are safe in Jesus' hands, because He and the Father are one, and so this great power of the Father is also His power, the emphasis falls upon the functional relationship which exists between Jesus and the Father.

The emphasis which Cullmann noted as characteristic of the title "Son of God"⁴¹ is reaffirmed by this consideration of the Father-Son relationship.

As the Son, Jesus was obedient to the Father in all

would lend great weight to Barrett's argument. Bernard says that to accept the neuters in this phrase would do violence to the context. The context stresses the weakness of the sheep and their dependence upon the Shepherd, and so Bernard prefers the masculine readings to the neuter even though he believes that the neuter has the best textual evidence. Cf. Bernard, II, 348. It may be that if Bernard had the evidence of p⁸⁶ and p⁷⁵ he would have had the textual evidence for what he believed was the best reading. It may be that the neuter form $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\beta\omega\nu$ is the correct form (cf. the neuter $\epsilon\upsilon$ in v. 30), and that this is responsible for the alteration of the masculine $\delta\varsigma$ to the neuter δ' . However, whether one reads $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\beta\omega\nu$ or $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\beta\omega\nu$ the thought is not changed substantially as long as one reads the masculine relative $\delta\varsigma$. Rudolf Bultmann concurs with Bernard that the correct readings must be the masculine. Cf. R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp. 294f. This is the reading I have accepted. There is good textual evidence for this reading and it fits most naturally with the context. The phrase then says that the power of the Father is unlimited. It transcends that of any other power, visible or invisible.

⁴¹Supra, p. 34. Cf. Cullmann, p. 299.

things. He did not seek His own will, He did not act independently of the Father; His acts were not capricious nor thoughtless, but in all His sayings and activities we note this overriding consciousness that Jesus was doing the works of the Father, He was not doing His own will but came down to do the will of the Father. He was obedient to the Father, seeking not His own glory but the glory of the Father. As He executed the works of the Father upon earth He was the organ of revelation. The Father is made known through the works and words of Jesus. Stevens correctly observes:

It is doubtless true that the ethical aspect of Jesus' relation to God and of the mission given him by the Father, is what is most prominently brought forward in the passages which speak of his sonship. This is what the practical and historical character of the Gospel should lead us to expect. The Gospel is not a treatise on the metaphysical nature of Christ, but an account of the way in which he revealed God. His perfect harmony with the Father's will, and his consequent fitness to accomplish the work of man's salvation, are naturally made especially prominent.⁴²

Others go farther and assert that beyond this functional relationship between Jesus and the Father pictured in the Gospel of John, there is also pictured an ontological relationship. In a recent article (1961), D. O. Via says:

⁴²Stevens, pp. 113f.

We had already noted that Father and Son are one so that to see the Son is to see the Father. Alongside this is the notion of mutual indwelling found in (17:21-23; 14:10-11,20 [10:38]). This oneness is not a matter of static essence for it expresses itself in action. God does His works in Jesus (14:10) or Jesus does God's works (5:17, 19; 8:28-29; 9:4). This, however, is not merely an external relationship of obedience, for God and Jesus share the same life (5:26). And this finally is grounded in God's love for Jesus and Jesus' responsive love for God (5:20; 3:35; 14:31). If John had understood Jesus' divine status purely in terms of a relationship to God he would have omitted the mutual indwelling passages and the statement that the Father gave the Son to have life in Himself (not to mention others). I think that it can hardly be denied that there are ontological as well as relational elements in John's Christology. . . .⁴³

It seems, however, that Via stresses a point which John did not intend to stress. Certainly, only few scholars would say that John denies an ontological relationship between Jesus and the Father. But the point must be raised whether or not the ontological relationship between Father and Son is a thrust in John's Christology. It might well be questioned whether the mutual indwelling passages really refer to an ontological relationship between the Father and the Son. In two places where Jesus says that He is in the Father and the Father in Him, He also speaks of being in the believer and the believer in Him (14:20; 17:21). If

⁴³D. O. Via, "Darkness, Christ, and the Church in the Fourth Gospel," Scottish Journal of Theology, XIV, 2 (1961), 180.

on the one hand these verses speak of an ontological relationship between Jesus and the Father, they also speak, so one must infer, of an ontological relationship between the believers and Jesus and the Father. To assert an ontological relationship between the believers and Jesus goes beyond the teaching not only of John but of the entire New Testament.

In 10:37,38, Jesus claims to be doing the work of God. He appeals to His audience to consider His works, even though they may be offended by His person. He appeals to them to note that the works which He does are really divine works; yes, they are the Father's works. Though they may take offense at the person of Jesus, yet if they would consider His works without prejudice they would have to acknowledge that the works which He did were the works of God the Father. Jesus had come forth from the Father and been sent into the world, but in this coming forth He is not separated from the Father in the sense that He goes an independent way and pursues His own ends. On the contrary, He acts in obedience to the Father's will, He performs the Father's work so that in seeing Jesus men are confronted with the Father.

T. W. Manson, in a recent study, says that the phrase "the Father is in me and I am in the Father"

(10:38) suggests that the unity between the Father and Son is thought of in terms of identity of will rather than identity of substance. He adds that the unity between Father and Son consists in the fact that the Son thinks the Father's thoughts, wills the Father's purpose, and acts in the Father's power. Manson then turns to the First Epistle of John for the parallel thought of believers abiding in the Father (I John 2:23,24), parallels which have already been noted in the Gospel of John (14:20; 17:21).⁴⁴

CONCLUSION

The oneness of the Son with the Father (10:30) is shown by the immediate context to be a functional rather than an ontological oneness. Jesus exercises this all-transcendent power of the Father and so the sheep are safe in His hands. Our consideration of other sections of John has given greater weight to such an interpretation of the oneness of Father and Son. The Son does the Father's work here upon earth and it is through the Son that men are brought into

⁴⁴T. W. Manson, On Paul and John: Some selected Theological Themes, No. 38 of Studies in Biblical Theology edited by Matthew Black (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963), pp. 133f.

confrontation with the Father. The work of judgment and of granting life to whom He would, has been entrusted by the Father to the Son (5:21,22). All of the works which Jesus did were the works of the Father and He did them because it was the Father's will (6:38; 10:25). As the obedient Son Jesus reveals the Father in all His works. This function of Jesus as the revealer was already indicated in the Prologue. Jesus as the Logos made the Father known (1:1-4,18).

As the revealer of the Father Jesus stands in a unique relationship to the Father. He is the unique son, the only one of its kind and while the disciples also have God as Father they do not have God as Father in the same sense as does Jesus (20:17). Yet John's presentation of the relationship between Jesus and the Father always emphasizes the functional nature of the oneness of the Father and the Son. Jesus does the works of the Father and speaks the words of the Father. Through Jesus men are confronted by the Father. Jesus is the Revealer of the Father.

Finally the scope of the prayer broadens to include all future believers (xvii. 20-26). Christ prays that they may all be brought into the perfect unity of the divine life as shared by Father and Son. Christ will thus be manifested to the world, and His own will be with Him, will have the vision of the glory of God, and will experience the divine life in its fulness." E. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1933), pp. 417f.

CHAPTER IV

THE ONENESS OF THE CHURCH IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Introduction

The seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of John is traditionally called "The Highpriestly Prayer" of our Lord. In this chapter John has recorded the last lengthy prayer of Jesus.¹ In it He prays for Himself (vv. 1-8); He prays for His Apostles (vv. 9-19); He prays for all future Believers (vv. 20-26).²

¹There are many commentators who say that we cannot know whether or not John 17 records the actual words of Jesus. It is not my purpose here to enter into a discussion of this question. I take it that this prayer as recorded in John 17 is substantively that which was prayed by Jesus. My purpose is only to try to understand what the text itself says.

²C. H. Dodd has outlined this chapter in the following way: "The central portion of the prayer (xvii. 9-19) contemplates the disciples in their situation in the world after Christ's departure οὐκέτι εἰμι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐξοίην ; commissioned to carry on His work (xvii. 18) and exposed to the hatred which brought Him to the cross (xvii. 14). He prays that they may be kept in God's 'name' (11), preserved from evil (15) and sanctified in the truth (19); that they may be one and have fulness of joy (13).

Finally the scope of the prayer broadens to include all future believers (xvii. 20-26). Christ prays that they may all be brought into the perfect unity of the divine life as shared by Father and Son. Christ will thus be manifested to the world, and His own will be with Him, will have the vision of the glory of God, and will experience the divine ἀγάπη in its fulness." C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953), pp. 417f.

One of the significant petitions which appears in both sections of this prayer is found in the words ἵνα ὣσιν ἐν (17:11,21,22,23). But this phrase does not stand in isolation. In the first three instances (vv. 11,21,22) the intended meaning of the petition is given by the addition of a comparison. In verse 11 the petition reads: ἵνα ὣσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς; in verse 21 it reads: ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὣσιν, καθὼς σὺ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί; and in verse 22 it reads: ἵνα ὣσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν. In all three instances the word καθὼς appears. This word is a conjunction which is used to compare two things.³ It is important to note that when καθὼς is used the first proposition presented is subordinated to the second proposition.⁴ This means

³Walter Bauer, "καθὼς," A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c.1957), p. 392. Blass-Debrunner lists καθὼς as a comparative conjunction under the classification of Subordinating Conjunctions. Cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, a translation and revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c.1961), p. 236, #453.

⁴In a brief article in The Expository Times, T. Evan Pollard states that in the early christological controversies the Arians tried to reverse the comparison. The Arians tried to work from the oneness of the disciples to the oneness of Father and Son (Jn. 10:30). Athanasius responded to this and stated that their

that the oneness for which Jesus prays is to be like the oneness which exists between the Father and Himself. Chapter III of this Thesis concluded that the oneness which exists between Father and Son as presented in the Fourth Gospel is a oneness which is basically functional and not primarily ontological. When this interpretation is applied to the phrase "that they may be one" (17:11,21,22,23) it almost certainly rules out any possibility that Jesus was specifically praying for any kind of an organizational unity.⁵ The question

method of interpretation was in error. Athanasius showed that in each of the three places where Jesus prays for the unity of His disciples with one another, the unity is compared with a higher unity, the unity of the Father and the Son. Therefore, Athanasius said, the unity of believers with one another must be compared with the higher unity of Father and Son, and not vice versa. Cf. T. Evan Pollard, "'That They All May Be One' (John xvii. 21)--and the Unity of the Church," The Expository Times, LXX, 5 (1959), 149.

⁵This interpretation is unacceptable to the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church claims to be the only church. Even the phrase "separated brethren" currently used (1965) by Pope Paul VI, (popularized by Pope John XXIII), while it is intended to be a charitable term to designate those non-Roman Catholics whom the Pope recognizes as Christians, still it implies that the Roman Catholic Church is the one church--no other Christian Church exists. It seems to be no accident that most Roman Catholic interpreters interpret the oneness of the Father and the Son in an ontological sense. In this way they arrive at a perfect apology for the Roman Catholic claim to be the one Church. In a dissertation presented to the Facultas Theologica Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, R. Matzerath expresses this thought. He says that the disciples will be one in heart as the Father and Jesus are one by nature. In

is then raised, "What other kind of unity is there besides organizational unity?"

The Oneness of the Disciples

Jesus was one with the Father in that He fully and completely fulfilled the Father's will here upon earth. He was the obedient Son who sought not His own will but the will of Him who sent Him (4:34; 5:30; 6:38). Jesus was sent to reveal the Father. This work He fulfilled (Jn. 14:9). Jesus and the Father never worked at cross purposes but were always in full accord because Jesus did not seek to work independently of the Father. He submitted to the scourging and the crucifixion because the Father so willed it (Jn. 18:11).

In John 17:9-19 Jesus prays for His disciples who will shortly be on their own *καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς σὲ ἕρξομαι*, that they would be of one will and mind and purpose

another section of his work he says that the unity of faithful must be of an exalted nature because it is based upon the ideal unity of the Father and the Son. From this it then follows that the faithful must be one in a body, a society, a Church. Cf. R. Matzerath, The Prayer of Christ for Unity (John 17:20-24), (Dissertatio ad Lauream in Facultate Theologica Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, Romae 1950 [a published copy was obtained from the Catholic University of America Library, Washington, D.C.]), pp. 127, 155. Cf. also Emile Mersch, The Whole Christ, translated by John R. Kelly (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938), pp. 189f.

even as He and the Father were of one will and mind and purpose throughout His earthly ministry. Bernard states that the meaning of the phrase ἵνα ὡσιν ἐν καθ' ὡς ἡμεῖς is

that the apostles might be united in will and purpose and spiritual fellowship even as the Father and the Son are united. . . . They had been given a "new" commandment, enjoining all disciples to love one another (see on 13:34), and the Fatherly protection of God is now invoked for them, that they may be kept of one mind in their sacred fellowship.⁶

Adolf Schlatter expresses the meaning of this phrase in this way:

Dass die Jünger sich nicht entzweien und nicht gegeneinander arbeiten, sondern in starker Gemeinsamkeit des Wirkens verbunden bleiben, ist das erste, unbedingt Notwendige, woran ihre ganze Wirksamkeit gebunden ist. Diese Eintracht liegt jenseits des menschlichen Vermögens und ist die Wirkung und Gabe der göttlichen Gnade. Darum ist sie der Inhalt des Gebets.⁷

The interpretation of Bernard and Schlatter is substantiated by the remainder of the prayer for the disciples (through verse 19). Jesus has a particular task for the disciples. It is not His will that they

⁶J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, a volume in The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), II, 569f.

⁷D. A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt (Stuttgart, Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1930), p. 321.

should be taken from the world.⁸ Rather than retreat they are to encounter and engage. Even as the Father sent Jesus into the world, so now Jesus sends the disciples into the world (17:18). It is an assignment which carries with it accompanying dangers. There is one who will prey upon the disciples--the evil one.⁹ He will not be satisfied to quietly withdraw and let the disciples go about their work unmolested.¹⁰ It will be the devil's purpose to sow strife and discord among the disciples if at all possible. Evidence of

⁸I here take world in the sense of sinful mankind who are separated from God. The world is the scene of the saving work of Jesus (Jn. 3:17,19; 6:14; 8:26; 10:36; 12:46; 16:28; etc.), yet not all receive Jesus, many are hostile to Him and will vent this hostility upon His disciples (17:14).

⁹There is some question whether τοῦ πονηροῦ is to be taken as neuter or masculine. Taken as a neuter it would mean that the disciples are to be kept from evil; as a masculine it would refer to the evil one--the devil. Barrett says that it is impossible to be sure whether πονηροῦ is adjectival or substantive (He uses these terms instead of neuter or masculine). The only other occurrences of the word in John's Gospel are both adjectival (3:19; 7:7) yet Barrett says, the use in I John (2:13f; 3:12; 5:18) suggests strongly that John is thinking of the Evil One, not of evil. The death of Jesus means the judgment of the prince of this world (12:31; 14:30; 16:11), but he is not deprived of the power to harm the disciples if they are left without divine aid. Cf. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (London: S.P.C.K., c.1958) p. 425.

¹⁰The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke give a picture of the activity of the devil in the temptation of Jesus (Matt. 4:1-11; Mark 1:12,13; Luke 4:1-13).

such activity lay near at hand (Mark 9:33,34; Luke 22:24-27).

While Jesus was visibly with His disciples He established their unity and their distinctiveness. The preservation of this unity and this distinctiveness could not now depend only upon the disciples; it would be preserved only as the disciples were kept in union with the Father. John expresses this thought in the petition $\tau\eta\rho\rho\sigma\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omega\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$. In this petition it is a bit difficult to determine whether the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omega\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ has a single or a double meaning. In 17:6 Jesus says that He has manifested (revealed) the name of the Father to the disciples. Here the word $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ undoubtedly signifies the being of God insofar as He has revealed Himself. This thought was prevalent in the Old Testament: "God also said to Moses, "Say this to the people of Israel, 'The Lord, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you': this is my name for ever, and thus I am to be remembered throughout all generations." (Ex. 3:15); "Thus says the Lord who made the earth, the Lord who formed it to establish it--the Lord is his name:" (Jer. 33:2; compare Ex. 6:8; Amos 5:8, 9:6). The question then arises whether $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ in the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omega\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ is instrumental or locative. If the $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is translated as instru-

mental the sense would be: "keep them by means of thy name"--that is, you who have revealed yourself to be the God of power and might, keep and preserve these disciples. If the thought were locative the phrase would mean "keep them as thy own."¹¹ Perhaps it would be well to allow both meanings to stand; the rest of the sentence would seem to allow for this. Jesus said that while He was with the disciples He kept them in the Father's name and guarded them so that none was lost save the son of perdition. Jesus kept the disciples and He also guarded them so that none was lost save Judas Iscariot. This means that the oneness of the disciples depends upon their being kept as God's possession, a state which can be maintained only by the activity of the almighty Father. From this it follows that the unity of the disciples depends upon their relationship to God.¹²

Not only does Jesus pray that the disciples may be one, but He also prays that they may be sanctified in the truth (17:17,19). These two thoughts cannot be separated; they belong together. Jesus has a mission

¹¹Barrett, pp. 423f.

¹²This thought appears in the parallel section of this prayer when Jesus prays for future believers and will be discussed more fully at that point (17:22).

for the disciples¹³ and this mission is the proclamation of the word which He had entrusted to them (17:20). The mission will not be completed if the disciples work at cross purposes, competing with one another, undermining one another.

Bernard says that this petition "that they may be one" was shown to have been fulfilled in the success of the apostolic preaching.¹⁴ Yet it seems difficult to speak of fulfillment in absolute terms. Even among the first apostles there were sometimes differences of opinion (Gal. 2:11). These disciples were human and their oneness was never realized in the absolute sense in which Jesus and the Father were one.¹⁵

The Oneness of the Church

There can be little doubt that John had the thought

¹³The word *ἁγιάζειν* appears infrequently in the Fourth Gospel, yet it is a significant word. It appears at 10:36 where it is said that God sanctified Jesus for his mission to the world. This is a use of *ἁγιάζειν* found also in the LXX. Jeremiah was sanctified to be a prophet (Jer. 1:5). Aaron and his sons were sanctified to be priests (Ex. 28:41). *ἁγιάζειν* means to consecrate for a religious purpose.

¹⁴Bernard, II, 570.

¹⁵It may be that the participle *τετελεσμένον* points in this direction. This thought will be discussed at greater length in the next section.

of the church in mind when he wrote the Fourth Gospel. Although the word ἐκκλησία does not appear in the Fourth Gospel, its absence does not exclude such thinking. Such thinking about the Church is made clear in the last section of Jesus' highpriestly prayer (17:20-26), where the thoughts of Jesus turn from the small band of the eleven to envision the result of their mission. Jesus sees beyond the present moment and He sees the fruit of the missionary activity of the disciples, a company of people who believe on Him because of the proclamation of the first disciples.

It may be that John preserved this particular part of the prayer of Jesus for apologetic reasons. There can be little doubt that the entire purpose of the Fourth Gospel is apologetic (20:31). It may be that John included the words of Jesus for the oneness of the Church because of the differences and divisions which were already appearing in the church.¹⁶ Whether or not such a state of the church is postulated, the exegesis

¹⁶I realize that this may be rightly challenged. I base such a statement upon the picture presented in the three epistles of John. The assumption that the state of the church for which the Gospel of John was written is substantially the same as the church to whom the epistles of John are addressed is based upon the premise that the author of the Gospel is also the author of the epistles and that the Gospel and Epistles were written about the same time. With few exceptions this is the consensus of modern scholarly opinion.

of this passage (17:20-26) will not be substantially altered. It is clear that Jesus visualizes a community of believers, the spiritual descendents of the first disciples, and He prays on their behalf, even as He had prayed for the disciples, that they may be one.¹⁷

The interpretation given in the preceding section, "The Oneness of the Disciples," need not be repeated in this section, save to expand upon it. In verse 21 the petition follows the pattern of verse 11. It must be noted, however, that in verse 21 a thought which was perhaps only implicit in 17:11ff is made explicit. In verses 21 and 22 it is stated that the oneness of the believers with one another is grounded in their relationship to Jesus Christ. This is a thought which is expressed in other New Testament writings (Gal. 3:28); it is expressed also in other places in the Fourth

¹⁷E. F. Scott says that the final section in John 17 shows us the whole intention of the Gospel. The Gospel portrays the disciples as the beginning of the Church. They represented in miniature the great community that Christ would gather to Himself hereafter out of the world. Scott says that the Fourth Gospel is the story of the upbuilding of the church--the formation of the elect company to which Christ had revealed Himself and imparted His gift to life. E. F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Its Theology (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), p. 109. Such an assertion would not contradict the statement made previously that the purpose of the Fourth Gospel is apologetic; Scott's statement complements this idea.

¹⁸Westcott, II, 60.

Gospel (10:11-16; 11:52; 15:1ff.).

In John 10:11-16 Jesus describes Himself as the Good Shepherd. He is the Good Shepherd because He does not let the wolf scatter and ravage the sheep, rather He protects the sheep, even laying down His life for them. Then Jesus speaks of other sheep which He has which were not of this fold (αὐλή); He desires to bring these sheep also under His care and protection. The result envisaged is that there will be one flock (ποίμνη)¹⁸ and one shepherd. Westcott says that here in this picture of the shepherd and the sheep, the bond of fellowship is shown to lie in the common relation to One Lord.¹⁹

¹⁸It is at this point that the Vulgate mistranslated and on the basis of this mistranslation the Roman Catholic Church found further support for its claim to be the only church. The Vulgate translated both αὐλή and ποίμνη with ovile. Westcott gives the history of the various translations of this verse in the various Latin editions and also in the English. He says that this translation entered into the English tradition through Wyclif who followed the Vulgate. This rendering, "one fold, one shepherd" was introduced into Cromwell's Bible [the Great Bible] in 1539 and retained its place down to 1611. Cf. B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John ([a reprint of 1898]; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), II, 74f.

It is interesting to note that even as late as 1963 Cardinal Bea still uses the Vulgate mistranslation as the basis for his argument that the Roman Catholic Church is the true church. Cf. Augustin Cardinal Bea, The Unity of Christians, edited by Bernard Leeming (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 221.

¹⁹Westcott, II, 60.

The oneness of the believers with one another is a reality only in Jesus Christ. This is indirectly affirmed in 11:52 where the author of the Fourth Gospel goes on to expand upon the prophecy of Caiaphas who had said that it would be better that one man should die for the nation rather than that the nation should perish. John elaborates on this statement of Caiaphas and says that this prophecy had wider implications than Caiaphas had realized; through the death of Jesus "all" the scattered sons of God will be gathered into one. It is because of the work of Christ and the relationship of each person to Christ that all the scattered children of God will be gathered into a unity. This echoes 10:16.

In John 15:1-11 Jesus speaks of Himself as the vine and of His disciples as the branches. Here again the thought is emphasized that the relationship between the believer and Christ is of fundamental importance.²⁰ It

²⁰In a study on eschatology in the Fourth Gospel, Alf Corell details at length the significance of this discourse and the fact that the image chosen was that of the vine. He finds allusions to the Eucharist in the image of the vine and to the final judgment in the statements that the unfruitful branches will be cut down and burned. But he also says that the image was chosen because it was the most perfect expression of the union of the disciples with Christ and with each other; it is the supreme cause for thanksgiving and at the same time the most perfect sign of their shared life and mutual love. Cf. Alf Corell, Consummatum est; Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John (New York: Macmillan Company, 1958), pp. 73f.

is only as the believer is in Christ that he is in any way related with other believers. Howard says:

In this last discourse [Jn. 15] the unity of the Church and its separateness from the world are emphasized. But its unity is not that of an organization but of organic life. "Apart from me ye can do nothing."²¹

It is only as the believers remain in this relationship with Jesus that they will be fruitful (15:5), a thought which is reflected in 17:23.

The survey of these three passages (10:11-16; 11:52; 15:1-11) shows that the words of John 17:21,23
 ΚΑΘΩΣ Σὺ ΠΑΤΗΡ ἘΝ ἘΜΟΙ ΚΑὶ ἘΓΩ ἘΝ ΣΟΙ, ἵνα καὶ
 αὐτοὶ ἘΝ ἙΜΙΝ ᾤσιν — Ἐγὼ ἘΝ αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ Ἐν ἐμοί
 do not introduce a new thought. Perhaps the best exegesis of the mutual indwelling of the believer in Christ and Christ in the believer is found in I John 1:3,7. Here the relationship between the believer and God the Father and God the Son is described as *κοινωνία*.²² The oneness

²¹Wilbert F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 133.

²²*κοινωνία* describes an intimately close relationship. It was a favorite expression for the marital relationship as the most intimate between human beings (Isocrates 3:40; III Macc. 4:6). The word was also used for generosity (II Cor. 9:13) and even for the gift given (Lev. 5:21). The basic thought in I John 1:3b,6,7, centers upon the idea of an intimate and dynamic relationship between the believers and God and among believers-- those who have fellowship with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. Cf. Bauer, p. 439.

of the church has its origin in the relationship between the believer and Christ. The oneness of the church never originates as a result of human decisions or human institutions; it arises only as a result of the common denominator which all believers share--Jesus Christ.²³

This oneness for which Jesus prays is to be functional--it is to serve a purpose. Jesus prays that they may be one in order that the world may believe that the Father sent Him and that the Father loves the world even as He loves the Son (Jn. 17:23; compare Jn. 3:16). This means that the church has a mission in the world and to the world. While the statement "even as you sent me into the world, so I am sending them into the world" (17:18) is not repeated in the prayer for the church (17:20ff), yet the thought is re-echoed unmistakably. The statement by Jesus that He is sending His disciples out into the world is a statement which knows no temporal limitations. It was not just the first group of eleven

²³ Bernhard Weiss says: "As the unity of the Father and of the Son depends on this, that the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, so the unity of believers depends on this, that through their mystical union with Christ they are in the Father (xvii. 21), and the Father, who is in the Son, is in them (ver. 23)." Bernhard Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, translated from the third revised edition by Rev. James E. Duguid (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883), II, 411.

men who surrounded Jesus immediately before His crucifixion and immediately after His resurrection who are sent forth--it is all those who believe who share in this sending. This becomes evident from the consideration that just as the disciples whom Jesus sent out were to be fruitful (17:20), so in turn were these future believers to be fruitful (that the world may believe).

This brings the interpreter back to the question originally raised. In what does the oneness of the church consist? Is the world to be convinced that Jesus was sent by the Father and that the Father loves the world by virtue of the fact that the Christians are a united organization? This is an interpretation which many who are vitally concerned in the ecumenical movement adopt. This can be inferred from the writing of Bishop Newbigin. He writes:

These words of our Lord's prayer tell us that there are two things which the world is expected to recognize from the unity of Christians. Firstly, it is to recognize that Jesus has been sent by God. The world is to recognize in the Christian fellowship a supernatural unity, a unity which transcends all the usual human groupings and parties, a unity which is the visible proof of the fact that at the heart of the Christian fellowship there is none other than the Apostle of God Himself; that JESUS is not the name of one of the great human religious leaders, but the name of Him who has been sent

by the Creator and Ruler of all as His plenipotentiary for the sake of men.²⁴

Such an interpretation would seem to come into conflict with the New Testament teaching that belief comes through proclamation (Rom. 10:14-17). Indeed it is not necessary to range so far for such statements. In the text being considered (Jn. 17:20ff) Jesus explicitly says that the future believers are brought into this new relationship with Him through the word of the disciples. If Bultmann is correct in his interpretation of $\delta\omicron\lambda\gamma\alpha$, Bishop Newbigin's interpretation becomes still less tenable. Bultmann says that this $\delta\omicron\lambda\gamma\alpha$ which the Father has given the Son (17:22) and the Son in turn has given to the disciples (17:22) is nothing other than the full revelation of the Father. Bultmann's words bear repetition.

Die Bitte um die Einheit der Gemeinde empfängt V. 22f. erneute Motivierung, indem nicht nur noch einmal die Erkenntnis der Welt als letztes Ziel dieser Einheit genannt wird (V. 23b), sondern diese Einheit auch als Sinn und Erfüllung des Offenbarungswirkens Jesu bezeichnet wird. Zweimal wird dieser Gedanke zum Ausdruck gebracht und dadurch sein Gewicht betont: die $\delta\omicron\lambda\gamma\alpha$, die ihm der Vater verliehen hatte, hat er den Seinen gegeben, damit sie eins seien wie er und der Vater eins sind (V.22); er ist in ihnen und der Vater in ihm, damit sie vollendet werden zur Einheit (V.23a).

²⁴ James Edward Lesslie Newbigin, Is Christ Divided? A plea for Christian Unity in a Revolutionary Age (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961), p. 23.

Der Sinn der beiden Sätze ist der gleiche; sie sagen, dass Jesu Werk seine Erfüllung darin findet, dass es eine einheitliche Gemeinde gibt. Sein Werk wird zuerst damit beschrieben, dass er den Seinen die ihm vom Vater geschenkte $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ gegeben hat. Wieder ist damit in der Sprach des Mythos sein Wirken als das des Offenbarers beschrieben: denn was heisst das anderes, als dass er ihnen den Namen Gottes Offenbarte (V.6), den Gott ihm gegeben hatte (V.11)?, als dass er ihnen Gottes Worte übermittelte, die er von Gott erhalten hatte (V.8)? Er hat ihnen seine $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ als Geschenk dadurch, dass er unter ihnen als der Offenbarer anerkannt wird, und damit selbst verherrlicht ist (V.10). Aber $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ wenn einerseits der Glaube der Gemeinde ihre heissen kann, die ihr von ihm geschenkt wurde, wenn sie als in gleicher Weise verherrlicht ist wie er selbst, und wenn andererseits seine $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ darin besteht, dass er der Offenbarer ist und als solcher geglaubt wird, so gilt auch von der Gemeinde, dass sie an seinem Offenbarungswirken teilbekommt.²⁵

This means that the oneness of the church is a oneness of faith as each believer is in Christ and Christ in him and the oneness is a oneness of proclamation as each believer is united in the on-going work of Offenbarung. This parallels the oneness of the Father and the Son. Even as Jesus worked in perfect harmony with the Father and fully revealed the Father on earth, so too He has now entrusted the work of revelation to His followers. He prays that they might not work at cross purposes in this work but that even as there was unity of will between Himself and the Father, so now He prays that there might be this same unity of will

²⁵Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (12. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), pp. 394f.

among all who follow Him, that the revelation of God might be made known in the world through proclamation.²⁶ Then the fruit will follow and the mission of the church will prosper. The comments of Theodor Jänicke give further emphasis to what has been said and will serve well as a concluding statement. Jänicke says:

Wenn nun von der Gemeinde erbeten wird "dass sie eins seien, wie ich in dir und du in mir", so geht es um weit mehr als nur "der Glieder Einigkeit" (die vom Neuen Testament auch im Allgemeinen mit den Ausdrücken "Gemeinschaft" und "eines Sinnes sein" bezeichnet wird). Es geht um die Vollmacht der Offenbarung im Zeugnis

²⁶The participle *ΤΕΤΕΛΕΩΜΕΝΟΙ* poses a bit of a problem. Does the participle mean that perfect unity can only come in the future? If so, how far in the future? Basically the verb *τελειόω* means to complete or carry to fruition, Acts 20:24. It also means to perfect Hebrews 10:1. Hoskyns maintains that to perfect is an almost technical term in John for a mighty act of the Father or the Son (4:34; 5:36; 17:4; 19:30; I John 2:5; 4:12,17,18). Cf. Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, edited by Francis Noel Davey (London, Faber and Faber Limited, 1947), p. 505. This would mean that the stress falls more on the thought that the oneness of the church is God's work rather than upon the thought that the unity of the church is something to be realized in the future. Bernard interprets this participle to refer to a growing unity. Cf. Bernard, II, 578. It may be that there is here a recognition of the sinfulness of human nature and the inability of men to work together harmoniously and so this unity will be a growing process. Or it may be that *ΤΕΤΕΛΕΩΜΕΝΟΙ* is to be thought of in terms of fulfillment (Jn. 19:28). If the oneness of the church is functional and entails the proclamation of Jesus Christ, then the fruition of this proclamation will be that others are also brought to believe that Jesus has been sent by God and that the Father loves even them. The world believes when the oneness has been fulfilled in that the word is proclaimed.

der Jünger. Wie die ganze Herrlichkeit Gottes über dem Sohn ist, so soll sie nun auch über der Gemeinde sein. "Und die Herrlichkeit, die du mir gabst, gab ich ihnen, damit sie eines seien, wie wir eins sind (d. h. damit die Offenbarungseinheit auch bei ihnen verwirklicht werde), ich in ihnen und du in mir, dass sie seien vollendet in eins, damit die Welt erkenne, dass du mich gesandt hast und liebst sie, wie du mich liebst" (22 u. 23). Gott und Christus sind so eins, dass im Christus Gott zu finden ist. So wird die Gemeinde eins im Vater und Sohn, dass in ihr die Herrlichkeit des Sohnes zu finden ist. "Damit die Welt erkenne. . ." Die Welt "erkennt" nicht auf Grund der Einigkeit der Glieder der Gemeinde. Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Gemeinde hat eine andere Garantie. Sie liegt in der "Einheit", die als Verheissung über ihr steht, in der Offenbarungsvollmacht des Zeugnisses von Christus. Die Gemeinde gründet in der Einheit Jesu mit dem Vater.²⁷

²⁷Theodor Jänicke, Die Herrlichkeit des Gottessohnes (Berlin-Bielefeld: Verlag Haus und Schule, 1949), pp. 180f.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The oneness of the Father and Son as presented in the Fourth Gospel is primarily a functional oneness. Jesus, as the obedient Son, always acted in complete agreement with the Father, He did the Father's work here upon earth, always seeking not His own will but the will of the Father. In the work which Jesus did and the words which He spoke, Jesus revealed to His disciples who the Father is. Jesus acted in full obedience to the Father and He fulfilled the mission given to Him by the Father.

The oneness of the church is compared to the oneness of the Father and the Son. It has its origin in the relationship of the believer with Jesus Christ. The oneness of the Church is functional in that it relates specifically to the mission of the church. Even as Jesus revealed the Father, so now the church has been given the commission to proclaim the words of Jesus to the world that the world may be brought to believe that Jesus came from the Father and that the Father loves the world. It is Jesus' prayer that in this work of proclamation the disciples will not work at cross purposes but with a unity of will and purpose. The oneness of the church is rooted in the relationship of the believer with Christ and is expressed in the proclamation of the Gospel.

73

APPENDIX

A Historical Survey of the Exegesis of John 10:30

The interpretation of John 10:30 has been of great importance in seeking to understand the prayer of Jesus recorded in John 17:11,21,22,23. The interpretation of John 10:30 also played a decisive role in the settlement of the Christological controversies which plagued the early church. Because the interpretation of John 10:30 was prominent in the early church, it was thought that a survey of interpretation would be a useful addition to this thesis. The survey then also includes some modern Biblical scholars to show the movement of interpretation, in some cases agreeing with the exegesis of the early theologians, and in some cases disagreeing with them.

According to T. E. Pollard¹ the question of the

¹T. E. Pollard, "The Exegesis of John X. 30 in the Early Trinitarian Controversies," New Testament Studies, III, 335. In my presentation of the interpretation of John 10:30 in the early church I am much indebted to this article. In general I shall follow his citations and present his conclusions. The citations have been checked through and the full bibliographic references will be given in the footnotes. Acknowledgement here that I am following the conclusions of Pollard will relieve me of the necessity of constantly giving footnotes referring to the article by Pollard. It should also be noted that Westcott gives some of the same references. Cf. Brooke Foss Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes (Grand

interpretation of this verse first arose during the Monarchian controversy at the beginning of the third century. Hippolytus criticized the exegesis of Noetus as being piecemeal (μονοκώλως).² Hippolytus gave the following exegesis of the verse:

If, again, he [Noetus] allege His [Jesus] own word when He said, "I and the Father are one," let him attend to the fact, and understand that He did not say, "I and the Father am one, but are one." [Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν εἰμι, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἔσμεν] For the word are is not said of one person, but it refers to two persons, and one power. He has Himself made this clear, when He spake to His Father concerning the disciples, "The glory which Thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; that the world may know that Thou hast sent me." What have the Noetians to say to these things? Are all one body in respect of substance, or is it that we become one in the power and disposition of unity of mind? In the same manner the Son, who was sent, and was not known of those who are in the world, confessed that He was in the Father in power and disposition. For the Son is the one mind of the Father.³

Hippolytus, therefore, distinguished between Father and

Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954), II, 68.

²Hippolytus, "Against the Heresy of one Noetus," Patrologiae: Patrum Graecorum, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris: n.p., 1857), X, 805. Hereafter Migne's edition will be referred to as MPG.

³Hippolytus, "Against the Heresy of one Noetus," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1886), V, 226. Hereafter this series will be referred to as ANF. The Greek text appears in MPG, X, 813.

Son on the basis of the plural present form of the verb ἔσμεν. He also emphasizes that the ἐν does not refer to a unity of essence.

Tertullian made use of John 10:30 when he wrote against Praxeas. Apparently Praxeas had used John 10:30 in much the same way as Noetus. Tertullian, however, was much more detailed in his exegesis of John 10:30 than Hippolytus. Tertullian said:

Here, then, they take their stand, too infatuated, nay, too blind, to see in the first place that there is in this passage an intimation of Two Beings--"I and my Father;" then that there is a plural predicate, "are," applicable to one person only; and lastly, that (the predicate terminates in an abstract, not a personal noun)--"we are one thing" Unum, not "one Person" Unus. For if He had said "one Person," He might have rendered some assistance to their opinion. Unus, no doubt, indicates the singular number; but (here we have a case where) "Two" are still the subject in the masculine gender. He accordingly says Unum, a neuter term, which does not imply singularity of number, but unity of essence, likeness, conjunction, affection on the Father's part, who loves the Son, and submission on the Son's, who obeys the Father's will. When He says, "I and my Father are one" in essence--Unum--He shows that there are Two, whom He puts on an equality and unites in one [Unum sumus, dicens, ego et Pater, ostendit duos esse, quos aequat et jungit].⁴

Here Tertullian understands John 10:30 to speak of a unity of essence between Father and Son. But he did

⁴Tertullian, "Against Praxeas," ANF, III, 618. Cf. Patrologiae: Patrum Latinorum, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris: n.p., 1844), II, 183. Hereafter Migne's edition will be referred to as MPL.

not stop with this interpretation. As his argument developed he interpreted John 10:30 to say that Father and Son are one in substance. He said:

These Three [Father, Son, and Paraclete] are one essence, not one Person [qui tres unum sint, non unus], as it is said, "I and my Father are One," in respect of unity of substance, not singularity of number [ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem].

Tertullian sought to uphold the doctrine of the Trinity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. The $\xi\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and the $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ καὶ ὁ πατήρ are proof of the distinction between Father and Son, while the $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is proof of their unity of substance.

Novatian also pondered the meaning of John 10:30. He defended the doctrine of the Trinity when it was being undermined by a teaching which preserved the monarchia of God by denying the divinity of Jesus. In his "Treatise Concerning The Trinity" he argued that Jesus is God. He said:

If Christ is only man, what is that which He says, "I and the Father are one?" For how can it be that "I and the Father are one," if He is not both God and the Son?—who may therefore be called one, seeing that He is of Himself, being both His Son, and being born of Him, being declared to have⁶ proceeded from Him, by which He is also God. . . .

⁵ Tertullian, "Against Praxeas," ANF, III, 621. Cf. MPL, II, 188.

⁶ Novatian, "Treatise Concerning the Trinity," ANF, V, 625. Cf. MPL, III, 941.

In the 27th chapter of this same treatise, Novatian again returned to John 10:30 and explained it in terms similar to those of Tertullian. He said:

But since they frequently urge upon us the passage where it is said, "I and the Father are one," in this also we shall overcome them with equal facility. For if, as the heretics think, Christ were the Father, He ought to have said, "I and the Father are one" [unus]. But when He says I, and afterwards introduces the Father by saying, "I and the Father," He severs and distinguishes the peculiarity of His, that is, the Son's person, from the paternal authority, not only in respect of the sound of the name, but moreover in respect of the order of the distribution of power, since He might have said, "I the Father," if He had had it in mind that He Himself was the Father. And since He said "one" thing [unum], let the heretics understand that He did not say "one" person [unus]. For one placed in the neuter, intimates the social concord, not the personal unity. He is said to be one neuter, not one masculine, because the expression is not referred to the number, but it is declared with reference to the association of another.⁷

Novatian did not speak of a unity of substance as did Tertullian, but he did maintain the deity of Jesus. In this he agreed with both Hippolytus and Tertullian.

Origen also referred to this verse. In a work discovered in 1941, The Dialogue with Heraclides, Origen developed his interpretation of John 10:30. He had forced Heraclides to admit that the Father and the Son are two Gods who become a unity. In a lengthy discourse Origen explained this statement. He sought to

⁷Novatian, "Treatise Concerning The Trinity," ANF, V, 637. Cf. MPL, III, 966.

show in what sense they are two Gods, and in what sense the two are one God. He approached the task by citing biblical "parallels." He said:

Accordingly there are many things which are two that are said in the Scriptures to be one. What passages of Scripture? Adam is one person, his wife another. Adam is distinct from his wife, and his wife is distinct from her husband. Yet it is said in the story of the creation of the world that the two are one: "For the two shall be one flesh."⁸

Origen concluded from this example:

So in relation to the God and Father of the universe, our Lord and Saviour is not one flesh, nor one spirit, but something higher than flesh and spirit, namely, one God. The appropriate word when human beings are joined to one another is flesh. The appropriate word when a righteous man is joined to Christ [here he refers to I Cor. 6:17] is spirit. The appropriate word when Christ is united to the Father is not flesh, not spirit, but more honourable than these--God. That is why we understand in this sense 'I and the Father are one.'⁹

⁸Origen, "Dialogue with Heraclides," The Library of Christian Classics, edited by John Ernest Leonard Oulton and Henry Chadwick, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), II, p. 439. For original text see Jean Scherer, editor, Entretien D'Origene avec Heraclide. No. 67 of Sources Chrétiennes (Paris: Les Editions Du Cerf, 1960), p. 58. Hereafter referred to as Scherer.

⁹The Library of Christian Classics, II, p. 439. Cf. Scherer, p. 60. However, Pollard points out that this statement that Jesus and the Father are one God, must be considered in the light of Origen's whole doctrine of the divinity of the Son. The Son is θεός, not ὁ θεός and so is inferior. Origen sought to maintain both the unity and the distinction of Jesus and the Father. However, Pollard says that his view of the unity is impaired by the pluralism implicit in his subordinationist view of the divinity of the Son. Cf. Pollard, p. 338.

This would indicate that Origen interpreted the ^{ε'}ε' of John 10:30 as εἰς Θεός .

The interpretation of John 10:30 played a key role in the Arian controversy. This was by no means a favorite verse of the Arians but they were forced to deal with it and fit it into their theology because of the emphasis which the "orthodox" party placed upon it. They had to attempt to harmonize it with their teaching that the Son was distinct from the Father as a creature is from his Creator. Athanasius accused them of solving their theological crux by asserting only a form of moral unity.

For they [the Arians] say, since what the Father wills, the Son wills also, and is not contrary either in what He thinks or in what He judges, but is in all respects concordant with Him, declaring doctrines which are the same, and a word consistent and united with the Father's teaching, therefore it is that He and the Father are One; and some of them have dared to write as well as say this.¹⁰

Athanasius was not satisfied with such an interpretation and argued that John 10:30 speaks about a unity of essence and nothing less. He stated that if such an interpretation as that given by the Arians is allowed

¹⁰ Athanasius, "Four Discourses Against The Arians," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1892), IV, 399. Hereafter referred to as NPNF2. Cf. MPG, XXVI, 341.

to stand, then it follows that the Angels too, and the other beings above us, Powers and Authorities, and Thrones and Dominions should be one with the Father for they will what God wills.¹¹ Athanasius contended that even among men there can be found some--Apostles, Prophets, even Patriarchs who, on the basis of the interpretation given by the Arians, could claim to be one with God, but in fact none ever do.¹² Athanasius proceeded from this and said:

This their notion then being evidently unseemly and irrational as well as the rest, the likeness and oneness must be referred to the very Essence of the Son; for unless it be so taken, He will not be shewn to have anything beyond things originate, as has been said, nor will He be like the Father, but He will be like the Father's doctrines. . . . Such then being the Son, therefore when the Son works, the Father is the Worker, and the Son coming to the Saints, the Father is He who cometh in the Son as he promised when He said, 'I and My Father will come, and will make Our abode with him;' for in the Image is contemplated the Father, and in the Radiance is the Light. Therefore also, as we said just now, when the Father gives grace and peace, the Son also gives it, as Paul signifies in every Epistle, writing, 'Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.'¹³

Athanasius said that the fact that the Father and the

¹¹ Athanasius, "Oratian Against Arius," NPNF2, IV, 399f. Cf. MPG, XXVI, 341.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., NPNF2, IV, 400. Cf. MPG, XXVI, 344, 345.

Son are one in operation proves that they are one in essence. He said:

For if there were no unity, nor the Word the own Offspring of the Father's Essence, as the radiance of the light, but the Son were divided in nature from the Father, it were sufficient that the Father alone should give, since none of originate things is a partner with his maker in his givings; but, as it is, such a mode of giving shews the oneness of the Father and the Son.¹⁴

He strengthened the argument that unity of operation points to unity of essence by emphasizing the unity of the Father and the Son in the work of revelation.

But what God speaks, it is very plain He speaks through the Word, and not through another. And the Word, as being not separate from the Father, nor unlike and foreign to the Father's Essence, what He works, those are the Father's works, and His framing of all things is one with His; and what the Son gives, that is the Father's gift. And he who hath seen the Son, knows that, in seeing Him, he has seen, not Angel, nor one merely greater than Angels, nor in short any creature, but the Father Himself. And he who hears the Word, knows that he hears the Father; as he who is irradiated by the radiance, knows that he is enlightened by the sun.¹⁵

Athanasius moved far beyond Hippolytus. For Athanasius it was not enough to assert that there is a moral unity between Father and Son; this the Arians will also do. Athanasius pressed on for a deeper meaning and asserted that the statement "I and the Father are one" (Jn. 10:3), speaks of a oneness of action and operation which is

¹⁴ Ibid., NPNF2, IV, 400. Cf. MPG, XXVI, 345.

¹⁵ Ibid., NPNF2, IV, 402. Cf. MPG, XXVI, 352.

possible only on the basis of a unity of essence. The external unity of operation can flow only from an internal unity of essence.

The interpretation of John 10:30 played a crucial role in the establishment of the trinitarian doctrine as it was finally expressed at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Interpreted by Hippolytus it was a significant factor in discrediting modal monarchism. Jesus and the Father are not to be identified. In the controversy between Athanasius and Arius it again was a significant verse. Athanasius used this verse to show that Jesus Christ was truly divine, although He was not to be identified with the person of the Father, yet He was of one substance, one essence with the Father.

In this historical introduction the pendulum now swings to the other side. From a consideration of the early fathers attention is now turned to the more contemporary scene. The purpose is to show briefly the positions held and the interpretations given by modern commentators against the background presented by the early church fathers. This is done to show the "climate" of opinion as to the meaning of John 10:30.

Bernhard Weiss said that the relationship between Father and Son is such that the Son is the perfect organ of the Father. He said:

The position of the Son as the perfect organ [for the execution of the power of the Father, Jn. 10:28f.] of the Father, implies in itself, that any separate working of the Father and the Son is excluded, that both are one in their working. It is on that account likewise but another expression for this unity, [which exists between Father and Son] if it is said, xiv. 9, that whoever has seen the Son has seen the Father. . . .¹⁶

Weiss has a very interesting footnote in connection with this statement. He took issue with the use which the early fathers made of this verse in the Christological controversies. He maintained that the mutual relationship which exists between the Father and the Son constitutes their oneness. The Father has made the Son the exclusive and abiding organ for His final saving work, so that He hands over to Him everything (Jn. 13:3) and retains nothing to be His own exclusive possession (Jn. 16:15).¹⁷ Having developed this thought Weiss then made this poignant statement:

Thus neither are the words, x.30 [I and the Father are one], used of the substantial unity of both

¹⁶ Bernhard Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, translated from the third revised edition by Rev. James E. Duguid (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883), II, 331. This book first appeared in Germany under the title, Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Berlin 1868). The section which deals with the Johannean Theology, Part Fifth, is a condensation and reworking of a previous work by Weiss on the Gospel of John entitled, Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff, in seinen Grundzügen untersucht (Berlin, 1862).

¹⁷ Ibid., 329.

[Father and Son] . . . , nor those of xiv. 9 of their equality of nature . . . , or of their equality in dignity . . . : but there is nothing said in either passage about the original (trinitarian) relation of the Son to the Father; nay, He who appeared on the earth only speaks of Himself and of His works.¹⁸

Weiss was an orthodox theologian and it is clear in his theology that he did not deny the doctrine of the trinity. Weiss did assert, however, that John 10:30 does not relate directly to the doctrine of the trinity.

Brooke Foss Westcott followed rather closely the lines laid out by Tertullian and Athanasius. Westcott held that the $\epsilon\upsilon$ of 10:30 refers to "one essence," not "one person."¹⁹ Westcott said:

It seems clear that the unity here spoken of cannot fall short of unity of essence. The thought springs from the equality of power (my hand, the Father's hand); but infinite power is an essential attribute of God; and it is impossible to suppose that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power.²⁰

Westcott reasoned that because the Son did the Father's work here upon earth and in this work the Son has the full

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Westcott, II, 68. Westcott sees an antithesis between the $\epsilon\upsilon$ of John 10:30 and the $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ of Galatians 3:28. The former, he says, means one essence, the later means one person. I would question Westcott's interpretation of the Galatians passage.

²⁰Ibid.

power of the Father, therefore the $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ^{c'} must refer specifically to a oneness of essence.

The views of three other English commentators, also merits mention in this historical survey. The works of all three men appeared within the last thirty-five years.

J. H. Bernard took issue with the patristic interpretation. He said:

It has been customary, following the habit of the patristic commentators, to interpret these significant words [I and the Father are one] in the light of the controversies of the fourth century. Bengel, e.g. (following Augustine), says: "Per sumus refutatur Sabellius, per unum Arius"; the words thus being taken to prove identity of essence between the Father and the Son, while the difference of persons is indicated by the plural $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. But it is an anachronism to transfer controversies of the fourth century to the theological statements of the first. We have a parallel to $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ in I Cor. 3:8, where Paul says $\delta \psi\upsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \delta \pi\omicron\tau\iota\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ meaning that both the "planter" and the "waterer" of the seed are in the same category, as compared with God who gives the increase. A unity of fellowship, of will, and of purpose between the Father and the Son is a frequent theme in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 5:18; 14:9,23, and 17:11,22), and it is tersely and powerfully expressed here; but to press the words so as to make them indicate identity of $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\alpha$, is to introduce thoughts which were not present to the theologian of the first century.²¹

Edward Hoskyns was more cautious in his approach.

²¹J. H. Bernard, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, a volume in the International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), II, 365f.

He neither censures nor endorses the patristic interpretation. He said:

The author of the gospel does not define the precise nature of the union between the Father and the Son. The unity is neither merely a moral unity or agreement of character, since the Jews would not presumably have treated as blasphemy the idea that a man could regulate his words and actions according to the will of God; nor is the unity a metaphysical unity which carries with it a necessary agreement of character, for the Evangelist is describing the union of the flesh and blood of Jesus of Nazareth with the Father and the word 'metaphysical' introduces a philosophical conception foreign to the gospel; nor is the union one which can be explained in terms of mysticism, as though it were constituted by the 'real presence of the Spirit' in Jesus (Loisy); nor is it really legitimate for the commentator to regard the unity as explained when the neuter one is interpreted as one substance, and the plural are of two Persons of the Trinity. No doubt, this passage was rightly regarded by the Fathers as of supreme importance when they had to meet Christian philosophies which undermined the authority of Jesus. No doubt also the Evangelist used language which to some extent controlled the course of later controversy. But he used the language because the material behind him demanded, not an explanation of the union between Jesus and the Father, but a clear statement that Jesus is the object of Faith and the organ of revelation and salvation, and that the honour which is paid to Him is honour paid to the Father.²²

R. H. Lightfoot very succinctly said:

The union of the Father and the Son is such that the Lord's words and works are indeed the words and works of God. For the same reason it can be said with equal truth that the Lord's sheep cannot

²²Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, edited by Francis Noel Davey (second revised edition; London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947), pp. 389f.

be torn from His keeping, and that they cannot be torn from the keeping of the Father.²³

Attention is next directed to two living commentators, one German and one English. The German, Rudolf Bultmann, first published his commentary on the Gospel of John in 1941. It has been revised several times since then.²⁴ Still more recently a major English commentary on the Gospel of John has appeared, written by C. K. Barrett.²⁵

While the theological thought of Bernard Weiss and Rudolf Bultmann does not always agree, yet in their understanding of John 10:30 their ideas appear to be very close. Bultmann did not speculate about the question of the oneness of essence which concerned Westcott and the patristic writers. Bultmann sees the main thought of John 10:30 to be centered in the idea of revelation. He interprets John 10:30 in context beginning with verse 28. Bultmann's interpretation is given succinctly in a paragraph:

²³R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, edited by C. F. Evans (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), p. 214.

²⁴Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (12. Auflage: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952).

²⁵C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (London: S. P. C. K., c.1958).

Die letzte Aussage von V. 28 wird in V. 29f ausdrücklich motiviert, entsprechend der Motivierung, die V. 14 in V. 15 erhalten hatte: die Sicherheit, die die Glaubenden beim Offenbarer finden, ist begründet in seinem Verhältnis zu Gott, in seiner Einheit mit Gott. Das Verhältnis der Glaubenden zu Jesus ist als solches ihr Verhältnis zu Gott; niemand kann sie Jesus entreissen, da niemand sie Gott entreissen kann; er und der Vater sind ja eins. Diese letzte Aussage, die schon V. 15 im Hintergrund stand, bringt den Offenbarungsgedanken zum schärfsten Ausdruck, der über die bisherigen Formulierungen des Gedankens der Einheit von Vater und Sohn 5:19f. 8:16 12:44f. noch hinausgeht und seine Analogie nur in dem Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος 1:2 hat: in Jesus und nur in ihm begegnet Gott den Menschen. Die Schroffheit der Formulierung soll den Anstoss erregen, der dem Offenbarungsgeschehen als dem Angriff Gottes auf die Welt wesensmässig eigen ist.²⁶

The key word here is Offenbarung. Jesus reveals the Father. He knows the Father perfectly (10:15) and He reveals the Father fully. He is so related to God that believers have the same relationship with God as they have with Jesus. No one can pluck them out of Jesus' hand because no one can pluck them out of the Father's hand. Bultmann interprets the oneness between Father and Son spoken of in John 10:30 in terms of a functional oneness rather than an ontological oneness.

C. K. Barrett agrees with the basic premise of Bultmann that John is thinking in terms of revelation and not of cosmological theory. At the same time

²⁶ Bultmann, pp. 294f.

Barrett does not rule out the possibility that there is also here and throughout the Gospel of John, a statement of oneness which includes a oneness of essence.

He said:

John is thinking in terms of revelation not of cosmological theory. . . . His meaning turns upon the belief that the actions and words of Jesus were veritably the actions and words of God, who thus uniquely confronted men in his incarnate Son. This unity is often expressed in moral terms: Jesus, who was sent by God, acts in such complete obedience to God's will that what he does is a complete revelation of that will (see e.g. vv. 17f.); here, as in the Prologue, John's language comes somewhat nearer to metaphysics, but even here the thought is by no means purely metaphysical and v. 17 is not far away: the oneness of Father and Son is a oneness of love and obedience even while it is a oneness of essence [emphasis mine].²⁷

By way of summary it is perhaps significant to note that no recent commentator wholly endorses the patristic interpretation. B. F. Westcott comes the closest and Hoskyns cannot completely disassociate himself from interpreting John 10:30 in terms of ontology, although he does indicate that such an interpretation does not explore the full implication of Johannine intention. Barrett sees in John 10:30 a double thrust--it speaks of both a functional oneness and a oneness of essence. Bernard Weiss, J. H. Bernard, and Rudolf Bultmann move the farthest from the patristic interpretation and

²⁷ Barrett, pp. 317f.

interpret John 10:30 in terms of the functional relationship which exists between Jesus and the Father; Jesus does the work of the Father and reveals the Father.

Adrianus, "Third Discourse Against Arius," Patrologiae Graecae. CXXVI. Edited by J. P. Migne, 1857. Cols. 321-462. English Translation in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series, IV. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1892. Pp. 393-431.

Burrows, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text. London: S. P. C. K., c.1901.

Garda, Earl. The Church and the Churches. Grand Rapids: Dr. G. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1936.

James, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c.1957.

Lee, Augustin Cardinal. The Unity of Christians. Edited by Richard Leasing. New York: Herder and Herder, 1952.

Quill, G. M. A. Christian Unity: The Anglican Position. London: Religious Book Co., 1949.

Severus, John Henry. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. 2 vols. Edited by A. R. McNeill. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Wills, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. A translation and revision of the ninth-teenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Sayer, Charise. Christian Unity. Vol. 132 of The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism. Translated from the Italian by Jill Dean. New York: New York Books, 1962.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Athanasius. "Third Discourse Against Arius," Patrologiae: Patrum Graecorum. XXVI. Edited by J. P. Migne, 1887. Cols. 321-468. English Translation in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series, IV. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1892. Pp. 393-431.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text. London: S. P. C. K., c.1958.
- Barth, Karl. The Church and the Churches. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c.1957.
- Bea, Augustin Cardinal. The Unity of Christians. Edited by Bernard Leeming. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Bell, G. K. A. Christian Unity: The Anglican Position. London: Religious Book Club, 1949.
- Bernard, John Henry. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. 2 vols. Edited by A. H. McNeile. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. A translation and revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Boyer, Charles. Christian Unity. Vol. 138 of The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism. Translated from the Italian by Jill Dean. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1962.

- : One Shepherd. The Problem of Christian Reunion.
Translated by Angeline Bouchard. New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1952.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. Das Evangelium des Johannes.
12. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952.
- : Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by Kenrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Burton, Ernest DeWitt. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898.
- Carpenter, J. Estlin. The Johannine Writings: A Study of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1927.
- Colwell, E. C. The Gospel of the Spirit: A Study in the Fourth Gospel. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Corell, Alf. Consummatum est; Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John. New York: Macmillan Company, 1958.
- Craig, Clarence T. The Nature of the Church. New York: Willett, Clark & Company, c.1945.
- : The One Church in the Light of the New Testament. New York: Abingdon, Cokesbury Press, c.1951.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Second English Edition. Translated by Shirley G. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.
- Davey, J. Ernest. The Jesus of St. John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.
- Ellwein, Eduard. Summus Evangelista: Die Botschaft des Johannesevangeliums in der Auslegung Luthers. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960.
- Godet, Frederic. Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. 3 vols. Translated from the last edition by

- M. D. Cusin. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892-1912.
- Hanson, Stig. The Unity of the Church in the New Testament. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1946. Reprinted in Lexington, Kentucky: The American Theological Library Association, 1963.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck, U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Hippolytus. "Against the Heresy of One Noetus," Patrologiae: Patrum Graecorum. X. Edited by J. P. Migne, 1957. Cols. 804-830. English translation in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. V. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1886. Pp. 223-231.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947.
- Howard, Wilbert F. Christianity According to St. John. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.
- The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation. 4th edition revised by C. K. Barrett. London: Epworth Press, 1955.
- Jänicke, Theodor. Die Herrlichkeit des Gottessohnes. Berlin-Bielefeld: Verlag Haus und Schule, 1949.
- Johnston, George. The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. Cambridge: The University Press, 1943.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Editor. Biblica Hebraica. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, c.1937.
- Lampe, G. W. H., and David M. Paton, Editors. One Lord, One Baptism. London: S. C. M. Press, 1960.
- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1931.
- Lightfoot, R. H. St. John's Gospel. Edited by C. F. Evans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Manson, T. W. On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes. No. 38 of Studies in Biblical Theology. Edited by Matthew Black. London: SCM Press, 1963.

- Matzerath, R. The Prayer of Christ for Unity (John 17:20-24). Dissertatio ad Lauream in Facultate Theologica Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, Romae, 1950.
- Mersch, Emile. The Whole Christ. Translated by John R. Kelly. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938.
- Minear, Paul S. Editor. The Nature of the Unity We Seek. The official report of the North American Conference on Faith and Order, Sept. 3-10, 1957, Oberlin, Ohio. St. Louis, Missouri: The Bethany Press, 1958.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. Statistik Des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes. Zürich-Frankfurt am Main: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958.
- Mouton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Nelson, J. Robert, Editor. One Lord, One Church. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Editor. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th edition with the assistance of Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
- Newbiggin, James Edward Lesslie. Is Christ Divided? A Plea for Christian Unity in a Revolutionary Age. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961.
- Novatian. "Treatise Concerning the Trinity," Patrologiae: Patrum Latinorum. III. Edited by J. P. Migne, 1886. Cols. 913-982. English translation in Ante-Nicene Fathers. V. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1886. Pp. 611-644.
- Origen. "Dialogue with Heraclides," Entretien D'Origene avec Heraclide. No. 67 of Sources Chretiennes. Edited by Jean Scherer. Paris: Les Editions Du Cerf, 1960. English translation in The Library of Christian Classics. II. Edited by John Ernest Leonard Oulton and Henry Chadwick. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. Pp. 437-455.

- Plummer, Alfred. The Gospel According to St. John. Cambridge: The University Press, 1938.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, Editor. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Editio Sexta. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959.
- Rainsforth, Marcus. Our Lord Prays for His Own: Thoughts on John 17. A reprint of the 4th edition, 1895. Chicago: Moody Press, 1955.
- Rengstorff, [Karl Heinrich]. "ἈΠΟΣΤΕΛΛΩ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. I. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933. Pp. 397-448.
- Robinson, W. H. The Biblical Doctrine of the Church. St. Louis, Missouri: The Bethany Press, 1955.
- Schlatter, Adolf. Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie Er Spricht, Denkt und Glaubte. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1930.
- Scott, E. F. The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Its Theology. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. "Ἐῖς," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. II. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935. Pp. 432-440.
- . New Testament Theology. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Stevens, George Barker. The Johannine Theology: a Study of the Doctrinal Contents of the Gospel and Epistle of the Apostle John. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1894.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Co., 1953.
- . The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958.

Deane, J. "The Unity of the Church: an Exposition of John 17." Interpretation, XI (1957), 166-176.

Colwell, E. C. "A Definite Noun for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LII (1933), 12-21.

- Tertullian. "Against Praxeas," Patrologiae: Patrum Latinorum. II. Edited by J. P. Migne, 1844. Cols. 153-196. English translation in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. III. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908. Pp. 597-627.
- Turner, Nigel. Syntax. Vol. III of A Grammar of New Testament Greek by James Hope Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. II. Translated from the third revised edition by James E. Duguid. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. 2 vols. published as one. A reprint of 1898. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954.
- Wolf, Ernst. Peregrinatio: Studien zur reformatorischen Theologie und zum Kirchenproblem. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1954. Pp. 146-182.

B. PERIODICALS

- Baird, W. "The Nature and the Unity of the Church in the New Testament," College of the Bible Quarterly, XXXIV, 4(1957), 1-15.
- Bell, L. N. "Nature and Mission of the Church," Christianity Today, III (Mar. 30, 1959), 19.
- Blank, Josef. "Ein Hirt und eine Herde; Die Kirche im Johannesevangelium," Bibel und Kirche, Heft 2, (Juni 1963), 48-51.
- Bours, Johannes. "Dass alle eins seien!," Bibel und Kirche, Heft 2 (Juni 1963), 51-54.
- Brunner, Emil. "One Holy Catholic Church," Theology Today, IV, 3 (Oct. 1947), 318-331.
- Cadier, J. "The Unity of the Church; an Exposition of John 17," Interpretation, XI (1957), 166-176.
- Colwell, E. C. "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LII (1933), 12-21.

- Fennel, W. C. "The Essential Oneness of Christ's Body," The Canadian Journal of Theology, IV (1958), 15-22.
- Fry, Franklin Clark. "The Unity of the Church," Lutheran World, III (Mar. 1957), 322-334.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Fourth Gospel and the Church," Harvard Theological Review, XXXV (1942), 95-116.
- Greenlee, Harold. "'My Father.' The Significance of the Manner in which Jesus refers to God as Father," The Bible Translator VI (1955), 119-121.
- Howard, Wilbert F. "The Father and the Son; An Exposition of John 5:19-29," Interpretation, IV (Jan. 1950), 3-11.
- Hulburt, C. "The Ontological Interrelationship of the persons of the Trinity," Bibliotheca Sacra LXXXII (April 1925), 158-163.
- Kotze, J. C. G. "The Meaning of our Unity in Christ," Ecumenical Review, VII (1955), 321-337.
- Lofthouse, W. F. "Fatherhood and Sonship in the Fourth Gospel," The Expository Times, XLIII (1931/1932), 442-448.
- Moody, Dale. "God's Only Son: The translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version," Journal of Biblical Literature LXXII (1953), 213-219.
- Nelson, J. R. "Many Images of the One Church," Ecumenical Review, IX (1957), 105-113.
- Pollard, T. Evan. "'That They All May Be One' (John 17:21)---and the Unity of the Church," The Expository Times, LXX, 5(1959), 149-150.
- ". "The Exegesis of Jn. X 30 in the Early Trinitarian Controversies," New Testament Studies, III (1956/57), 334-349.
- Schlier, H. "Die Einheit der Kirche nach dem Neuen Testament," Catholica, XIV, 3 (1960), 161-177.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Unity and Diversity in the New Testament Teaching regarding the Church," Theology Today, XIII, 4 (1957), 471-483.

- Soucek, J. B. "The Good Shepherd and the Flock,"
Ecumenical Review, IX (1956), 143-153.
- "That they all may be one," a symposium by the editors,
The Cresset, XVI, 11 (Oct. 1953), 19-27.
- Via, D. O. "Darkness, Christ and the Church in the
Fourth Gospel," Scottish Journal of Theology, XIV,
2 (1961), 172-193.
- Wenger, E. L. "That They All May Be One," The
Expository Times, LXX, 11 (1959), 333.
- Wolf, Ernst. "Lost Unity?," Ecumenical Review, I, 1(1948),
46-56.