

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1967

KOSMOS in John

Donald Heinz

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Heinz, Donald, "KOSMOS in John" (1967). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 330.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/330>

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.

KOSMOS IN JOHN

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

Donald Heinz

June 1967

49275

Approved by:

Frederick W. Danker
Advisor

Paul M. Bretscher
Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1967
10.11

49275

TABLE OF CONTENTS
C. 2

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. <u>KOSMOS</u> IN THE <u>UMWELT</u> OF JOHN	6
Non-Biblical Greek	6
Classical Greek to Plotinus, including Philo	6
Gnosticism	15
The <u>Hermetica</u>	26
The Mandaean Literature	33
The Septuagint	38
Judaism	40
Old Testament, apocryphal, apocalyptic, rabbinic thought	41
Qumran	46
The New Testament	48
Summary	60
III. <u>KOSMOS</u> IN JOHN	65
Syntax	65
Active and passive verbs	65
Anarthrous	66
Oblique cases, without a preposition	66
With a preposition	67
Conclusions	71
Meanings of <u>Kosmos</u>	72
Special Problems Relative to <u>Kosmos</u>	83
Creation	83
Cosmology	87
Dualism	89
Houtos <u>Kosmos</u>	93
Archōn tou kosmou	99
<u>Kosmos</u> , God's love, the believers' love	102
The Choice of <u>Kosmos</u>	108

Chapter	Page
IV. <u>KOSMOS</u> IN JOHN: <u>KOSMOS</u> DEFINED THROUGH <u>KOSMOS</u> -MEN	111
Justification for this Procedure	111
The Jews	111
<u>Kosmos</u> Conversation	114
<u>Kosmos</u> thinking	114
<u>Kosmos</u> misunderstandings	118
<u>Kosmos</u> Action	120
<u>Kosmos</u> and Non- <u>Kosmos</u> Personified	121
Pilate, <u>kosmos</u> -man	122
John the Baptizer, non- <u>kosmos</u> man	123
<u>Kosmos</u> Antitheses	124
V. <u>KOSMOS</u> IN JOHN: JESUS AND THE <u>KOSMOS</u>	130
Logos, Sent-One, Savior	130
Life--Death	135
Light--Darkness	138
Truth--Lie	141
Fulfiller--Incompleteness	143
Dependent Son--Independent <u>Kosmos</u>	145
<u>Doxa</u>	146
Division	149
Judgment	150
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY	160

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to determine what John¹ aims to say with the word kosmos. What understanding of man underlies John's semantic signal kosmos? Why did John choose this particular word to signal the thought he wanted to convey? What role did this term play in the Umwelt of John? Is the idea behind the term kosmos effectively and accurately signalled by the English term "world"?

Such a study is necessary for several reasons. The usage of kosmos in John is unique, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in relation to Synoptic usage. The fact that John uses kosmos seventy-eight times and the Synoptics together use kosmos fifteen times² indicates that the word plays some major role in John's presentation and theology. When the Synoptics do use the word, it lacks the theological overtones of Johannine usage. Nor do other New Testament documents, except the Pauline corpus, reflect John's extensive and theological usage.

Past studies of the word kosmos in John have paid insufficient attention to the broad scope of Johannine usage. Sasse has written an

¹Throughout this study "John" means either the Fourth Gospel or the author of the Fourth Gospel, whoever that may have been.

²W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek Testament (Fourth revised edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 556. Synoptic usage is as follows: Matt. 4:8; 5:14; 13:35,38; 16:26; 18:7; 24:21; 25:34; 26:13; Mark 8:36; 14:9; 16:15; Luke 9:25; 11:50; 12:30.

instructive article on kosmos,³ but his consideration of Johannine usage is not comprehensive. Commentators give no extended consideration to John's usage, although most make some remarks, varying from a few sentences to a few pages.⁴ Instructive studies on this subject are those made by Bultmann⁵ and Schlier.⁶ Two American doctoral dissertations deal with kosmos in John, but the one⁷ is too schematic, penetrating neither the depth nor viewing the breadth of Johannine usage,

³Herman Sasse, "kosmos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., c.1965), III, 868-895.

⁴C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 135. Walter Bauer, Johannes, in Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament, zweiter Band: Die Evangelien, II (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912), p. 13. Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii), in The Anchor Bible, Volume 29 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., c.1966), pp. 508-509. Brown cites the following articles as bibliography, which have not been examined in this study: F. M. Braun, "Le 'monde' bon et mauvais de l'Evangile johannique," La Vie Spirituelle, 88 (1953), pp. 580-598; 89 (1954), pp. 15-29; P. Benoit, "Le monde peut-il etre sauve?" La Vie Intellectuelle, 17 (1949), pp. 3-20. Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (14 Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), passim. H. J. Holtzmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, in Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, Vierter Band (Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage; Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893), passim. Edwyn Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, edited by Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947), passim. R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, edited by C. F. Evans (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 74-76. R. H. Strachan, The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment (Third edition; London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1955), pp. 100-101. Rudolf Schnackenburg, Das Johannes-evangelium, Erster Teil (Freiburg: Herder, c.1965), pp. 231-232.

⁵Rudolf Bultmann, "Das Verstaendnis von Welt und Mensch im Neuen Testament und im Griechentum," Glauben und Verstehen: Gesammelte Aufsaeetze, Zweiter Band (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), pp. 59-78; Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955), II, passim.

⁶Heinrich Schlier, "Welt und Mensch nach dem Johannesevangelium," Besinnung auf das Neue Testament (Freiburg: Herder, c.1964), II, 242-253.

⁷George Walker Redding, "Kosmos in John's Gospel and Epistles" (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1938).

and the other⁸ deals only with the "ethical" idea of the kosmos, and fails to integrate its conclusions sufficiently into Johannine theology.

In the current groping after proper approaches of the church to the world and an understanding of the relation of Christ to the world, several approaches could be made. One might rebel against a past "Puritanism" and, urged on by conscience or environment, seek to make new approaches to the world. Such an effort might be undertaken in despair of any help from the New Testament, or non-theological bridges might be built to the world, which would disregard the witness of the New Testament and bypass the very kosmos-problems which the New Testament refuses to ignore. The latter mission would fail to hear God's questions addressed to itself and would fail to address these questions to the world. But one might also take the term "world" of the English versions as a literal and realistic equivalent for kosmos and thus find theological justification for aloofness from the world. Such an approach would favor the cliché "in, not of the world" and assume that such an expression, so worded, is faithful to the witness of the New Testament. A study of kosmos in John may indicate which approaches are unacceptable and may open the way for new ones as well.

In the approach to the definition of kosmos in John, the usage of kosmos in the Umwelt, including, Greek, Hellenistic, Oriental, and Jewish writings, is examined, but the historical problems of this literature

⁸William Griffin Henderson, "The Ethical Idea of the World in John's Gospel" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1944).

are not considered in detail.⁹ Then account is taken of the usage of kosmos in the New Testament outside of John, followed by an intensive and extensive investigation of the usage of kosmos in John. References and comparisons to 1 John are occasionally made, but 1 John does not receive any major consideration.¹⁰ Special attention is also given to data which appear to reflect John's concept of men of the kosmos, but which do not incorporate the term kosmos. Isagogical, historical, and special theological problems in John are considered only to the extent necessary for an understanding of the usage of kosmos.

The second chapter of this study takes up the usage of kosmos or its equivalents throughout the Umwelt of John, with reference to classical and Hellenistic Greek, Gnostic, Hermetic, Mandaean, Septuagintal, and Jewish usages, as well as the usage of the New Testament outside John. The third chapter offers a detailed study of John's usage of the word kosmos. Special problems relating to this usage are also considered. In chapters four and five data are examined in which the word kosmos is not used. The subject of chapter four is men of the kosmos in conversation and action. In chapter five kosmos-men are studied as John develops and defines them in their relation to Jesus. The sixth chapter

⁹The Umwelt of John is defined as the total secular and religious thought world in which John conceivably wrote. Much of the literature examined from this Umwelt has been written later than the Fourth Gospel, but it may still express the thought world of John's day. Historical questions do not significantly affect the understanding of kosmos in the Umwelt.

¹⁰While 1 John appears to come from the "school" of the Fourth Gospel and much of its vocabulary and theological thought are similar, it cannot certainly be stated that they have the same author. Further, the usage of kosmos in the Fourth Gospel can profitably be studied as a unit.

contains summary and conclusions.

Primary sources for this study are Gnostic, Hermetic, and Jewish documents, the Septuagint, and the New Testament. Secondary sources are word studies, especially Sasse's article, monographs, and major commentaries.

The following methodology was used. Representative literature of the Umwelt, including Gnostic and Jewish literature, the Hermetica, the Septuagint, and the New Testament, was examined, where possible, by means of a concordance. This examination was supplemented with word studies, monographs, commentaries, and studies of the history and thought reflected in the literature of the Umwelt. Every use of kosmos in John was then studied and evaluated, with attempt at a solution of special problems relating to John's usage of kosmos. Finally, a study was made of all data which further elaborate and define the understanding of man behind John's usage of kosmos. Data were examined in which John narrates the conversation and actions of men of the kosmos. These data do not ordinarily contain the word kosmos, but an attempt was made to discover what contribution they make to the picture of kosmos-men and the concept of men which John elsewhere signals with the term kosmos.

CHAPTER II

KOSMOS IN THE UMWELT OF JOHN

Non-Biblical Greek

Classical Greek to Plotinus, including Philo

Although kosmos had an "established place in the vocabulary of the Greeks from the time of Homer, its etymology is uncertain."¹ Combining the idea of building or establishing with that of order, kosmos came to mean: that which is well assembled; order between men; order in a general sense; adornment—because the beautiful is inseparable from the ordered.²

More important in view of the subject of this study is the development of the usage of kosmos in the sense of world. As previous usage merges with the denotation "world," kosmos becomes an important term in Greek philosophy. An uncertain tradition ascribes the first use of kosmos in the Ionian natural philosophy of the sixth century. The Greeks had come to assert an order of things corresponding to the order of law existing between men. The world was a macrocosm, an ordered society of things. Thus kosmos came to signify the order by which the sum of

¹Herman Sasse, "kosmos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966), III, 868.

²Ibid., pp. 868-869.

individual things is gathered into a totality, cosmic order.³

At least by the end of the fifth century kosmos came to denote the totality held together by this order, the world in a spatial sense. Plato uses kosmos in the sense of "universe," because in it all individual things are brought into unity by a universal order. The kosmos is the spatial manifestation of the Idea, a rational creature with body and soul. Because of a merging of the sense of cosmic space and heavenly space kosmos and ouranos were used interchangeably at the time of Plato and Aristotle. For Aristotle kosmos is a spherical body, with the spherical earth at its heart. Having no beginning or end in time, Aristotle's kosmos embraces everything bound to time and space. In Aristotle classical Greek thinking reached its termination; further development in the Hellenistic and Roman period took place under increasing Oriental influence and religious emphasis.⁴

Unique for the Greek view of kosmos are the following: unity; an immanent norm integrating the individual things into a perfect totality;⁵ beauty; a deep natural relation between man and the kosmos.⁶ Philosophically, ideas about the kosmos ranged from Heraclitus' affirmation

³Ibid., pp. 869-870.

⁴Ibid., pp. 870-873.

⁵"Heraclitus [proposes as this norm] his discovery of the logos which is the supreme norm of the thinking and conduct of men and which is also the norm which integrates the varied and opposing elements into cosmic unity. It is no accident that after the magnificent concepts of Plato and Aristotle concerning the subjection of the universe to divine reason, Stoicism returned to the idea of the logos in its attempt to understand the divine nature of the immanent law of the world" (Ibid., p. 873).

⁶Ibid., pp. 873-874.

that the kosmos is eternal; to Plato's view of the kosmos as a creation of the demiurge, a demonstration of God's existence, and itself a God; to Aristotle's assertion, more specifically material than that of Heraclitus, that the world is without beginning or end; to the Stoic conception of the coming into being and passing of the kosmos as an eternal recurrence.⁷

Significant differences developed between the Platonic and Stoic traditions. In Platonic thought the world of sensible experience, kosmos aisthētos, is the copy of a higher world of eternal forms, kosmos noētos. The Stoics recognized no such supramundane existences. For them the logos is the rational principle immanent in the universe. The world exists because the active principle, logos, acts upon the passive principle, hylē, and gives it form and meaning. Man can know the kosmos because logos is in him also. While the Stoics can call the logos God, since there is no other God than the immanent rational principle, the Platonists seek God beyond the world. Either God is identified with the highest of the Ideas which make up the kosmos noētos or he is the cause and ground of the kosmos noētos.⁸

When the Platonists introduced a third element, that of form or pattern, to complete their two principles of God and matter, a new fusion of conceptions arose. The Platonic forms in the mind of God, often conceived as causes operating outside him, became identified with the Stoic logoi. The ground was laid on which Philo built.⁹

⁷Ibid., pp. 874-876.

⁸C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), pp. 65-66.

⁹Edwin Hatch, The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 181-182.

In every case kosmos had become a term invested with the highest religious dignity. Its very literal meaning of order expresses a positive evaluation of the object. The attitude toward the all is not neutral, but the whole is seen through the ennobling quality of order. While countless other common usages of kosmos as order continue, the universe is the widest instance and most perfect exemplar of order. The bounded physical universe is a divine entity, however differently viewed by Platonic or Stoic eyes.¹⁰ Veneration of the kosmos is veneration of a whole of which man is a part.¹¹ Bultmann writes:

Die Welt ist dabei nach Analogie des ergon der texnē verstanden, als das Kunstwerk, in dem die Materie geformt ist, Gestalt gewonnen hat. Die Gesetze der Gestalten und alles Gestaltwerdens gilt es zu erkennen. Damit versteht der Mensch sich selbst, naemlich also einen Teil des grossen kosmos, organisch eingegliedert in den objektiven Zusammenhang der Welt, sich selbst gegenstaendlich fuer die Betrachtung wie die anderen Naturobjekte. Solches Wissen ist seine Weltanschauung: der Mensch versteht sich als einen Fall des Allgemeinen, und er versteht die Raetsel seines Daseins, wenn er die Gesetzmaessigkeit des Ganzen versteht. Was dem Ganzen Sein und Gesetz gibt, gibt es auch ihm. Er selbst ist ein Mikrokosmos.¹²

How seriously the Greeks took the kosmos may be seen in their doctrine of aretē, "the actualization in the mode of excellence of the several faculties of the soul for dealing with the world."¹³ Cicero could say that man is born to contemplate the kosmos and to imitate it. Though he

¹⁰ Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Second edition; revised; Boston: Beacon Press, c.1963), pp. 241-242.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 246.

¹² Rudolf Bultmann, "Das Verstaendnis von Welt und Mensch im Neuen Testament und im Griechentum," Glaube und Verstehen: Gesammelte Aufsätze (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), II, 63.

¹³ Jonas, p. 267. Such a virtue, Jonas remarks, would appear not only absurd, but positively irreligious to the Gnostic.

is far from being perfect, he is a little part of the perfect.¹⁴

Yet, "a strain of pessimism was always latent in the Greek attitude toward the world."¹⁵ The material world can easily be an obstruction to man's true relation to the divine. Disparagement of the world received further impetus from the independent growth of astrology.¹⁶ The decline of the polis and the rise of monarchies also alter the positive valuation of man, society, and the kosmos. The later Greek view comes to represent a position of retreat. While formerly man's relation to the kosmos was only one special case of the part-whole relation fundamental to all classical thought, the later Stoic man is no longer a part of anything except the universe.¹⁷ Jonas notes that

the ontological principle survived the conditions of its concrete validation. Stoic pantheism, and generally the physico-theology of the post-Aristotelian thought, substituted for the relation between citizen and city that between the individual and the cosmos, the larger living whole. By this shift of reference the classical doctrine of whole and parts was kept in force even though it no longer reflected the practical situation of men.¹⁸

Now kosmos has become the great city of gods and men and to be a cosmopolitan is the goal by which otherwise isolated man can set his course. Man is asked to adopt the cause of the universe as his own and identify with it, relating his logos to the logos of the whole. His role is to act in the place and station accorded him by cosmic destiny. Heimarmenē

¹⁴Cicero, De Natura Deorum, ii, 14, quoted in Jonas, p. 245.

¹⁵C. R. North, "World, the," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, c.1962), IV, 875.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Jonas, pp. 246-248.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 248.

has been equated with pronoia. Man's integration with the whole is maintained only by a strained fervor. The Stoic wanted to preserve the dignity of man and save a sanction for positive morality.¹⁹ This effort to succeed in what formerly was inspired by civic virtue

represented a heroic attempt on the part of the intellectuals to carry over the life-sustaining force of that ideal into fundamentally changed conditions. But the new atomized masses of the Empire, who had never shared in that noble tradition of aretē, might react very differently to a situation in which they found themselves passively involved: a situation in which the part was insignificant to the whole, and the whole alien to the parts.²⁰

The Stoic began to withdraw, to turn inward, believing that concentration on his inner nature--which is spirit--would make him free. Lord in his inner self over his thoughts and will, he has lost control of the outside world. But it has no control over him either, if he does not misunderstand his true nature.²¹ Yet the order of the universe as something divine remained a pervading public validity and represented the religion of the intellectuals.²²

The development of kosmos usage from the Ionian thinkers to its climax in the Athenian schools ended, as did Greek philosophy generally, in Alexandria. Here the last thinkers of Hellenism concluded philosophical work on the Greek view of kosmos. Here Philo was active, using kosmos more than any other thinker of antiquity.²³ How significant the Greek idea is, Philo shows in his concern to harmonize Jewish

¹⁹Jonas, pp. 248-249.

²⁰Ibid., p. 249.

²¹Bultmann, Glauben und Verstehen, II, 65.

²²Jonas, p. 250.

²³Sasse, p. 877.

Biblical faith and Greek philosophy in the problem of God and the world. He wants to remain loyal to the truth of the Old Testament and to the main principles of Stoic-Platonic philosophy.²⁴

Philo makes the distinction between kosmos noētos as the spiritual model of the empirical world and the kosmos houtos or kosmos aisthētos or kosmos oratos, as the empirical world itself. Philo believes he finds in the Septuagintal text of Genesis 1:1 the creation, on the first day, of a world of Ideas. The perceptible world stands to this world as copy to original. Philo follows Greek thought regarding the kosmos as order, a thing of beauty, and a living creature with a soul. He finds it necessary to reconcile the doctrine of the divine transcendence, increasingly stressed since Plato and Aristotle and now represented by the Neo-Pythagoreans; the Stoic pronoia that governs the world; and the Old Testament belief in God as Creator. He goes at his task by way of the logos.²⁵

The logos is the mediator between God and the world; through it the transcendent God of philosophy becomes the Creator of the world. Generally, Philo seems closer to Plato's Timaeus than to Genesis.

In De Opificio Mundi, Philo writes: "When he designed to found the Great City, he first conceived of its types, and from them composed a world of the mind (kosmos noētos), and then using it as a model completed the world of the senses."²⁶ Dodd remarks: "Consequently, the kosmos noētos is simply the logos in the act of creating a world."²⁷ Philo tries to

²⁴Sasse, p. 877.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 877-878.

²⁶Dodd, p. 67.

²⁷Ibid.

show that the world of ideas is not localized.²⁸ The kosmos which consists of ideas has no other location than the divine logos, which is the author of this ordered frame.²⁹ God made the kosmos because he is good; he gave of his own nature to something which otherwise would be worthless by itself.³⁰ The intellect discerns the kosmos noetos and this archetypal seed is none other than the very logos of God.³¹ Philo concludes on the basis of Genesis that the Deity is and has been from eternity, that God is one, that the world came into being, that the world too is one as well as its Maker, who made his work like himself in its uniqueness, that God used up for the creation of the world all the material that exists, that God also exercises forethought in the world's behalf.³² Elsewhere in Philo, the logos is the shepherd of the kosmos³³ and the kosmos is called the only and beloved son.³⁴

The history of kosmos in ancient philosophy ends with Neo-Platonism. The Platonic duplication of the kosmos which reappeared in Philo's kosmos noētos and kosmos aisthētos finds its culmination in Plotinus' doctrine of the two worlds, the kosmos ekeinos, the intelligible world, and the kosmos houtos, the phenomenal world. Plotinus lauds the beauty

²⁸Philo, De Opificio Mundi, chapter 17, translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), I. Further references are to the chapter in Philo.

²⁹Ibid., 20.

³⁰Ibid., 21.

³¹Ibid., 20-25.

³²Ibid., 170-172.

³³Dodd, p. 136.

³⁴Hugo Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckerei [1929]), p. 119.

of the kosmos noētos and emphasizes its perfect unity over against the empirical world. Yet, in true Greek manner, Plotinus avoids any logical dualism and extols the beauty, too, of the phenomenal world. Its beauty consists in the fact that it is a copy or reflection of the kosmos noētos.³⁵

The phenomenal world maintains its beauty and glory whenever the Idea really has dominion over matter, the soul over the body. The lower world is an image of the upper world, though a shadowy one. In point of fact, however, the unity and harmony in the phenomenal world disappears in strife and opposition. The original cause of this appears to be matter, which is evil when devoid of form and idea. Yet it can be considered something intermediate—capable of form. The kosmos, then, does not equal matter and so is not intrinsically evil; to the extent that it loses form and meaning it becomes evil.³⁶

Important for Plotinus' view of man is the unity of all being in the universe. Man in his essence is kindred to the whole kosmos, even to the macrocosmic entities, though they are incomparably superior to him. But their very superiority lies in reason, which man is to imitate. "The better he is, the more he actualizes his kinship with the cosmic powers, that is, the more he increases the original generic community of his being and that of the total cosmos."³⁷ This is a far cry from Gnosticism, and Plotinus himself shows his antipathy to any

³⁵Sasse, p. 879.

³⁶Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, translated by Neil Buchanan (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961), I, 344.

³⁷Jonas, p. 263.

kind of hatred of the world in his writing: "Against the Gnostics, or against those who say that the Creator of the World is evil and that the world is bad."³⁸

Meanwhile, in the later Koinē kosmos has acquired the sense of earth, inhabited world, humanity, the totality of creatures existing in the world.³⁹ The birthday of the divine Augustus, for example, is the beginning of good news to the world; Nero is called the Lord of the whole world.⁴⁰

Gnosticism

The usage of kosmos from the Milesian thinkers to the last Neo-Platonists was not confined to philosophy. When Platonic and Stoic ideas of the kosmos began to influence the outlook and religion of wider circles, the word kosmos made its way into religious and cultic speech. Sasse writes:

In earlier times the concept had vanquished the nature myths which controlled the view of early Greece (Hesiod, the Orphics). But the ancient theogonic and cosmogonic speculations were never completely banished. With the penetration of oriental religions into the Hellenistic world, the nature speculations and creation myths of the Babylonians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Persians came also. How powerfully these speculations, long since overcome by Greek learning, dominated the minds of the time, may be seen in the flowering of syncretistic Gnosticism. This adopts even the term kosmos with its rich content and varied meaning, and brings it into the vocabulary of syncretistic nature mythology.⁴¹

³⁸Plotinus, Enn. ii, 9.

³⁹Sasse, p. 880.

⁴⁰James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Limited, 1952), p. 356.

⁴¹Sasse, p. 879.

Gnosticism is an overwhelmingly complex subject, and it does not lie within the scope of this study to discuss the numerous historical problems connected with the subject. Whatever conclusions may be drawn regarding the sources, influences, dating, and origins of Gnostic thinking, two facts are pertinent here. In all the so-called Gnostic writings that use the term, the view of kosmos is nearly uniform; and, Gnostic documents provide a usage which certainly plays a significant role in the thought world of John. In this section the usage of kosmos in the Gnostic documents,⁴² as well as significant analyses of this usage by Gnostic scholars, is examined.

Possibly the one exception to the typical world view of Gnosticism is the early Gnostic system of Simonianism, in which Simon Magus and Menander are the first two leading figures. Whether setting its hope on Simon and Helen or on Menander, early Simonianism sought to live on in this world and overcome the evil angels here, having received a baptism which makes the disciples deathless, ageless, and immortal. The very use of the word magician to describe both Simon and Menander indicates the this-worldly emphasis, for magical art seeks to give power here and now.⁴³ Indeed, compared with later major Gnostic systems, "Simonianism was an optimistic, this-worldly religion."⁴⁴ To be sure, Simonianism sees the state of the world as bad, so bad that it can be set right only by divine intervention. Evil angels made the world and now are

⁴²Most of the significant Gnostic writings of the first and second centuries are compiled in Robert M. Grant, Gnosticism: A Sourcebook of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period (New York: Harper and Brothers, c.1961).

⁴³R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (Revised edition; New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, c.1966), p. 108.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 97.

responsible for its present condition.⁴⁵ Saturninus, the third member of the Simonian school, emphasizes only the latter points and there is no thought of this-worldly salvation. He is militantly ascetic and rejects all this-worldly magic, seeking only escape from this world in the divine spark of life.⁴⁶ He is hostile "toward the world, toward the world-accepting Jews, toward the world-creating, sex-creating god of the Jews."⁴⁷

In all other Gnostic systems polemicized by Irenaeus, hatred of the world and redemption through escape stand out among an otherwise varied and confusing array of speculations. Grant remarks: "For any Gnostic the world is really hell."⁴⁸ Indeed, Grant is able to assert that the one element which binds all the various Gnostic systems together is the view that the world is bad, that it is under the control of evil or ignorance or nothingness, that it cannot be redeemed.⁴⁹

Carpocrates follows the Simonians. For him the world is made by inferior angels. Jesus is born naturally of Joseph, becomes righteous, attains a vigorous and pure soul, remembers his former life, and so escapes the world-creators by means of divine power sent to him. Passing through all, he is free and comes to God. The moral of the story is that any soul can do the same if it learns to despise the world-creating archons.⁵⁰ Jesus plays a similar role in Marcion's thought. He "destroyed

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 17.

⁴⁶Grant, Gnosticism, p. 32.

⁴⁷Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 107.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 150.

⁴⁹Grant, Gnosticism, p. 15.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 36.

the prophets and the law and all the works of that God who made the world," the Cosmocrator.⁵¹

The Barbelo-Gnostics investigate the origins of the kosmos and find that Sophia, driven by simplicity and kindness, generated a work in which were Ignorance and Presumption; this work is called Proarchon, the fashioner of this universe. Stealing power from Sophia, Proarchon makes the firmament and all the powers beneath, generating Wickedness, Jealousy, Envy, Strife, and Desire.⁵² A similar view is expressed by one of the leading Valentinians, Ptolemaeus. Sophia gives birth without father to a shapeless mass; Matter has its primal origin in her ignorance, grief, fear, and consternation.⁵³

More significant is the exegesis of John found in Ptolemaeus:

John the Lord's disciple, desiring to tell of the origin of the universe, by which the Father produced everything, posits a certain Beginning, which was first generated by God, which he called Only-Begotten Son and God, in which the Father emitted all things spermatically. By this the Logos was emitted and in it was the whole substance of the Aeons, which the Logos itself later shaped.⁵⁴

Then follow amazingly inventive cosmogenies based on the Prologue. Regarding John 1:5 and the light shining in darkness, Ptolemaeus concludes: "even when he shaped everything which came into existence out of passion, he was not known by it."⁵⁵

Another Valentinian, Heracleon, composed notes on parts of the first eight chapters of John. In a comment on John 1:29 he concludes that Lamb

⁵¹Ibid., p. 45.

⁵²Ibid., p. 50-51.

⁵³Ibid., p. 166.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 182.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 183.

refers to Christ and "takes away the sin of the world" concerns him who was in the body. "As the lamb is imperfect in the genus of sheep, so the body is imperfect by comparison with him who dwells in it. If he had wanted to ascribe perfection to the body, he would have spoken of a ram which was to be sacrificed."⁵⁶ On John 4:21, he says mountain means the devil or his world, since the devil is one part of the whole of matter and the whole world is the mountain of evil which all Jews prior to the law and all Gentiles worship. Jerusalem is the creation of the Creator, whom the Jews worship. But the spirituals "will worship neither the creation nor the Demiurge, but the Father of Truth."⁵⁷

Barrett believes that Gnostic interest in John

was almost entirely cosmological and was concentrated upon the Prologue, which supplied or confirmed the titles of several aeons, such as Arche, Logos, Zoe, and the like. It is difficult to resist the view that the gnostics used John because out of it, by exegesis sound or unsound, they were able to win support and enrichment for preconceived theories and mythologies.⁵⁸

Granting variations in "Gnostic" thought, for there is no one Gnostic viewpoint, what is the common goal, if any, toward which Gnostic thought aims, and what role does its view of the world play? Irenaeus reports that gnosis is the redemption of the inner, spiritual man, not of the body or the soul.⁵⁹ The most famous description of the Gnostic religious goal is that in Clement: "Who we are and what we have become; where we

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 197.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 200-201.

⁵⁸C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to John (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 55.

⁵⁹Adv. Haer. i, 21. 4, quoted in Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 7.

were or where we had been made to fall; whither we are hastening, whence we are being redeemed; what birth is and what rebirth is."⁶⁰

Often the Gnostic religious concerns appear to get lost in cosmology and some writers on Gnosticism have failed to see anything more in Gnosticism than mythological speculations. Dodd takes an intermediate view. Gnosticism, he believes, is not so much knowledge of God in any profoundly religious sense, as knowledge about the structure of the higher world and the way to get there. This knowledge includes cosmology, but the Gnostic special interest goes beyond the kosmos. Gnosticism wants to attain access to the realm of being beyond sense experience through communication of detailed knowledge of that world, rather than through religious attitudes and activities.⁶¹ "He who knows what he is and whence he is can find the way home. He who knows the nature of the world and its governing powers can overcome these powers."⁶²

Bigg, however, believes it would be a mistake to approach Gnosticism on a metaphysical side. The Gnostic interest and meaning lies entirely in an ethical motive. "It was an attempt, a serious attempt, to fathom the dread mystery of sorrow and pain, to answer that spectral doubt, which is mostly crushed down by force--Can the world as we know it have been made by God?"⁶³ In a similar vein, Galloway concludes that it is true in a certain sense to say that the church's failure to

⁶⁰Excerpta ex Theodota 78.2, quoted in Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 7.

⁶¹Dodd, pp. 101-102.

⁶²Ibid., p. 113.

⁶³Charles Bigg, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1886), p. 28.

interpret by emphasizing cosmic redemption the apocalyptic eschatology of the Bible contributed largely to the rise of Gnosticism.⁶⁴

Grant takes up the problem of eschatology and apocalyptic. Maintaining that some of the most significant early Gnostic systems have Jewish roots, he asserts that these Gnostics must have been ex-Jews, renegades from their religion. They arose through the failure of apocalyptic. When apocalyptic predictions were not realized, three courses were open: postpone the time of fulfillment and rewrite; abandon religion entirely; seek escape rather than victory and then reinterpret the revelation to show it had been misunderstood. The latter was the Gnostic course.⁶⁵ "The essence of their religion had come to be knowledge of the nature of the self and of the way in which the self could escape from this world to another."⁶⁶ The dualism which thereby arose was often Iranian in origin, but had filtered through Judaism into Gnosticism.⁶⁷ Much of this dualism was present in apocalyptic. The Gnostics only magnified the world as the battleground of good and evil angels into the world as the product of evil angels from whose power only escape

⁶⁴Alan Galloway, The Cosmic Christ (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1951), p. 77.

⁶⁵Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp. 26-35.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 35.

⁶⁷Ibid. Grant, ibid., p. 113, quotes K. G. Kuhn: "The ethical and eschatological dualism of the preaching of Zarathustra and of the later Iranian religion found acceptance in [Qumran] . . . and was combined with its Old Testament foundation, while gnosis represents a later stage of the infiltration of Parsee dualism. In this stage it was revised under the wholly different influence of Greek thought, into a physical dualism of substance. In this way for the first time there arose the notion, decisive for gnosis, that matter, the world in terms of its physical substance, is the enemy of God."

could be provided, and that through planetary spheres.⁶⁸ Grant finds Jonas agreeing that the anti-cosmic aspect of Gnosticism, which was coupled with the eschatological dualism, arose out of a "belief that the God of this cosmos has failed to act on behalf of his people."⁶⁹

What purpose, then, did all the cosmology and mythology serve? The self-centered Gnostic is concerned with mythological cosmology only because it expresses and illuminates his understanding of himself, Grant thinks. In his passionate subjectivity he counts the world lost for the sake of self-discovery.⁷⁰ Mythology is significant because it represents an attempt to explain the present situation and how to get out of it.⁷¹ Gnostics were devoted ultimately not to mythology, but to freedom. Mythology was an aspect of this freedom—freedom from astral spirits, from the God of the Old Testament, from the tyranny of creation and law.⁷²

Working through mythology, then, Gnostic speculation "recapitulates the journey of the fall, the odyssey of ignorance, in the form of knowledge"⁷³ and thereby raises the individual existence which is the victim of ignorance out of that very depth of ignorance whose origin it describes. In the Valentinian "pneumatic equation" the event of human knowledge is the inverse equivalent of the pre-cosmic event of divine ignorance. In its redeeming effect it belongs to the same ontological

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 39.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 37.

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 10.

⁷²Ibid., p. 12.

⁷³Jonas, p. 194.

order.⁷⁴ It would appear, then, that Gnosticism is interested in the kosmos only with a view to disinterest in it—to express the view that salvation can come only from beyond the kosmos and that salvation itself means going beyond the kosmos.

Significantly, the Gnostics retained the name kosmos with its Greek characteristic of order. The very features of order are enhanced in their power and impact on man, but the order is now rigid and inimical, a tyrannical and evil law, devoid of meaning and goodness, alien to the purposes of man. It is an order empty of divinity, an emphatically negative concept.⁷⁵ "There is a basic experience of an absolute rift between man and that in which he finds himself lodged, the world."⁷⁶ The passionately felt dualism between man and the world posits as its metaphysical counterpart that between God and the world.⁷⁷ "As the world is that which alienates from God, so God is that which alienates and liberates from the world."⁷⁸ The order of kosmos has become order with a vengeance. Far from being chaos, creation is a comprehensively binding system governed by law, a cosmic law which thwarts freedom. The Stoic cosmic logos is now oppressive cosmic fate.⁷⁹ Never before or after this time, Jonas believes, had such a gulf opened up between man and the world, between life and its begetter. Hence it was possible to speak so rebelliously and contemptuously about the world, and a felling of

⁷⁴Jonas, p. 176.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 250.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 251.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 252.

⁷⁹Ibid.

cosmic solitude, abandonment, and transcendental superiority of the self took hold of men's consciousness.⁸⁰ "The music of the spheres was no longer heard, and the admiration for the perfect spherical form gave place to the terror of so much perfection directed at the enslavement of man."⁸¹

But the total view of life, Jonas believes, is neither optimistic nor pessimistic. If the kosmos is bad, there is the goodness of the outer-worldly God; if a prison, there is an alternative; if man is a prisoner, there is salvation from the kosmos.⁸² But if this is to be true, man must be acosmic in his inner nature. There must be an ultimate otherness of his origin; his kinship can be neither with the whole nor with any part of the universe.⁸³ The new positive, then, is a trans-mundane deity, not merely extra- or supra-mundane, but contra-mundane.⁸⁴ Man's home in the outside, the beyond, is his very salvation, for the limitation of the beyond deprives the kosmos power structure of its claim to totality. Because of this radical limitation, the kosmos has become merely this kosmos. The other world is the habitation of Life. Seen from beyond, man's world becomes that world. The important

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 254.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 251.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Ibid., p. 263. How close the Gnostics came! They got to the inner nature, but then solved the problem by postulating a certain cosmological origin of that nature--instead of dealing with the historical-ethical rebellion of that nature against God, as John did.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 251. Unlike the kosmos noetos of Plato and the world-Lord of Judaism, this radically transcendent deity stands in no positive relation to the sensible world. He is not the essence, but the cancellation and negation of the sensible world. There is more nihil than ens in this concept of God (ibid., p. 271).

demonstrative pronoun becomes closely related to the primary concept of the Alien.⁸⁵ In some Gnostic systems, when all men are restored to that sphere in the Beyond, when the deity's pre-cosmic wholeness is restored, then the kosmos, deprived of its elements of light, will come to an end.⁸⁶

A whole new view of man in the kosmos has developed, then, in Gnosticism... Jonas writes:

The self is kindred only to other human selves living in the world—and to the transmundane God, with whom the non-mundane center of the self can enter into communication. This God must be acosmic, because the cosmos has become the realm of that which is alien to the self. Here we can discern the profound connection which exists between the discovery of the self, the despiritualizing of the world, and the positing of the transcendent God.⁸⁷

Hostility toward the world, the body, and man's physical existence in the world raises the problem of ethics. Ptolemaeus maintains that the psychis are of the world and must practice good conduct so that through it they may make it to the Middle. The spirituals, however, are only in the world and continence is not necessary at all. It is not conduct that leads to the Pleroma anyway, but the seed sent out from the Pleroma at birth.⁸⁸ Epiphanes took a different approach, providing a philosophical justification for promiscuity. Making all things for man to be common property, God showed righteousness to be a universal sharing, he asserts. Commandments regarding the neighbor's wife were regarded by Epiphanes as comic words and a great jest.⁸⁹

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 51.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 45.

⁸⁷Ibid., pp. 263-264.

⁸⁸Grant, Gnosticism, p. 176.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 40.

Although contempt for mundane ties sometimes led to asceticism, much Gnostic thought expresses more vigorously than Ptolemaeus or Epiphaneus a strident libertinism. Laws are just one more form of cosmic tyranny exercised by the Creator, and sanctions affect only the body and psyche. "Through intentional violation of the demiurgical norms the pneumatic thwarts the design of the Archons and paradoxically contributes to the work of salvation."⁹⁰ This intense antinomianism forcefully exhibits the nihilistic element in Gnostic acosmism.⁹¹ Thus libertinism actually becomes a program to be completed, since laws set the seal of seriousness on kosmos involvement. The last thing the Gnostic wants to do is assist the kosmos to function smoothly and himself become a compliant part of the whole compulsory system.⁹² All the realities between the Gnostic and his wholly other God are either fetters and obstacles or irrelevant to his direct relationship with that God. The sum of these intervening realities is the kosmos. "The surpassing interest in salvation, the exclusive concern in the destiny of the transcendent self, 'denatures,' as it were, these real ties and takes the heart out of the concern with them where such a concern is unavoidable."⁹³

The Hermetica

The Hermetica are the literary products of a Hellenistic religious

⁹⁰Jonas, p. 46.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Ibid., p. 272.

⁹³Ibid., pp. 267-268.

thought which might be called semi-Gnostic, but is certainly different from much of Gnostic thought. These documents were written primarily in the second and third centuries, A.D.⁹⁴

This literature uses kosmos frequently, but without complete consistency. The Greek view is recognized when the kosmos is declared rightly named since all things in it are wrought into an ordered whole.⁹⁵ All matter is set in order through necessity and providence and nature, which are the instruments by which the kosmos is governed.⁹⁶ The kosmos is a great and perfect life.⁹⁷ Even kalos is used of the visible universe;⁹⁸

⁹⁴In Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 148, Grant notes that Festugiere insists on the eclectic Middle-Platonic character of the Hermetica and derives them from the milieu of popular philosophy rather than from mythological gnosis; van Moorsel believes they are not Gnostic at all; Quispel calls them Gnosticizing and van Moorsel is willing to call them semi-Gnostic; Grant agrees.

In The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), pp. 244-245, C. H. Dodd writes that the Hermetica are a reaction against rationalism; that they use philosophy as a handmaid of gnosis which has been preserved in ancient religious traditions and communicated through prophets; that they show a Platonism with the mystical and theistic elements emphasized. Dodd believes that philosophy has been employed to rationalize or interpret Eastern religions and mythologies in an effort to attain a divinely communicated gnosis. The Hermetica presuppose a higher synthesis of all religions.

⁹⁵Corpus Hermeticum 9.8. All quotations and citations are from the edition of Walter Scott, Hermetica (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924-1936), four volumes. This edition contains an introduction, the Greek text, an English translation, and extensive notes. All quotations and citations have been compared with a more critical edition of the Greek text: A. D. Nock and A. J. Festugiere, Corpus Hermeticum (Paris: Societa D'Edition Les Belles Lettres, 1945-1954), four volumes. Hereafter, the common abbreviation C.H. will be used.

⁹⁶C.H. 12.ii.14b.

⁹⁷C.H. 11.i.4b.

⁹⁸C.H. 11.7.

elsewhere it is used only of the invisible.⁹⁹

The differentiation between kosmos noētos and kosmos aisthētos, prominent in Philo, occurs in the Hermetica also. The kosmos noētos encompasses the kosmos aisthētos and fills its material mass with many forms of every shape.¹⁰⁰ The kosmos aisthētos came into being when God beheld the beautiful kosmos noētos and copied it.¹⁰¹ The kosmos noētos is a world without bounds.¹⁰² In a hierarchy from God to man, the kosmos noētos seems to occupy second place, after God, and the kosmos aisthētos, fourth place, after the sun.¹⁰³ The kosmos is sōma and moves in a great incorporeal space, which is mind; God is the cause of the mind's existence.¹⁰⁴ Mind encompasses the kosmos aisthētos.¹⁰⁵

Sometimes kosmos is distinguished from earth. In one place the home of evil is the earth, and not the whole kosmos, as some will blasphemously say in days to come.¹⁰⁶ When the demiurge had made the kosmos,

⁹⁹Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 127.

¹⁰⁰C.H. 16.12.

¹⁰¹C.H. 1.8b.

¹⁰²C.H. 1.7. This depends on Scott's conjecture, II, p. 27, that the kosmos aisthētos is perioristos.

¹⁰³C.H. 16.17.

¹⁰⁴C.H. 2.13.

¹⁰⁵C.H. 1.9.

¹⁰⁶Hans Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist (Dritte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 154, thinks this may be an anti-Gnostic gloss—part of a Greek reaction against the Gnostic deprivation of the kosmos. He notes that the Hermetica do, however, represent a newer feeling toward the world.

he willed to kosmēsai (set in order, embellish) the earth also and so he sent down man to be an embellishment (kosmon) on the divine body.¹⁰⁷

It is man's function to contemplate the works of God. He was made to view the kosmos with wondering awe and come to know its Maker.¹⁰⁸

In the same tractate, however, there is a warning to reject the corporeal in order to attain the incorporeal. The corporeal is only an encumbrance in God's kosmos.

Kosmos is often connected with the sun or the heavenly bodies. God maintains the undying merē tou kosmou (heavenly bodies).¹⁰⁹ God is the Father of all: the Sun, the demiurge, and the kosmos, which is the instrument by which the demiurge works.¹¹⁰ In this usage, kosmos means a whole system of spheres. The sun is in the midst of the kosmos above and below, wearing the kosmos as a wreath around it.¹¹¹ The sun lets the kosmos go on its course, but never lets it separate itself from the sun; lest the kosmos should rush away in disorder, the sun binds itself to the

¹⁰⁷C.H. 5.2. This may mean that God needed something more for the earthly part of the kosmos and so put men on earth, or it may imply man's function to beautify the earth. Dodd, Interpretation, p. 27, believes there may be a hint here that the honorable term kosmos belongs to the universe only as completed by the presence of divine humanity. Note the pun on kosmos as universe and as ornament.

¹⁰⁸C.H. 4.2. The text is corrupt; Nock-Festugiere do not support Scott's conjecture.

¹⁰⁹C.H. 16.8.

¹¹⁰C.H. 16.18.

¹¹¹C.H. 16.7.

chariot of the kosmos.¹¹²

The whole kosmos is a great God, 'an image of the God who is greater, maintaining its order with the Father's will, a plērōma tēs zōēs, a living being.¹¹³ The kosmos is the second God, an immortal being.¹¹⁴ The sense and thought of the kosmos are occupied in accomplishing God's will.¹¹⁵ The kosmos receives seed from God and develops it into a perpetual succession of living beings. The bodies of these beings are composed of the cosmic elements; their qualities are imposed by the heavenly bodies; their life is breathed into them from the life-breath of the kosmos. God is the Father of the kosmos and the kosmos the father of those in the kosmos.¹¹⁶ The kosmos is the son of God and the things in the kosmos are the sons of the kosmos. Man is, so to speak, the grandson of God.¹¹⁷ The Lord manifests himself ungrudgingly through the whole kosmos. Man can behold God's image with his eyes and lay hold on it with his hands.¹¹⁸ But Scott believes that the emphasis here is on seeing with the mind, rather than with bodily eyes.¹¹⁹

¹¹²Ataktōs is used for disorder, and not a pun on kosmos.

¹¹³C.H. 12.15b.

¹¹⁴C.H. 8.1b.

¹¹⁵C.H. 9.6-8.

¹¹⁶C.H. 9.8.

¹¹⁷C.H. 10.14b.

¹¹⁸C.H. 5.2.

¹¹⁹Scott, II, p. 155.

In a few tractates the enthusiasm for kosmos is tempered. The point is made that the kosmos is not, in the same sense as God, the author of what is good.¹²⁰ If the kosmos acts as an author of life it does so only under the compulsion imposed on it by God's will. Whatever good the kosmos has it has received from God.¹²¹ The kosmos is not evil, but it also is not good, since it is material and subject to perturbation.¹²² Though it is first among all things subject to perturbation, it is second among things that are. The kosmos is ever-existent, but always in the process of becoming. The kosmos is a head, with an outermost cerebral membrane being immortal, but with things at a greater distance from the outer membrane being mortal—having more body than soul.

The pupil seeking rebirth is advised that he must first alienate his heart from the world's deceptions.¹²³ Purification is putting away the earthly tabernacle.¹²⁴ As Tat, the pupil, answers, "Father, by your song of praise to God you have put into my world also," he is interrupted by Hermes, who says, "Nay, my son, say rather 'my incorporeal world:.'"¹²⁵ In other tractates the body is seen as an enemy¹²⁶ and as a cloak of darkness, a web of ignorance, a prop of evil, a bond of corruption, living death,

¹²⁰C.H. 10.2.

¹²¹C.H. 10.3.

¹²²C.H. 10.11.

¹²³C.H. 13.

¹²⁴C.H. 13.15.

¹²⁵C.H. 13.21.

¹²⁶C.H. 1.

a conscious corpse, a tomb, a robber in the house, an enemy who hates the things one seeks after and grudges the things one desires, a garment which grips one and holds him down that he may not look upward.¹²⁷

But it is important to note that the only unambiguous contemptus mundi in the entire extant Hermetic literature is that in the sixth tractate of the Corpus Hermeticum. Only here is hostility expressed toward the kosmos, with express use of the term kosmos. The writer of this tractate grants that since the world of matter participates in the ideal archetypes and in the good, to that extent the kosmos is good.¹²⁸ But in all other respects the kosmos is not good, being subject to perturbation. It is impossible for things in the kosmos to be pure from evil. The good in the kosmos is that which has the smallest share of evil, and in this kosmos the good becomes evil.¹²⁹ There is not room for the good in a material body.¹³⁰ The kosmos is a plērōma kakias, even as God is a plērōma of good.¹³¹ Indeed, it is impossible for the good to be present in the kosmos, as it is impossible for any evil to enter God.¹³²

¹²⁷C.H. 7.2b.

¹²⁸C.H. 6.2b. Scott, II, p. 175, thinks this is a concession to the majority view of the Hermetics.

¹²⁹C.H. 6.3a.

¹³⁰C.H. 6.3b.

¹³¹C.H. 6.4a.

¹³²Scott, II, 169, notes that this tractate must be distinguished from most other Hermetic writings by its intensely pessimistic tone. In his sweeping condemnation of the kosmos and all in it, the writer goes beyond Plato and agrees rather with some of the Neo-Pythagoreans and Gnostics. Ernst Percy, Untersuchung ueber den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei, 1939), p. 134-135, appears to over-emphasize this tractate in his discussion of the Hermetica.

It is difficult to disagree with the conclusions reached by Dodd after his study of the Hermetica. There is no absolute dualism. Almost always the kosmos is in one way or another a revelation of God.¹³³ Two somewhat opposing tendencies appear in the Hermetica: an emphasis on God's transcendence, leading to further grades of being between God and the kosmos; and an emphasis on man as something more than the mere offspring of the kosmos, not wholly dependent on it for his knowledge of God.¹³⁴ Despite the kosmos noētos and kosmos aisthētos, Dodd believes the Hermetica do not generally employ Platonic or Philonic conceptions, that the kosmos as cosmic soul is more congenial to them than the kosmos as a reflection of a transcendent world of Ideas.¹³⁵ The transcendent God is able to relate himself to the kosmos through dunamis or energeia, which pervade the kosmos. These are often compared to rays streaming from eternal light. Dodd sees a concept of aiōn occasionally mediating between God and kosmos, but more often nous plays this role.¹³⁶ The Hermetica contain cosmological dualism to the extent that they find a universe originating in darkness, but forced to submit to a divine order and definition. Though the stuff of the kosmos is non-divine, its form is divinely imposed.¹³⁷

The Mandaean Literature

¹³³Dodd, Interpretation, p. 22. Dodd conjectures that knowledge of God through the Son would be acceptable to the Hermetists if Son=kosmos.

¹³⁴Ibid.

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 23.

¹³⁶Ibid., pp. 23-24.

¹³⁷Ibid., p. 36.

The position of the Mandaean literature in the ancient world is not yet clear. While its affinities with Gnostic thought are clear, the dating of this literature is quite difficult. The language is Semitic, a form of Aramaic which developed in lower Babylonia.

For the Mandaeans, world denotes a collective demonic family rather than a unity. The world is a labyrinth for the wandering soul. Its role is inimical and obstructive, anti-divine and imprisoning. All of space has a malevolently spiritual character and even the time dimension is demonized. There is cosmic terror in view of the spatial and the temporal. The worlds of the Mandaeans may be compared with the aeons of Hellenistic Gnosticism.¹³⁸

The world is an enclosed cell and man is only a stranger in it. "To come from outside" and "to get out" are standard phrases. Sometimes the world appears as an inn in which one lodges, the body being a tent or a garment. To the redeemed come the words: "Thou wert not from here, and thy root was not of the world."¹³⁹

Generally the Mandaeans see a pre-cosmic fall underlying the genesis of the world and human existence. Sometimes the process is initiated by the powers of darkness. Elsewhere there appears a voluntary element, a guilty inclination, curiosity, sensual desire causing the origin of the world and man's existence.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸Jonas, pp. 51-53.

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 55. The quotation is from Ginza, 379.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 62.

Jonas asserts that the Mandaeans have an attitude of "thrownness"—similar to that of contemporary nihilism. This is not merely a description of the past, but it qualifies the given, present situation as one determined by the past. A dramatic image of the genesis of the world has been projected into the past from the painful experience of the present situation, Jonas believes.¹⁴¹ The redeemed cries: "Who has cast me into the affliction of the world?"¹⁴² and again: "Save us out of the darkness of this world into which we are thrown."¹⁴³ The Mandaeans also evidence attitudes of forlornness, dread, homesickness, fall, sinking, capture, alienation, numbness, sleep, intoxication.¹⁴⁴ The world itself has taken the place of the traditional underworld and is already the realm of the dead, of those who must be raised to life.¹⁴⁵

The only hope for man in the world is that the transmundane will come to man within the world. So fundamental is this call from without that the Mandaean religion may be called a "religion of the call."¹⁴⁶ The call typically awakes, reminds of heavenly origins, promises redemption, and gives practical instruction.¹⁴⁷ The Messenger from without comes to take believers away from this world and to make them strangers

¹⁴¹Ibid., pp. 63-64.

¹⁴²Ginza, 457, quoted in Jonas, p. 64.

¹⁴³Ginza, 254, quoted ibid.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 65-68.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 68.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., p. 74.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., p. 81.

to this world of darkness.¹⁴⁸ Under the dominant power of the Messenger, the lower world is destined to perish.¹⁴⁹

Because the Messenger comes to bring life, it can occasionally be said that the human world (meaning the spirits of the tribe of Adam) is awakened. Similarly, Adam can be called the King of this world. This world, then, can be used in a good sense, as a world that good has entered. Over against this human world lying in darkness stands Life-- in a relation that might be expressed as friendship, mercy, or even love.¹⁵⁰ There arises mutual love between life and the believers dwelling in the world. Whatever good there may be in the world, it does not really belong there.¹⁵¹ Life is related to the world in love only in that Life wills to cause human beings to return to the world of Life and Light.¹⁵²

More common is a thoroughly hostile view toward the world. The entirety of the lower world is a place of darkness. Even when world means man, the same expression of darkness is used. The whole world is nothing and untrustworthy; it is full of sins; it is like a wild beast, not knowing left from right. The evil ones call the world "this our world." The world as men is a house ready to fall.¹⁵³

The believer feels greatly antagonistic to the world; he considers

¹⁴⁸Odeberg, p. 126.

¹⁴⁹Ibid.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 127.

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 128.

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 129.

¹⁵³Ibid., pp. 123-124.

himself very superior.¹⁵⁴ He haughtily rebukes the world.¹⁵⁵ To the believer who has just left the world the words are spoken: "You have left decay and the stinking corpse in which you lingered, the dwelling of evil, the place where is nothing but sin, the world of darkness, hate, jealousy, and discension."¹⁵⁶ The world the believers hate is full of falsehood and illusion, beset with thistles and thorns, a world of disorder and confusion without firmness, darkness without light, stench without a good smell, persecution and death without life in eternity.¹⁵⁷

Bultmann finds parallels between the Mandaean literature and John. Of the twenty-eight parallels he studies, five have to do with the world. (1) The Sent-One is sent from the Father into the world.¹⁵⁸ (2) He has come into the world.¹⁵⁹ (3) The Sent-One appears as a stranger to the power of the world; it does not know his origin since it is different from its own.¹⁶⁰ (4) The Sent-One is abandoned and hated in the world.¹⁶¹ (5) His ascension is the catastrophe of the world.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁴Percy, p. 127.

¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 129.

¹⁵⁶Rudolf Schnackenburg, Die Johannesbriefe (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953), p. 118.

¹⁵⁷Ibid.

¹⁵⁸"Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandaeischen und manichaeischen Quellen fuer das Verstaendnis des Johannesevangelium," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 24 (1925), 105.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 106.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 119-120.

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 123.

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 136.

The Septuagint

Kosmos occurs frequently in the Septuagint to denote host (of heaven), adornment, and universe or world. Generally the Hebrew writings use kosmos for adornment and host (of heaven).

Kosmos translates the Hebrew qaba'. God creates the host of heaven and earth (Gen. 2:1). He brings out his host by number (Is. 40:26). The host of heaven is distinguished from the earth (Is. 24:21). Man is warned against looking up to the host of heaven and worshipping them (Deut. 4:19; 17:3).¹⁶³

Kosmos is commonly used to denote adornment. Eight different Hebrew terms underlie this usage of the word. In addition, kosmos occurs a few times with this meaning where there is no Hebrew original with that sense.

Kosmos is also used to denote adornment in the original Greek writings of the Septuagint. This is especially true in Sirach, although the sense there occasionally is closer to order or array.

Most important for this study is the use of kosmos for world or universe. The Hebrew Old Testament has no word for the universe, normally using heaven and earth, or the "all."¹⁶⁴ Apparently the translators chose kosmos for world (in the rare instances of its occurrence with that meaning in the Hebrew writings of the Septuagint) because of:

¹⁶³While kosmos is used for qaba' of heaven, it is not used for YHWH qiba'oth. Kurios tōn dunameōn translates that expression. This may indicate that kosmos was chosen because it was thought a good word to convey the idea of heavenly bodies—not as an equivalent for the general meaning of host. Indeed, Sasse (p. 880) thinks the phrase ho kosmos tou ouranou would connote the ideas of order, adornment, world, heaven, and stars to Septuagint readers.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 881. The Hebrew is kōl or hakōl.

its wide and common usage in Hellenistic Greek. For example, Symmachus has kosmos instead of gē (Job 38:4), and Alexandrinus has as the title of Genesis: genesis kosmou. The usage of kosmos to denote world is very common, however, in the Greek writings of the Septuagint. Sasse notes:

Indeed, the Jewish Hellenistic writers, especially those influenced by Greek philosophy, seemed to have a liking for the term and brought it into their religious and theological vocabulary. It denotes the world in the spatial sense and replaces the older "heaven and earth."¹⁶⁵

Most significant is the usage of kosmos in Wisdom and 2 Maccabees.

God is the King of the kosmos who will raise up to everlasting life those who died for his laws (2 Macc. 7:9). Men call upon God as the great sovereign of the kosmos (2 Macc. 12:15). God is the creator of the kosmos (2 Macc. 13:14; 4 Macc. 5:25), who shapes the beginning of man and devises the origins of all things (2 Macc. 7:23). Wisdom is present when God creates the kosmos (Wisdom 9:9). God's powerful hand created the kosmos out of formless matter (Wisdom 11:17).

Kosmos appears to mean universe in Wisdom 13:2, where it is observed that men equate the luminaries of heaven with the gods who rule the kosmos. The men upon whom God spread heavy night are contrasted with the whole kosmos, illumined with brilliant light (Wisdom 17:20). In the eschatological conflict the ungodly perish, for the kosmos defends the righteous (Wisdom 16:17). The kosmos joins God in fighting against mad men (Wisdom 5:20).

Kosmos can mean the earthly world over which man is to rule in holiness and righteousness (Wisdom 9:3). For the sake of God man has come into the kosmos (4 Macc. 16:18). Through the vanity of men idols (AS: death) entered the kosmos (Wisdom 14:14). There is one entrance for

¹⁶⁵Ibid.,

all who come into the kosmos (AB: bion) (Wisdom 7:6S). Death enters the kosmos through the devil's envy (Wisdom 2:24). Since God created all things that they might exist, the generative forces (or creatures) of the kosmos are wholesome (Wisdom 1:14).

Kosmos may also mean mankind. The number of the wise is the salvation of the kosmos (Wisdom 6:24). Wisdom protects the first-formed father of the kosmos (Wisdom 10:1). The hope of the kosmos takes refuge on a raft during the flood (Wisdom 14:6). God is able to strike down those coming against his people, even the whole kosmos (2 Macc. 8:18).

The obvious preference for kosmos in the Greek writings of the Septuagint suggests that Greek-speaking Judaism had adopted the word as a fixed expression for the world. Current Hellenistic usage was probably the primary influence, and among the more educated the philosophical doctrine of the kosmos may have had effect. Here Philo played a mediatorial role. . In a formal way the various nuances of kosmos in Wisdom and 2 Maccabees (universe, earth, inhabited earth, humanity) correspond to New Testament usage.

The use of kosmos in such divine titles as Creator, Lord or King of the cosmos, which are alien to the NT, enables us to conclude that among the Jews the word had found its way not only into cultic speech but also into liturgical usage, and that it was beginning in some cases to oust such terms as ouranos kai gē and aiōn.¹⁶⁶

The adoption of kosmos into Septuagintal usage was, then, an incisive event in the history of the word. From that point on the concept has a Biblical and philosophical development; there is an interaction which effects its future history both in antithesis and relationship.¹⁶⁷

Judaism

¹⁶⁶Ibid., p. 882.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 880.

Old Testament, apocryphal, apocalyptic, rabbinic thought

For Israel in the Old Testament the world does not have any self-contained unity, nor unity "in principle"; its unity lies only in its relation to God, to its origin in his creative will, to his continued preservation, to the goal he has appointed for it.¹⁶⁸ The understanding of the world in the Old Testament is constantly in flux, and any given interpretation may be held at any time by only a few prophets. There are many advances and never a complete picture at one time. The Old Testament man had to master the world from a knowledge of its Creator and Controller, not from any concept of nature or history.¹⁶⁹ Steps along the way included the view of the world as the sphere of Yahweh's historical action (against mythology);¹⁷⁰ mastering the world outside man through Wisdom which derives from experience;¹⁷¹ prophetic tearing open of the world to see the non-sacral secularity of other nations;¹⁷² Deuteronomic secularization of Israel's life.¹⁷³

The view of the world in Judaism is inevitably linked with the word 'ōlām. Dalman seriously doubts the use of 'ōlām for world in pre-Christian times, finding it impossible that the use of kosmos for world should have

¹⁶⁸ Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, translated by D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, c.1965), Volume II: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions, p. 338.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 341.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 342.

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 343.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 344.

"prematurely modified the phraseology of the Syrians and the Jews."¹⁷⁴ The older sections of Enoch, Dalman believes, do not use 'ōlām in the sense of world, but in the sense of time or duration. Melek ha'ōlām, for instance, means he who controls infinite time, not king of the world.¹⁷⁵ The later editions of the Similitudes of Enoch do, however, speak of a creation of the world.¹⁷⁶ The Book of Jubilees is ambiguous in its usage. Reference is made to the generations of the world, but also to the God of the ages. He is called Creator of all things, but heaven and earth, not the world, constitute his creative work. In the flood the water fills the whole world.¹⁷⁷

In 2 Esdras the Syriac 'almā' definitely occurs in the sense of created world, but in some of the many instances of its usage, the idea of aiōn is not to be excluded. On the contrary, Dalman believes a Greek original would necessarily have had aiōn throughout.¹⁷⁸

The last portion of Enoch speaks of a created world. Other expressions are more difficult: King of the glory of the world may be eternal King of glory; Lord of the world may be eternal Lord; to all the generations of the world may be to all generations in perpetuity.¹⁷⁹

The Assumption of Moses speaks of the world only in the chapters (1; 11; 12) which frame the prophetic part of the book (2-10). God is

¹⁷⁴Gustav Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated by D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 166.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 163-165.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., p. 166.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 171.

¹⁷⁸Ibid.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 170.

creator of the world (1:2); he is Lord of the world (1:12); he rules the world with compassion and righteousness (11:17). There is an earthly world (11:16) and the "foundation of the world" is used as a time reference (1:13,14).¹⁸⁰

In the Apocalypse of Baruch, world occurs in one of the three parts dating before 70 A.D. God knows the deep things of the world (54:1); the world is his creation (56:2); he made it (56:3); it is the place of evil human affairs (73:1,5). In later sections of Baruch, world is much more frequent. There is an earthly world (3:7; 4:1; 14:2; 85:100; God creates the world (21:24); there is a world of mankind (3:1), which men enter at birth (48:15); the world is God's world (83:2). Man is warned not to be in bondage in both worlds (83:8), and there clearly appears the idea of a future world. It is the world which God has promised (14:13). The question is posed whether the world will be changed in God's final day (49:3). God has made man administrator of his world, and the world is made on account of man (14:18).¹⁸¹

There occur even a few instances of a "new world." A new world is coming which does not turn to corruption those who depart to its blessedness (Baruch 44:12). There is hope of a world to be renewed in the Messianic time (Baruch 57:2; also a few Targums). A new creation is looked for (Enoch 72:1; Jubilees 1:29). The Mighty One will renew his creation (Baruch 32:6).¹⁸²

Dalman readily concedes, then, that later Jewish literature abounds in instances of 'ölām as world. A clear distinction among meanings of

¹⁸⁰Ibid.

¹⁸¹Ibid.

¹⁸²Ibid., pp. 177-178.

age, eternity, and world is not everywhere practicable, he believes. As soon as the geographical idea of kosmos gets transferred to 'ōlām, the writer can at will apprehend it as a magnitude of space or time.¹⁸³ From the end of the first century A.D. 'ōlām is so commonly used for world that it cannot be doubted that this name for the idea was then in general use.

† In the older Targums also world is widely used. The world is made through God's word; God created the world. The expression "from one end of the world to another" occurs. "Destroy" comes to be "put out of the world"; "fathers of antiquity" becomes "fathers of the world"; "primeval mountain" becomes "mountains of the world"; "mighty ones of old" becomes "great ones of the world." Other expressions are pious of the world, prophets of the world, come into the world, be in the world, go out of the world, judge the world. Finally, world can mean simply people.¹⁸⁴ The Targums also define God's relation to the world as Lord, King, God of the world.¹⁸⁵ The fourth century Samaritan author Marka also speaks of the Lord, King, God of the world.¹⁸⁶

World is used often by the rabbis, but it is impossible to speak of any unified world-view.¹⁸⁷ Generally,¹⁸⁸ the world is God's possession, it is sinful and fallen, it is yet not rejected or accounted essentially

¹⁸³Ibid., p. 171.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., p. 172.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 174.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., p. 173.

¹⁸⁷Hans Beitenhard, Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum (Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1951), p. 256.

¹⁸⁸The following relies on Odeberg, p. 115.

evil, nor viewed as the antithesis of the holiness of God. It is a world of imperfection and blindness, that some day will become perfect and a worthy abode of God's Presence. But the relation of the Holy One to the world is never expressed with the term love.¹⁸⁹ The world is created in justice and mercy. An attitude of love is expressed toward man qua man. There are frequent dicta regarding God's love for Israel or the righteous. There is an inherent evil aspect usually attached to the expression 'ōlām hāzeh', in contrast to the expression 'ōlām hābō'.¹⁹⁰ Attention is often fixed on the human element and world almost equals humanity.¹⁹¹ In all the cases where "coming into the world" occurs, humanity rather than space is the thought, Bietenhard maintains.¹⁹²

Apocalyptic writers show much greater pessimism toward the world and appear, at least on the surface, more confident of the imminence of God's action. Many believe God will destroy the world and substitute a new one.¹⁹³ For the apocalyptists, cosmology itself becomes a part of the apocalyptic kerygma.¹⁹⁴ Enoch speaks of a world of unrighteousness (48:7) and contrasts the good things of the world with God and heaven (108:8). 4 Esdras shows the world lying in darkness (14:20) and full of sorrow, hastening to its end (4:26).

¹⁸⁹Odeberg, p. 115.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 116.

¹⁹¹Ibid., p. 115.

¹⁹²Bietenhard, p. 85.

¹⁹³Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 27.

¹⁹⁴Bietenhard, p. 255.

Judaism does not have any single view of the world. The world is God's creation, but stands under judgment and needs redemption. These two lines of thought, both resting on Biblical foundations, are never brought together. The optimistic openness of the Alexandrians and the profound pessimism of apocalyptic confront each other irreconcilably. The one rests on the Biblical belief in creation and incorporates a Hellenistic joy in the world in its system; the other rests on the Biblical thought of judgment and incorporates a Persian dualism in its system. Judaism vacillates between these extremes, but is not able to unite them. Indeed, good and evil seem to exist simultaneously in the world.¹⁹⁵

Qumran

The Qumran community confesses the Biblical doctrine of creation, occasionally in a way similar to the Prologue of John.¹⁹⁶ Yet it sees the present world under the Lordship of Belial, and the elect seek to withdraw from it. Here occurs a complete devaluation of the world.¹⁹⁷ Yet the community awaits a new creation. Yearning for redemption, it desires a new world and firmly believes in the imminent restoration of the world in a new aeon.¹⁹⁸ There shall be continued light and darkness "until the determined end and until the new creation" (Manual of Discipline 4:25). Qumran "cherished the hope of a re-ordering of the cosmic

¹⁹⁵Sasse, p. 891.

¹⁹⁶Raymond E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," The Scrolls and the New Testament, edited by Krister Stendahl (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, c.1957), pp. 186-187.

¹⁹⁷Schnackenburg, p. 120.

¹⁹⁸Kurt Schubert, The Dead Sea Community, translated by John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, c.1959), p. 104.

which would remove all the imperfections of the present aeon forever. This new order was the goal of their apocalyptic speculations."¹⁹⁹

There are not one, but several kinds of dualism at Qumran, but they all attest an ethical interest. "Alle zusammen stehen sie im Dienst der wertenden Beurteilung der vorhandenen Welt."²⁰⁰ (1) The basic dualism is ethical. The fundamental commandment is to exercise righteousness and truth in a world full of unrighteousness, because God demands righteous action. Concretely this means fulfilling the Torah as a member of the community.²⁰¹ (2) There is also a physical-metaphysical dualism, in which there is a strict separation between Creator and creation. Over against God there is the spiritual world which is God-fearing and good and the earthly world which is godless and evil. On the other hand, the spiritual world is both righteous and godless and so is the earthly world.²⁰² (3) There is a cosmic dualism, in which are spheres of light and darkness. But interest in cosmic origins was always subordinate to ethical action.²⁰³ (4) There is a mythological dualism, in that cosmic principles are personified, for example, Belial.²⁰⁴ (5) Finally, there is

¹⁹⁹Ibid., p. 112.

²⁰⁰Hans Walter Huppenbauer, Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten (Zuerich: Zwingli Verlag, c.1959), p. 103.

²⁰¹Ibid., p. 104.

²⁰²Ibid., pp. 104-106.

²⁰³Ibid., pp. 108-109.

²⁰⁴Ibid., p. 110.

eschatological dualism. Qumran stands waiting for God to create anew, to assert his Lordship in place of the rule of the godless.²⁰⁵ One may conclude that the Qumran dualism is a relative, ethical dualism, with a cosmic orientation.²⁰⁶ For Qumran, this means an emphasis on God's transcendence and predestination and on man's responsibility.²⁰⁷

The New Testament

In the New Testament kosmos never means order, and means adornment only once (1 Peter 3:3). Everywhere else kosmos means world in some sense.²⁰⁸

Kosmos may mean world or universe and is synonymous with the Old Testament "heaven and earth" (Acts 17:24). Parallel to this are the passages which speak of the panta ta en autō (Acts 4:24; 14:15).

The indication of the world by an enumeration of its constituent parts, like the distinction between the kosmos and its contents, may be attributed to the influence on the NT of the older OT concept which did not yet envisage the world as a unity.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁵Ibid., p. 111.

²⁰⁶Ibid., p. 113.

²⁰⁷Ibid., p. 114. Although much terminology and the interest in man are similar, Gnosticism evidences a different feeling toward the world "Wo der Gnostiker sich aus der boesen, ihm fremden Welt der Materie heraussehen, weiss der Glaebige von Qumran um seine Erdenverbundenheit. Wo der erstere sich zwei Substanzen denkt, da sieht der andere zwei Tatbereiche. Wo der erste seine Heimkehr zum Licht sucht, da sehnt sich der andere nach Gottes Sieg ueber alles Boese. Und wo der jener zwei anfaengliche, ewige Prinzipien erkennt, da weiss dieser um das Geheimnis der Schoepfertaetigkeit Gottes, der sich ueber Staub und Fleisch erbarmt." (Ibid., pp. 117-118).

²⁰⁸Sasse, p. 883. Kosmeō means put in order (Matt. 25:7) and adorn (women: 1 Tim. 2:9; 1 Peter 3:5; Rev. 21:2; house: Matt. 12:44; temple: Luke 21:5; graves: Matt. 23:24).

²⁰⁹Ibid., p. 884.

Sometimes kosmos seems to mean the sum of all created being (1 Cor. 3:22); God creates the kosmos through Christ (Heb. 1:2). The most explicit New Testament statements on creation, outside John, use panta rather than kosmos (1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16).²¹⁰

The kosmos has a limited duration.²¹¹ The expressions "from the beginning" or "from the foundation" of the kosmos are common (Matt. 24:21; 25:34; Luke 11:50; Rom. 1:20; Eph. 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 9:26; 1 Peter 1:20; Rev. 13:8; 17:8). The kosmos is transitory. Its form is passing away (1 Cor. 7:31). In contrast to the future of eschatological expectation, the kosmos is kosmos houtos (1 Cor. 1:20; 3:19; 5:10; 7:31). Kosmos is not used for the age to come, probably because of its common pejorative sense. Nor does the New Testament speak of God as King and Lord of the kosmos, as did Hellenistic Judaism.²¹²

While the New Testament speaks of ta stoicheia tou kosmou (Gal. 4:3; Col. 2:8,20) and makes other cosmological statements, Sasse insists

²¹⁰On kosmos as creation, Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated by John Marsh (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963), p. 59, notes: "The Greek speaks of a cosmos and for him the reality of the world is absolute. But the Bible speaks of a creation. With this one word the reality of the world is reduced to a relative order that goes back to, and points back to, an absolute subject who has established the world as an object over against himself, precisely as, and precisely as long as, he pleases." In this way, Stauffer believes, man ceases to be caught up in the stream of events and also stops sinking into complete despair. In view of creation, everything that can be meant by world is conditional.

²¹¹The following relies on Sasse, pp. 883-886.

²¹²The reason may be different from that conjectured by Sasse: the secularity of the kosmos (p. 886). Such usage may arise simply from a preference for panta, because of Old Testament familiarity, or from the fact that God in Jesus Christ is reestablishing his Lordship over the kosmos. Sasse does say that the New Testament realizes that the fulfillment of God's rule over the kosmos is the object of eschatological expectation (p. 886).

that these cosmological notions never become the object of proclamation, that there are no distinctive New Testament cosmological conceptions, that it is quite impossible to present a coherent cosmology of the New Testament,²¹³ and that the canon of the early church confirms the decision of apostolic proclamation that cosmology is no part of the message of the Gospel.²¹⁴ Bietenhard, too, strongly insists that unlike apocalyptic the New Testament has no cosmology as part of its message. "Die christliche Botschaft haengt nicht an einem bestimmten Weltbild."²¹⁵ He continues: "Die Kosmologie ist nicht—auch in der positiven Wertung nicht—ein integrierender Bestandteil der biblischen Botschaft. Darum ist das Weltbild der Bibel von ihrer Verkuendigung grundsatzlich abloesbar."²¹⁶ Bietenhard concludes: "der Kreuz ist die Ueberwindung des kosmologischen Kerygmas der Apokalyptik und des Rabbinate, es ist die Befreiung der christlichen Botschaft von der Bindung an ein bestimmtes Weltbild."²¹⁷ Drawing very different conclusions, Bultmann also notes:

der Glaube ist keine Weltanschauung. Eine Weltanschauung will auf Grund eines allgemeinen Verstaendnisses von Welt und Mensch auch je mein Schicksal verstaendlich machen als einen Fall des allgemeinen Geschehens. Nach der Meinung des NT entliehe ich damit gerade meinem eigentlichen Sein, da ich nicht im Allgemeinen meine Existenz gewinne, sondern im Konkreten, im Hier und Jetzt, in meiner individuellen Verantwortung und Entscheidung, in der ich mich wagend gewinnen oder verlieren kann; d.h. ich stehe als Einzelner vor Gottes Augen.²¹⁸

²¹³Bietenhard, p. 257, heartily agrees.

²¹⁴Sasse, pp. 887-888.

²¹⁵Bietenhard, p. 256.

²¹⁶Ibid., p. 259.

²¹⁷Ibid., p. 263.

²¹⁸Glauben und Verstehen, II, 69.

Kosmos also means the abode of men, the theater of history, the inhabited world, the earth.²¹⁹ Kosmos means earth (Matt. 4:8; Luke 12:30). Kosmos means everything that man can control (Matt. 16:26; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25).²²⁰ Kosmos means the inhabited world (Matt. 26:13; Mark 16:15; Rom. 1:8; 4:13).

Certain common expressions are closer to the sense of "humanity": Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 1:15; Heb. 10:5), sin and death (Rom. 5:12) come into the kosmos. Christian behavior (2 Cor. 1:12) and many languages (1 Cor. 14:10) are in the kosmos. One would need to go out of this kosmos to avoid some kinds of people (1 Cor. 5:10). Kosmos, then, can mean humanity itself.²²¹ A message is proclaimed to the kosmos (Matt. 26:13; Mark 14:9; 16:1f). Jesus calls the disciples the light of the kosmos (Matt. 5:14); he calls the kosmos a field (Matt. 13:38); he pronounces woes on the kosmos (Matt. 18:7). Kosmos is the ancient race and the ungodly (2 Peter 2:5); it is humanity condemned (Heb. 11:7). Paul writes of the dregs of the kosmos (1 Cor. 4:13) and the kosmos of men and angels (1 Cor. 4:9). Kosmos as humanity before God tends to become humanity against God. Thus Paul writes of the weak and foolish and low-born things of the kosmos (1 Cor. 1:27). The kosmos is unworthy of

²¹⁹The following relies on Sasse, pp. 888-889. Herman Cremer, Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Graezitaet (Zehnte, voellig durchgearbeitete und vielfach veraenderte Auflage herausgegeben von Julius Koegel; Gotha: Verlag und Druck der Friedrich Andreas Perthes A.G., c.1915), p. 620, believes that even though instances of kosmos as ordered whole and creation are not uncommon, the attention of the New Testament is always focused on kosmos as man, because there lies the problem of the broken relationship between heaven and earth.

²²⁰Dalman, p. 167, believes that there is some degree of certainty that Jesus employed 'ōlām in the sense of kosmos only in one instance: kerdainein ton kosmon holon. He also believes that for Jesus the sense of world had not attained to any importance (p. 170).

²²¹The remainder of this paragraph relies on Sasse, p. 890.

God's faithful people (Heb. 11:38).

Once the kosmos is related to the living God who creates and judges, a particular nuance results.²²² Sasse notes:

When the term no longer denotes merely the dwelling-place of man or the theatre of human history, but the setting of God's saving work, then it takes on a new significance which is distinctive in the NT and for which there are no parallels either in the Greek world or in the Jewish.²²³

Besides John, only Paul develops this distinctive connotation of kosmos, peculiar to the New Testament. Seen as the theater of salvation history and the locus of revelation in Christ, the kosmos appears in a wholly new light.

Paul identifies the kosmos with aiōn houtos and so radically distinguishes between God and the kosmos. The pneuma tou kosmou and the pneuma to ek tou theou are mutually exclusive (1 Cor. 2:12). The wisdom of the kosmos is foolishness before God (1 Cor. 1:21; 3:19). God's standards are different from those of the world (1 Cor. 1:26-30). The sorrow of the kosmos leads only to death, while godly sorrow brings repentance and salvation (2 Cor. 7:10). Paul traces the gulf between God

²²²Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955), II, notes that when the kosmos changes from a cosmological term to a historical term and becomes the "quintessence of earthly conditions of life and earthly possibilities" (p. 254), it carries definite theological judgment (p. 255). As an eschatological rather than spatial concept, the power of the kosmos "does not come over man, either the individual or the race, as a sheer curse of fate, but grows up out of himself" (p. 256). The kosmos is "constituted by that which the individual does and upon which he bestows his care" and "itself gains the upper hand over the individual. The kosmos comes to constitute an independent super-self over all individual selves" (pp. 256-257).

²²³Sasse, p. 889. Of course, it is the "world" not the term kosmos which is viewed in a fresh light. But kosmos is applied to kosmos-men under judgment. Cremer, p. 622, emphasizes that the order of all things actually becomes disorder, as it actualizes its opposition to God.

and the kosmos back to sin, which came into the kosmos through Adam (Rom. 5:12).²²⁴ Now all humanity (pas ho kosmos) is guilty before God (Rom. 3:19); the kosmos (man) has fallen under God's judgment (Rom. 3:6; 1 Cor. 6:2) and is condemned (1 Cor. 11:32). While sometimes Paul follows Jewish usage and distinguishes Israel and the nations of the kosmos (Rom. 11:12,15), he also expressly includes Israel in the whole kosmos (all humanity) guilty before God (Rom. 3:19). Only the hagioi are distinguished from the kosmos (1 Cor. 11:32), and they shall judge the kosmos (1 Cor. 6:2). As the antithesis between God and the kosmos is seen most clearly with reference to Christ, so the reconciliation of God and the kosmos (all humanity) occurs only in him (2 Cor. 5:19;²²⁵ Rom. 11:15). It is always man in need of God's action in Jesus Christ who stands at the center of Paul's attention.

Sasse notes, however, that when salvation history is the context, Paul's usage extends beyond the sense of humanity (Rom. 8:22; Col. 1:16), just as elsewhere in connection with sin Paul mentions those who rule the kosmos (1 Cor. 2:6,8; 2 Cor. 4:4). Yet while salvation history transcends the framework of human history, this history does not cease to be true human history. Paul's view yields a full unity:

The universe and all individual creatures, the visible world and the invisible, nature and history, humanity and the spirit world, are all brought under the single term kosmos. The kosmos is the sum of the divine creation which has been shattered by the fall, which stands under the judgment of God, and in which Jesus Christ appears as the Redeemer.²²⁶

²²⁴Bultmann, Theology, II, 258, notes that spirit powers serve no purpose of cosmological speculation, nor do they relieve men of responsibility and guilt. Paul clearly ties the entry of death into the world with Adam's sin.

²²⁵The word paraptōmata in this verse makes it clear that "men," not "all creation" is meant.

²²⁶Sasse, p. 893.

There remains the problem of the response which the kosmos will make to God's action in Jesus Christ. Are the kosmos-men who respond in faith still kosmos-men? What is their relation to kosmos-men who turn in on themselves, away from God's gracious action towards them?

Sasse argues: "When the kosmos is redeemed, it ceases to be kosmos."²²⁷ The reconciled and redeemed world is not kosmos or aiōn houtos, but basileia tou theou, aiōn erchomenos, ouranos kainos kai gē kainē. "While the new world is described in terms of these expressions taken from apocalyptic and the OT belief in the Creator, the term kosmos, which derives from pagan philosophy, is reserved for the world which lies under sin and death."²²⁸ When Christ comes to the kosmos to save sinners, then the saved sinners are taken from the authority of the powers of darkness and set in the Kingdom of his beloved Son (Col. 1:13). Hence the ekklesia does not belong to the kosmos. The saints live in the kosmos (1 Cor. 5:10), cannot leave it (Phil. 2:15), obey the orders set up by God in the kosmos (Rom. 13:2), and are forced to care for the things of the kosmos (1 Cor. 7:32-34). But their true life is no longer a life in the kosmos (Col. 2:20), and the kosmos is crucified to the believer (Gal. 6:14). Sasse concludes:

Hence there arises the distinctive nuance which has ever after clung to the word kosmos in the NT and the Church. The world is the epitome of unredeemed creation. It has become the enemy of God. It is the great obstacle to the Christian life.²²⁹

Sasse finds James in material agreement with Paul in his insistence

²²⁷Sasse, p. 892. The following relies on Sasse, pp. 892-894. North, 878, agrees at least with the quoted statement.

²²⁸Ibid., p. 893. The reason given is certainly only conjecture.

²²⁹Ibid.

that the believer keep himself unspotted from the kosmos (James 1:27), which is hostile to God (James 4:4).

Sasse's discussion, however, suggests that he is perilously close to a misunderstanding of Pauline theology. At least his argumentation is infelicitous. Certainly his reference to an "unredeemed creation" does not do justice to the data of the New Testament, for Paul states unequivocally that God has reconciled the whole world to himself (2 Cor. 5:19). Furthermore, the remainder of Sasse's statement cited above may rightly be asserted only if one is rigorously aware that kosmos is being used in its highly theological Pauline sense—a sense which is not conveyed in the contemporary English word "world." Nor does he allow for the possibility that Paul may be using kosmos in different ways. Bultmann's emphasis on the necessity of "Entweltlichung" appears much closer to Pauline thought, for the problem of the kosmos is not only or even primarily "out there"—in the "world." This would agree also with Paul's "internalization" of sarx. Luther might have said "simul justus et kosmos"!

Sasse's emphasis, to a certain degree appropriate to the New Testament witness, is one-sided. Wendland, for example, insists that the New Testament witness to the Lordship of Christ over the kosmos has seriously been neglected. That the Redeemer is the Creator has cosmic significance, and his Lordship must not be spiritualized.²³⁰ If Jesus Christ is Lord, Head, Creator, and Re-Creator of the kosmos, then one cannot view the Christian and the Christian community in their relation to this creation as if they had to live and act in it outside of Christ. One dare not

²³⁰Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, "Die Weltherrschaft Christi und die zwei Reiche," Kosmos und Ekklesia: Festschrift fuer Wilhelm Staehlin, edited by Heinz-Dietrich Wendland (Kassel: Johannes Stauda Verlag, 1953), pp. 24-25.

construct a Christian ethic which does not see the cosmic Lordship of Christ.²³¹ If Christ's victory is the realization of the redeemed humanity through the second Adam, then the boundary between world and Church falls. What they had become in opposition to one another as representatives of the two aeons is now overcome.²³²

Bornkamm believes that in the cross the world finds its end.²³³ Christ's Lordship means the Gospel of reconciliation, and this means that the world receives its boundary as creation. The redeeming Lordship of Christ returns the kosmos to its essence as creation.²³⁴ To this thought of creation the early church held fast with renewed energy.²³⁵ The Christian leaves no unfinished business in the kosmos, for he is called to the unending responsibility of love. What makes a Christian different is that he no longer is in bondage to the kosmos, no longer seeks his life in terms of the kosmos, but views himself in terms of the Lordship of Christ's love in the kosmos.²³⁶

²³¹Ibid., p. 26.

²³²Ibid., p. 27. Wendland continues his argument with a plea to think through the aeon theology of the Synoptics and the eschatological world view of the Apocalypse. The chief object of his attack is the abuse he sees of Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms. The point he makes in this particular citation may be essentially correct, but his expression appears somewhat fuzzy. The opposition he sees and laments between church and world of course did not arise until after the Christ event. When does the boundary between the two aeons arise? Not until the Christ event? Then does the Christ event simultaneously raise the boundary and remove it?

²³³Guenther Bornkamm, "Christus und die Welt in der urchristlichen Botschaft," Das Ende des Gesetzes, in Gesammelte Aufsätze (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963), I, 167.

²³⁴Ibid., p. 168. But it is now a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17).

²³⁵Ibid., p. 169.

²³⁶Ibid., p. 170. Faith in the Lordship of Christ also defines the course and goal of the Pauline mission (p. 160). Cf. 2 Cor. 5:17.

Reminding the church that Christ accomplished his redemption when there was only kosmos and not yet church, Schweizer notes that the church which wants to count itself worthy because of its faith and separate itself from the kosmos throws off the Lordship of Christ and returns to the Lordship of the world-powers. The Church which lives by grace confesses Christ as her Lord in the same way that she confesses Christ as the world's Lord. Nor can this be in the abstract, neutral sense of greater power. Rather the church must recognize that Jesus Christ has taken the kosmos as his possession, for he has died and rose for it and wants to lead it to peace in faith. Church and kosmos are distinguished therefore only through the mystery of faith, which is not our mystery but God's mystery.²³⁷

Summarizing and contrasting the unique New Testament view of kosmos with the Greek view, Bultmann writes that for the New Testament God is not the answer to the question about archē; he is not the principle from which the kosmos becomes understandable. Having no theory of the origin and formation of the kosmos and no concept of natural law, the New Testament confesses God the Creator. God does not belong to the kosmos as its life-force and law. The New Testament does not know this Greek idea of the kosmos. Rather, God stands beyond the world, over against it. He has, according to his own will, created it out of nothing; he rules it and gives it its end.²³⁸

Both the New Testament and the Stoics use the term logos. While

²³⁷Eduard Schweizer, "Jesus Christus, Herr ueber Kirche und Welt," Libertas Christiana: Friedrich Delekat zum 65. Geburtstag, im Gemeinschaft mit E. Wolf besorgt von W. Matthias (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957), p. 185.

²³⁸Glauben und Verstehen, II, 66.

for Stoicism the logos is the life force and law of the kosmos, for the New Testament the logos is God's address to man, which teaches him to understand himself as creature and demands obedience from him.²³⁹

God the Creator stands as Lord, giving life to nothingness and receiving honor in the fulfilling of his will and in the recognition of his grace.²⁴⁰

Kosmos comes to mean men, often men strange and hostile to God.

Kosmos is the sphere of all that men think, plan, and want in their cares and wishes, lusts and pride.

Es ist die geistige Sphaere, von der jeder Mensch von vornherein umfassen ist, mit ihren Urteilen und Vorurteilen, ihren Wertungen und Strebungen, von denen sich jeder mitnehmen laesst, beeinflussen laesst, von denen sich der Einzelne nur schwer losreisst zur Selbststaendigkeit, wobei er ihr auch dann noch, im Widerspruch, eigen-tuemlich verhaftet bleibt.²⁴¹

If the Greek understands himself as one instance of the universal, the New Testament man understands himself as an individual before God.²⁴²

The kernel of man's sin is Angst—before his task in the kosmos. Uncertain, man grasps hold of what he himself can bring about. So he misuses the created kosmos by trying to live out of his own works. Instead of the created kosmos existing as the gift of the Creator, the gift out of which the Creator's question is addressed to man, the kosmos becomes the field of man's achievements, by which he creates his own life and certainty. Then the things at hand in the kosmos, neutral in themselves, become sarx as man wants to win his life on the ground of his own certainty. From this same self-seeking certainty arises all lack of

²³⁹Ibid., p. 66.

²⁴⁰Ibid., p. 67.

²⁴¹Ibid., p. 68.

²⁴²Ibid., p. 69.

love and concern for the neighbor.²⁴³

Basic to the difference between the Greek and New Testament view is that for the Greek the real world is not the sphere designated by the New Testament as this world, and the real man does not live in this sphere, but in the sphere of the eternal Ideas. If the Greek forgets this, he needs only a reminder. For the New Testament man's real life is not cosmic, but is played out in the present and individual moment, in the sphere of history. Its essential reality is that which is only appearance to the Greek. Precisely in this life man's fate is decided for good or evil. That God is not visible in the timeless Ideas of the eternal world is scandalous to the Greeks. But timeless thoughts are ambiguous and may veil God as well as reveal him. God rather meets man in the historical happening; that is his free choice of action.²⁴⁴

Man and the kosmos, then, find themselves in a terrible schism. The kosmos in which man lives out his life is the true kosmos, and it stands over man asking for decisions. But at the same time this kosmos is unreal, delusion, and appearance, because its conditions close to man the future out of which alone he is to live. Reality for man is being bound.²⁴⁵

The only way out is God's forgiveness. If man cannot free himself from kosmos bondage, God can. The New Testament does not witness to a trans-historical idea of a forgiving God. Rather, the New Testament proclaims that God's freedom of action is documented precisely in the

²⁴³ Ibid., pp. 71-72.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 74.

concrete historical Jesus, in whom God has acted decisively for all the kosmos and all time. Through him each man is addressed and asked if he wants to hear the word of forgiveness and receive God's grace. When man responds in faith, this means the Entweltlichung of man; it means he is set into eschatological existence. So the believer gets a proper distance toward the world. And in this eschatological perspective, the kosmos once again becomes visible as creation.²⁴⁶

Summary

Kosmos had a glorious early history in Greek philosophy. Always carrying the idea of order and beauty, kosmos came in time to mean the perfectly ordered universe, the whole world, in which man lived as a perfect part. Whether the kosmos was a model of God's perfect Idea or God inhered in the kosmos itself, God was very much a part of the kosmos. Not unnaturally, great reverence was due the kosmos. In time, however, the enthusiasm of the Greeks for the kosmos waned. It became clear to the Platonists that the extent to which the kosmos was distant from the genuine eternal Idea was the extent to which it was less than perfect and less than the fulness for which man could hope. To the Stoic dawned the uneasy feeling that all was not as well in the kosmos as one might expect. Man's relation to his immediate society and to the world became less than what it had been. The kosmos was no longer the perfect whole in which existed the perfectly adjusted parts. Philo followed the Platonic distinction between the real world of Ideas and the still-not-to-be-despised sensible world, but attempted to mesh this Platonism with

²⁴⁶Ibid.

Hebrew creation theology--the Timaeus winning out over Genesis. Finally, Plotinus ended the period of Greek thought. While in his emanations he distinguishes among different strata of perfection and reality, with the kosmos at a considerable distance from the ultimate Center, Plotinus never let himself take an anti-kosmos stance and went out of his way to oppose those who did. With greater and lesser enthusiasm, the Greeks ever saw the kosmos as a positive good, if not always the highest good. They never became so disillusioned as to turn their backs on the kosmos, rejecting and despising it. In this respect they shared the world-affirming view of most of the Old Testament.

Under strong influence of the East and the crushing burden of reality as they experienced it, the Gnostics did an about face on Greek kosmos theology. What lines there were in Greek thought which focused attention on an ultimate reality beyond the kosmos, the Gnostics extended to the nth degree. Overwhelmed by the problem of evil and man's life in this world, they attached their present bondage to the physical world and came to despise whatever is material. Fleeing this world, whose origin and present condition they explained and explored in endlessly elaborate mythologies, they sought escape in peaceful reunion with the pure and ethereal Light from which they had long ago been separated. Taking offense at all that is merely human in the kosmos, despising the material world and the God who created it, sometimes terrified at the awful order arrayed against them, they turned from the last stages of Greek kosmos piety and found hostility toward the kosmos a religious requirement. Explaining the real problem of their existence in terms of mythological cosmology, they themselves found it necessary to be totally acosmic and anti-cosmic; accordingly they posited a wholly

transcendent God or Ultimate. Thus they sought to escape their present condition.

The popular philosophy of the Hermetic literature shows that even in the second and third century A.D. Greek kosmos piety had not ceased to exist. Although the Hermetics emphasize God's transcendence and further grades of being between God and the earthly world, they are not absolute dualists. The kosmos as universe is still a vehicle of God's revelation and goodness and their literature is full of positive statements about the beauty and order of the kosmos and its appropriate relation to God, with little evidence of Gnostic hostility toward the world. But man himself appears to be more than an offspring of the kosmos, and his rebirth or salvation involves a departure from material and purely earthly concerns and an ascent to the true home of his proper being in God. The earthly world itself has indeed come under divine order and definition, but is not an ultimate good and hinders man from realizing his true home with God. Man's salvation depends on a divinely communicated knowledge of himself and the world. It appears that the positive valuation of the kosmos in this literature adheres to an idea of kosmos as cosmic soul, rather than as material world.

The Mandaean literature possibly carries the Gnostic kosmos antipathies even further. The Mandaeans have drunk deeply in Eastern dualism and become intoxicated in frenzied kosmos rejection and revulsion. They live in dreadful bondage to the earthly world and long for the call from without which will enable them to escape. Together with all the called ones they live in hostility towards the world, whose origin and condition they explain in mythological cosmologies. All that is of this world is despicable and stinking and the believer haughtily rejects it. The Sent-One finally gathers all those he has called and leads them

out of the world and past the powers which control the world. Their departure is catastrophic for the world.

The most significant Septuagintal usage of kosmos occurs in the Greek writings, especially Wisdom and 2 Maccabees. Kosmos here means universe, earthly world, and even men. Here for the first time the Greek kosmos comes into contact with Old Testament theology--and ultimately with New Testament theology. The valuation is always positive, for the Hebrew Old Testament creation theology gets tied inseparably to the usage of kosmos in the Septuagint. Indeed, God as King, Sovereign, and Creator is syntactically connected with the word kosmos. The apparently natural choice of kosmos for the Septuagint suggests how common a role kosmos had come to play in Greek-speaking Judaism.

The Old Testament gave to Judaism a view of the world standing in relation to God as creation to Creator. Its origin depends on his creative will, its existence on his continued preservation, and its goal on his rulership. The view of the world may be traced via the gradual evolution of the usage of 'ōlām. From the first century A.D. 'ōlām appears clearly to have the sense of spatial world, inhabited world, man. Judaism yields no unified world view. It holds in tension, not always successfully, the world as creation and the world as under God's judgment. The optimism of the Alexandrians and the pessimism of the apocalyptists confront each other irreconcilably. Judaism wavered between these two extremes, but was never able to unite them.

Pessimism toward the world is much more pronounced in the dualism of Qumran, but even there the dualism is ethical and the Biblical doctrine of creation is confessed. This community completely devaluated the present world and awaited a new creation.

Much of the New Testament usage of kosmos relies on Old Testament and Judaic precedent. God neither inheres in the kosmos nor is he its first principle or life-force. He stands over it as Creator, addressing kosmos-men and calling them into question--the question of their relationship to him. Quite naturally, then, the New Testament witness is both optimistic and pessimistic. It sees the world as transitory and passing away; God is not called the King or Lord of the kosmos, as in the Greek writings of the Septuagint and of late Judaism. Yet the kosmos is the subject of God's address and his redeeming activity in Jesus Christ. What is distinctive for the New Testament view is that all cosmological considerations fall by the way and attention is fixed on men--the subject of God's action in Jesus Christ. The New Testament is rigorously theological in its consideration of the kosmos-problem. Disregarding mythological speculations, it comes quickly to the point. The kosmos and kosmos-men owe their existence to God the Creator; yet kosmos-men have turned the kosmos into the field of their own activities and have refused to derive their existence in the kosmos from God who created them and continues to address them in his kosmos. While the origin of the kosmos lay in God's creation, its subsequent history is the history of the rebellion and fall of kosmos-men. As they have in history caused the present condition of the kosmos, so history is the scene in which God sets about to recall man to his true relationship to God and the created kosmos. The redeemed continue to live in the kosmos and they take their cues from the historical fact that the entire kosmos now stands under the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Thus the kosmos is ultimately viewed ecclesiologically, and Paul's statement in 1 Corinthians 1:18-25 is the classic expression of this view.

CHAPTER III

KOSMOS IN JOHN

Kosmos is at the center of theological thinking in John in a way not true of any other New Testament writing or group of writings. The kosmos is the setting of John's drama of redemption. All the meanings of kosmos come together in his usage.¹

Syntax

Although the Johannine syntactical usage of kosmos presents no great grammatical difficulties, a study of the usage of kosmos in the sentence structure is significant for an understanding of John's idea of kosmos.

Active and passive verbs

In seventeen of the seventy-eight instances of kosmos in John, kosmos is the subject of an active verb. In three of these seventeen instances, kosmos is the subject of a subjunctive verb in a hina clause. Jesus does something so that the kosmos may know (14:31; 17:23) or believe (17:21). The remaining fourteen instances are all uncomplimentary in their predication. The kosmos knows neither the Logos (1:10) nor the Father (17:25). It cannot hate its own (7:7), but rather loves its own (15:19). The kosmos does hate the disciples (15:18,19; 17:14) and Jesus (15:18). It cannot receive the Spirit (14:17), rejoices at Jesus'

¹Herman Sasse, "Kosmos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1965), III, 894.

departure (16:20), and cannot see him thereafter (14:19). It gives its own kind of peace (14:27). It could not contain all the books necessary to tell everything about Jesus (21:25). At one time, the kosmos goes after Jesus (12:19), though evidently for the wrong reason.

Three times kosmos is the subject of a passive verb. The kosmos was made (1:10; 17:5); it is to be saved by the Logos (3:17).

Anarthrous

Kosmos is anarthrous only once (17:24), where it is used as a time designation. In all authors kosmos is regularly anarthrous in the formula apo katabolēs kosmou.²

Oblique cases, without a preposition

Kosmos occurs seven times in the accusative without a preposition. God loves it (3:16); Jesus does not come to judge it (3:17; 12:47), but to save it (12:47). Jesus overcomes it (16:33) and leaves it (16:28); the Holy Spirit convicts it (16:8).

Kosmos occurs four times in the dative without a preposition. The bread from Jesus gives life to the kosmos (6:33). His brothers advise him to show himself to the kosmos for approval (7:4). Jesus has spoken openly to the kosmos (18:20). After a while he no longer will manifest himself to the kosmos (14:22).

Kosmos occurs eleven times in the genitive without a preposition. It has a beginning or foundation (17: 24), judgment (12:31), its own ruler

²F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, 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. 133, paragraph 253.4.

or prince (12:31; 14:30; 16:11), and sins (1:29). But Jesus is the Savior (4:42), life (6:51), and light (8:12; 9:5; 11:9) of the kosmos.

With a preposition

Kosmos occurs fourteen times with eis. The Father sends Jesus into the kosmos (3:17; 10:36; 17:18); Jesus comes as a light into the kosmos (1:9; 3:19; 12:46); Jesus or the Son comes into the kosmos (9:39; 11:27; 16:28; 18:37); Jesus declares the Father's words to the kosmos (8:26) and sends his disciples into it (17:18). Kosmos occurs with eis also in the case of the coming of a prophet (6:14) and the birth of a man (16:21).

Kosmos occurs eight times with en. Jesus or the Logos is in the kosmos (1:10; 9:5) and speaks in it (17:13). The disciples are in the kosmos (13:1; 17:11), have tribulations in it (16:33), and are to hate their life in it (12:25). Jesus is finally no longer in the kosmos (17:11).

Kosmos occurs fourteen times with ek. The Jews are of this kosmos (8:23); Jesus is not (8:23; 17:14,16), nor is his kingship (twice in 18:36), nor are his disciples (twice in 15:19; 17:14,16). Jesus has chosen his disciples from the kosmos (15:19); the Father gave him men from the kosmos (17:6). Jesus does not pray that the disciples be taken from the kosmos (17:15). Jesus finally departs from the kosmos (13:1).

One problem arises in the translation of John 15:19: all' egō exelegamen humas ek tou kosmou. The Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible translate: "I chose you out of the world." This translation is ambiguous at best, and at worst is easily misconstrued by Christians who find their proper role to be out of the world. The problem, it is true, may be with the word "world," since few seem to understand

that word correctly. For several reasons, however, the translation "from the world" would be preferable. "From" would preserve whatever intentional ambiguity there may be in John's use of ek.³ More important, there is a very frequent partitive use of ek in John, occurring about fifty times. The thought may then be: I chose you as ones who were of the kosmos, or as ones who did belong to the number of the kosmos. While the present passage may not unambiguously present a partitive usage, partitive connotations cannot be ruled out. The partitive idea also effectively excludes any metaphysical or predetermined dualism. In John 10:16,26 the phrases "sheep of this fold" and those "not of my sheep" seem to express a partitive idea, and there is no thought of "out of." In John 17:6 the disciples are men whom the Father gave Jesus ek tou kosmou—certainly not "away from."⁴ Most important, however, is the fact that the disciples do indeed remain in the kosmos, and Jesus does not pray (17:15) that they should be taken out of it.⁵ The thought, then, of John 15:19 would seem to be this: If you drew your existence from (or belonged to) the kosmos, then the kosmos would love you as its own kind of people. But because you do not draw your existence from (or

³The translation "out of" may convey the meaning "from," but it may also convey the meaning "away from."

⁴In 6:70; 13:18; 15:16 eklego occurs with simple accusative, with no idea of "away from." In Luke 6:13; 10:42 eklego has a partitive idea. So also at 1 Cor. 1:27. Most clear is the partitive idea of eklego in Acts 1:24; 15:22.

⁵It is true, of course, that ek can mean "out of" or "away from": John 12:17; 13:1; 20:1,2. But it is precisely the idea of "away from the kosmos" that Jesus negates in his prayer. This should have alerted translators to the dangers of the translation "out of." The stone may be taken away, Mary may think the body of Jesus has been taken away, but the disciples must not be taken away from the kosmos!

belong to) the kosmos, although I chose and elected you from among those who were (or when you were; compare Eph. 2:1-5) drawing existence from the kosmos, therefore the kosmos hates you.

This paraphrase leads to the next problem in John's use of ek. What is its significance when used with enai or verbs of origin? Ek in John seems to connote origin or a partitive genitive idea. Where the idea of origin predominates, the thought may accent local origin or material origin. The following might be considered the ek of material origin: whip of cords (2:15), clay from spittle (9:6), and crown of thorns (19:2). The following seem to express locality: dove descending from heaven (1:32), something good coming out of Nazareth (1:46), rivers of water flowing from the belly (7:38), Christ coming from Galilee (7:41), Lazarus from the village (11:1), and many instances of going from one place to another.⁶

It is more difficult to say whether "from heaven" conveys the idea of local origin or what might be called qualitative origin: that is, an idea of an origin which defines and qualitatively distinguishes present existence. In many cases it expresses both ideas. Jesus descended from heaven (3:13); God gave bread from heaven (6:31); Jesus is bread which came down from heaven (6:41); but also Jesus is lifted up from the earth (12:32). The qualitative idea of origin is expressed in the following: The Jews insist that they are not born of adultery (8:41). One must be born of water and the Spirit (3:5). Whoever is of the earth belongs to the earth and speaks of the earth (3:31). The believer passes from death to life (5:24). Teaching is from God (7:17). The Jews

⁶There is also an ek of temporal origin: 9:1,32; 16:4.

are from below and Jesus is from above (8:23). Jesus comes from God (8:42), but the Jews are from the devil (8:44). Those who are of God hear God's words (8:47). There are sheep not of this fold (10:16), and the Jews are not of Jesus' sheep (10:26). Works which are good are from the Father (10:32).

All these examples lead to an understanding of what it means that Jesus and the disciples are not ek tou kosmou (although the disciples were chosen ek tou kosmou). The emphasis is on much more than local origin (being from the place of the earthly world). Rather, the point is that Jesus and the disciples (and Jesus' kingship) do not belong to the kosmos, do not derive their existence from it, do not partake of what it means to be kosmos, do not live out of the resources of the kosmos, do not find truth in the "realities" of the kosmos—and are different qualitatively from those who do. What must always be kept in mind, of course, is that kosmos in these instances does not mean the spatial world. Failure to note this fact leads to confusion and erroneous thinking about what it means to be "not of the kosmos."⁷

⁷Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955), II, 20, who notes that the one who tries to live out of his own resources (rather than recognizing God as the Creator and the one who alone can live from his own resources), who in fact lives from falsehood, from Nothing—this is the one who lives or is ek tou kosmou. Since man always comes from a Whence and since he rejects God the Creator as his Whence, he lives out of an uncontrollable origin which has power over him. He gives power over himself to Nothingness, rather than to God. The phrases "to be from" and "to be born from" have therefore lost their cosmological sense, which they have in Gnostic mythology, and now "denote the individual's essence which asserts itself in all his speaking and doing and determines the Whither of his way." Bultmann applies this thought existentially: "This means a man is determined by his origin and in each present moment does not have himself in hand; he has only one alternative: to exist from God (reality) or from the world (unreality). By man's Whence, his Whither is also determined."

Conclusions

The predication connected with kosmos leaves no doubt that men are intended. The only things which the kosmos is able to accomplish on its own are unacceptable or hostile to God. If the kosmos is to know God, respond to him, believe in him, turn its attention from itself, God will have to make this possible. The kosmos not only originally was acted upon (created) by God, but is continually the object of God's attention (accusative and dative usages). God loves it and brings life to it. He attempts to provide for the incompleteness of the kosmos. So Jesus comes to the kosmos (eis), brings life and light to it, speaks to it of the Father, and even sends his disciples into it. Indeed, both Jesus and the disciples are very much in (en) the kosmos. It is in the kosmos that God's salvation is worked out, not away from it. While the kosmos can boast only judgment, enslavement to a ruler, and sins as its own, God acts so that Jesus becomes the Savior, the life, and the light of the kosmos (genitive usages). Although tou theou and tou kosmou stand over against one another, Jesus as light and life of the kosmos bridges the gap. There is no doubt in John that without God, without what he sends and offers in Jesus, the kosmos is hopelessly lost. When the kosmos tries to live on its own (ek), it only ruins itself. But in God's call, the kosmos gets the chance to live from God (ek), to derive its life and existence and meaning from him. And this is the salvation of the kosmos: the chance to stop living on its own, to see itself for what it is and what it needs to be, to know and see its existence derived from God.

Meanings of Kosmos

There are several shades of meaning in John's usage of kosmos. In the primary sense in which he uses the term, John has in view all men—men who are God's creatures, who must know their relation to God but do not, who live in a situation without God, who try to make it on their own in an inferior existence, who act as if they were autonomous and self-controlled and able to make their own life for themselves, who are accordingly lost in darkness. Generally, John uses the semantic signal kosmos to convey this concept.⁸ Just as often, however, he pictures such men in action and conversation; he shows them up by antitheses; he epitomizes them in specific individuals or groups. He also defines their situation by means of his Christology.⁹

⁸As such, kosmos becomes a dynamic term, subject to different nuances as the kosmos-men encounter Jesus. It is not precisely the term kosmos which develops in the Johannine drama, but the men whom kosmos signals. But the term kosmos is taken up and involved in the on-marching drama of the Fourth Gospel—as men of the kosmos encounter Jesus and are challenged to response by him.

Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, translated by J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), p. 337, writes: "The world does not mean God's creation, nor the sum of existing things and conditions which man is called upon to care for, to administer in due order and to shape, but it means the world as an historical factor, existing in a particular historical condition, and precisely as the world of men in its relation to God and the moral order established and intended by him. Even more does it signify 'this world' in its attitude to God's eschatological envoy Jesus Christ who was intended most profoundly to heal its shattered order, bring life and redemption to men, but against whom it shuts itself in unbelief and hatred." Schnackenburg may be going too far, if he intends to exclude any sense of the world as creation, for it is the Creator-God who addresses men and calls into question their self-centered existence.

⁹It would, then, be an unwarranted restriction to consider the linguistic history of the semantic signal kosmos and go no farther. Although this study has primary importance, one cannot neglect John's concept of men (kosmos-men), which has vital significance here. In other words,

John wants to emphasize that God created all men, including those who are without God and do not know him (1:10c; 1 John 3:1).¹⁰ Indeed, their whole sphere of existence came into being through the Logos (1:10b),¹¹ who has been among them by virtue of his creative activity¹² and is now

there is much data to be mined where the term kosmos is not even used. The approach of Westcott, for example, is too restrictive and, as a result, has some weaknesses. He is overly concerned to maintain kosmos as an ordered whole relative both to God and to man. He does note that fallen man impresses his character upon the order and that kosmos then comes to represent humanity itself. Cf. Brooke Foss Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), I, 64-65. In John the attention is on man and then on his inextricable involvement in his total situation. The "ordered whole" is, of course, a part of this situation. But kosmos describes the entire situation, with man at the center. This is not always clear in Westcott and many others.

¹⁰C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 136, notes that the Old Testament idea of humble obedience and trust are decisive for John's conception of knowledge. As Jesus' knowing the Father issues in a relation of love, obedience, and mutual indwelling, so a similar relation comes about when men know God through Jesus. The Greek emphasis on seeing, observation, objectivity is also not absent.

The point seems to be that the kosmos refuses to acknowledge God. It should know God (ethical), but it chooses not to. As in the Old Testament man's knowing God is correlative to God's knowing man, so in John God again takes the initiative and approaches man in love. John's emphasis here is clear indication that men's present situation did not arise from their nature or origin, but from themselves. It is interesting, though, to note with Franz Mussner, ZOE (Muenchen: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952), p. 62, that John has no Unheilsgeschichte against which to develop Heilsgeschichte, as does Paul in Romans 5:12-24. The reason, no doubt, is that John is concentrating only on the present Heilsdrama between Christ and the kosmos. If one wanted a theological history of kosmos, it might be something like the following: the kosmos created by God (Genesis); an ordered whole with God in the center and so not the Creator (Greek); an ordered whole which good men must escape (Gnostic); an entity with a demand on God (Jewish); men and their world created and addressed by God (John).

¹¹Alan D. Galloway, The Cosmic Christ (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1951), p. 54, comments on John's use of Logos here: "When seen against its own syncretistic background this is tantamount to the assertion that in and through Christ the whole universe is reaching its maturity and returning to its perfection."

¹²Cf. for this understanding M. E. Boismard, St. John's Prologue, translated by Carisbrooke Dominic (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1957), pp. 33-39.

among them in a unique way (1:10a; 9:5).¹³ The stage for the drama is set. Jesus comes as a light for men, a light into the darkness in which they have enwrapped themselves (3:19; 8:12; 9:5; 12:46). The Son of God comes among men (3:17; 11:27) because the Father still loves all of them (3:16)¹⁴ and has sent his Son among them (10:36; 1 John 4:9). Jesus comes not to judge, but to save men (3:17; 12:47).¹⁵ Men could not really live on their own. They need what God can give.¹⁶ Jesus comes from God as the genuine life-giving bread for all men (6:33). He gives his own flesh for the sake of life to men (6:51).¹⁷ Jesus tells all men without God all that he has heard from God his Father (8:26).¹⁸ Jesus

¹³Walter Lowrie, The Doctrine of Saint John (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., c.1899), p. 95, notes that John "needed no intermediary to bridge the gulf between the invisible God and the sensible world; for this was not the contrast which occupied his mind. Even human nature itself as it is physically constituted is not evil; and therefore the Logos, who is God and not a being of intermediate grade, can become flesh."

¹⁴It is important to remember that the usage here is profoundly theological, that it includes precisely all men, including all those who go into action against God's Son. Such men cannot be considered separately.

¹⁵Barrett, p. 181, notes on 3:17: "The parallelism here (cf. 10:9; 11:12; 12:27) shows that the meaning of sōzein is substantially the same as that of zōē aiōnios. No stress is laid here upon anything from which the world is saved; it is in fact saved from being itself."

¹⁶Cf. the great frequency of didōmi in John.

¹⁷Mussner, pp. 62-63, sees the essence of kosmos as Todeskosmos. To recognize God and his Sent-One would mean eternal life, but the kosmos does not know him. The sins of the kosmos lead to universal guilt which leads to dying in sins. As light is tied to life, so the darkness of the kosmos means its death. The devil rules with a lordship of lies and death. The light which causes the judgment of the kosmos illuminates the deadness of the kosmos. But Mussner's emphasis is one-sided. Kosmos is a broader term and his point is stretched. The data simply do not support any view of kosmos which only fits under the rubric of death—significant as death may be as a qualification of the kosmos.

¹⁸H. J. Holtzmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, in Hand-Commentar

comes to show the kosmos God's realities (18:37). He comes as God's Sent-One, without any effort to gain approval or recognition from these men on their own terms--which would be a typically kosmos approach (7:4) since kosmos-men never hate their own kind (7:7).

Men in the kosmos situation have enslaved themselves in a whole system of attitudes and actions and concerns, which also can be called kosmos (1 John 2:15-16).¹⁹

There is no question that Jesus' mission is to all men, nor that there are any not in need of his mission, for he takes away the sins

zum Neuen Testament (Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage: Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893), IV, 132, notes that here is the universal meaning of Logos. He finds this passage parallel to Mark 13:10 and Luke 24:47. Where the Johannine Christ speaks, he notes, all the nations and generations stand before him.

¹⁹A. E. Brooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1964), p. 47, notes that the conception here is wider than the ethical view of man fallen away from God. This passage refers to the whole system, considered in itself, apart from its Maker. The things of the world are the individual objects which excite admiration and love. Edwin Kenneth Lee, The Religious Thought of St. John (London: SPCK, 1962), p. 110, concludes from this passage that kosmos means the whole system which answers to the circumstances of man's present life, though it is usually limited to men and society as organized apart from God. More perceptively and with greater care, Rudolf Schnackenburg, Die Johannesbriefe (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953), p. 117, notes that this usage is not otherwise found in the Johannine writings. It means not the created world, but the material world, and the judgment is negative. The view is not of its created character as the world of God, but of its danger as an occasion of sin. The very substance of the kosmos is not damned, as in the Mandaean literature, but the kosmos is filled with evil desires and therefore dangerous (p. 118). The kosmos here offers evil desires only a living place and a Tummelplatz. The kosmos becomes evil through what happens in it. Whoever makes a pact with the kosmos falls into its noose. The opposition between God and the kosmos is moral, not metaphysical. Love for both God and the kosmos is simply impossible (p. 119).

of all men (1:29; 1 John 2:2),²⁰ and is the Savior of all men (4:42).²¹

A similar thought may be present ironically in John 12:19.²²

²⁰Barrett, p. 147, suggests "the totality of sins" or "universal sinfulness." No longer shall the Jewish sins of ignorance be removed by sacrifice, but all the sins of the whole world shall be removed. Herman Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924), II, 370, note that a Messiah who takes away all men's sins (including the sins of non-Israelites) is unknown in the older rabbinic literature. The works of the Messiah count only for the good of Israel. In fact, on the basis of Isaiah 43:3 the rabbis thought that the heathen should be given up as an expiation for Israel. Mussner, p. 109, includes this passage, as well as 3:16; 6:51c; and the use of pantes in 3:15 and 12:32 under his heading: "universale 'Lebens' Bedeutung des Todes Jesu." Edwyn Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, edited by Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947), p. 176, notes that the obedience of the Son leads to the guilt of sin being removed. Since his obedience is ultimate, the consequences are universal. If, as the Jews thought, the uniqueness of the Temple sacrifices made them universally significant, then the far greater uniqueness of the obedience of Jesus would imply the sins of the whole world and the necessity of forgiveness for all men.

²¹William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), p. 79, is very disturbed that no one seems to notice that in kosmos there is an "additional idea that no distinction is made with respect to race or nationality; hence men from every tribe and nation; not only Jews but also Gentiles, 4:42 and probably also 1:29; 3:16,17; 6:33,51; 8:12; 9:5; 12:46; 1 John 2:2; 4:14,15." He finds it strange that standard lexicons have apparently missed it entirely. His point is certainly worth noting, especially in the Samaritan context of John 4:42.

²²Barrett, p. 350, notes that the Pharisees may only mean, "Everyone is on his side." But John may ironically be stating through them two truths: Jesus is sent to save the world; representatives of the Gentile world are at present approaching (12:20). C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), p. 371, notes that since kosmos for John has a broader meaning the thought here may be that the crowd acclaiming the coming King is a prolepsis of all mankind united under the sovereignty of Christ. R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 251, believes that John wants the Pharisees' words understood in two ways: Jesus has the crowds on his side; yet many in the same crowd will shout for his death as they now shout welcome. The crowd unconsciously welcomes the conqueror of death (Lazarus' death) and makes the results of his work available for all men: the Greeks come seeking Jesus.

When openly confronted (18:20) with the emptiness, incompleteness, and inadequacy of their life apart from God, kosmos-men go into action against the Sent-One. They hate anyone making agitating comments about their present situation (15:18). They prefer to think of themselves as perfectly able to live on their own. Actually these men have no knowledge of what really matters in life. They have their own inadequate kind of wholeness (14:27), and they love only men who conform to their own inadequate situation (15:19). Rejecting Jesus, they cannot see his manifestation (14:22). As they are, they will no longer see him (14:19).²³ They cannot receive the Spirit (14:17),²⁴ but that Spirit will convict them of the sin of preferring their own existence when confronted with the life of God (16:8). They now no longer are just all men who have been living out of their own resources, but they are men who have responded negatively to God's address. The emphasis shifts from men who need to live out of God to men who refuse to live from God.²⁵

²³Barrett, p. 387, believes that crucifixion and resurrection are suggested by the context. When Jesus is dead and buried, the world will see him no more, but the disciples, to whom he will appear in his risen body, will see him. The same applies to all of history, in which the Church is united to Jesus while the world does not know him. Barrett's point may be good as far as it goes. Yet the vital theological point may be that the kosmos cannot see beyond death because it cannot see beyond its own standards. To the kosmos, death is the end and Jesus is a failure.

²⁴Westcott, II, 177, remarks that the kosmos cannot receive the Spirit because sympathy is the necessary condition for reception. The soul can apprehend that only for which it has affinity. They who stand apart from Christ have neither the spiritual eye to discern the Paraclete nor the spiritual power to acknowledge him. This Platonic approach weakens the radical call to decision in John.

²⁵Heinrich Schlier, "Welt und Mensch nach dem Johannesevangelium," Besinnung auf das Neue Testament (Freiburg: Herder, c.1964), II, 251, notes that 8:12; 1:9 and other "light" passages assume that the kosmos

Jesus, of course, never did belong to all the men living without God (17:14,16), nor does his rule derive from them (18:36). When John wants to heighten the difference between living from God, as Jesus does, and living on one's own without recognition of God, as kosmos-men do, he uses the term houtos kosmos (8:23).²⁶ This expression may include not only the men in opposition to God, but everything about them. As they insist on their own situation, God's good news for them turns to judgment (9:39). Their whole existence personified, the epitome of their situation, is the ruler of this kosmos (14:30),²⁷ who moves against Jesus. But the ruler is judged (16:11) and cast out (12:31) because

understands what light is and has been seeking the light. The same is true of life: not just that the kosmos does not want to die, but that it has Lebendurst and Lebenhunger. Further, lies, sin, and death do not make absolute darkness for the kosmos. For not just unbelief greets Jesus, but a heightened, questioning unrest. Behind the uncertainty of the crowd lies a quest after transcendent fulness (p. 252). Yet kosmos-men hold on too strongly to the kosmos interpretation of reality, the essence of which is Selbst-Herrlichkeit. They are wrapped up in their own interpretation of truth. Despite its Wissen and Verlangen, the kosmos cannot free itself from its Selbst-Verhaengnis der Finsternis. "Das kann allein der neue Anfang des Wortes mitten in dieser Menschenwelt, die Gegenwort des urspruenglichen Wortes im Fleisch gewordenen Wort, und der Glaube, der hoerend und sehend sich ihm oeffnet" (p. 253).

²⁶Barrett, p. 282, sees a contrast between the lower world and heaven, whence Jesus came. "The thought in this verse is not so much that of a world of appearance and a world of reality, as of a primitive 'three-storey' universe, in which heavenly beings may come down from their proper abode to visit the earth." Barrett's interpretation, of course, is influenced by 8:23a, but it is certainly possible that a more profound theological point lies behind John's usage here.

²⁷Max Meinertz, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950), II, 286, notes: "An sich besagt das Wort kosmos nur den Bereich der geschaffenen Dingen, wie sie aus der Schoepferhand hervorgegangen sind oder wo der Mensch lebt. Aber eben weil diese Welt durch die Suende unter den Einfluss des Teufels gekommen ist, darum ist sie mit ihm eng verbunden, ja recht in seiner Macht."

Jesus has overcome the kosmos (16:33; 1 John 5:4,5).²⁸

Some men of the kosmos see God's love and begin to hate their present existence out of their own resources (12:25). Numbered with the kosmos, they are elected by Jesus (15:19) and God gives them to Jesus in discipleship (17:6). Jesus manifests himself to them (14:22). And they cease to belong to that situation of living without God (15:19; 17:14,16). They do not cease to live among such men who try to live on their own (13:1; 17:11; 1 John 4:17), nor does Jesus wish this for them (17:15). The believers live with all men, but they derive their existence and life from God, not from men--or themselves. No longer belonging to the kosmos, they are hated by kosmos-men (17:14; 15:19; 1 John 3:13), just as they first hated Jesus (15:18). Their life among men who want to live without God will not be easy (16:33), and the kosmos actually will rejoice at the believers' distress (16:20).

The drama, then, has been the entry of God's Son into the sphere of existence of and among all men who need to, but do not, live out of their relation to God, the relation they have as his creatures. Confronted with the Revealer, many hardened themselves in their own existence, but some took hold of the existence offered from God. Much of the second half of John (chapters 13-17) deals only with the believers. Yet Jesus has never given up trying to show the kosmos-men his relation to the

²⁸Schnackenburg, Moral Teaching, p. 338, notes that there is not the slightest doubt that Jesus Christ will bring to conclusion on the cosmic scale the victory won on the cross over the prince of this world. In fact, he will do so through his Church, despite all resistance.

Unquestionably, faith can overcome the kosmos because it can see through the kosmos, or it can see the kosmos once again as creation. Faith grasps God's action and lives out of it, so overcoming an existence lived out of the kosmos.

Father (14:31). While his prayer (chapter 17) is only for the believers and not for the kosmos as such, he clearly and intentionally sets the entire drama moving all over again,²⁹ for he is soon to leave this kosmos (13:1). He came from the Father into the kosmos and now he leaves the kosmos to return to the Father (16:28). These kosmos-men have not known God is for them (17:25), as Jesus knows God. Therefore just as God sent Jesus among men, so Jesus sends the believers among all men (17:18). The intention is still the same: that all men might believe and know that God is behind Jesus and see what that means for their existence (17:21, 23). The prayer is for kosmos-men after all!

One cannot deny that John occasionally uses the term kosmos without this concept of kosmos-men in mind.³⁰ To mark a point of time Jesus speaks of his glory before the foundation of the kosmos (17:5,24). Even this "non-theological" usage bears witness that man's dwelling place is secondary to the envoy of God who comes into it. Indeed, the entire created universe first came into being through God's Logos (1:10b). This usage in John 1:10b may mean "all men," who owe their being to God, or "the entire sum of created existence," including, then, the men who

²⁹A careful observation of John's progressive use of the signal kosmos will show that the word increases in intensity as the dramatic encounter between men and Jesus heightens. The usage picks up momentum and in the Farewell Discourses the height of active opposition to God is signalled by this word. Then, suddenly, kosmos appears to revert to its sense at the beginning of John, as Jesus prepares for a new mission to the kosmos through his disciples.

³⁰One could write a word study carefully listing the various meanings of kosmos. Yet it must be insisted that since the Incarnation is overwhelmingly predominant, it would be difficult for any usage of kosmos not to take on some theological significance. Many word studies also fail to take account of the dynamic of the drama which John sees. At all times, two of the definitions (men; men hostile to God) must be held together--both inseparably subjects of God's address and love.

are living without their Creator-God.³¹ Fittingly, this same kosmos could not contain all the records of what Jesus did (for the kosmos), were they to be written (21:25).

The use of kosmos in John 11:9 seems to be a simple parable of human life. Men can work as long as the sun is shining.³² One can

³¹Schlier, p. 245, notes that the kosmos gets its existence from the Logos; it exists through the Logos; the Logos is its ground. The kosmos is in this Logos, the Logos is its life. Called into existence through this Word at the beginning, standing in its life, the kosmos "ist nun fuer immer Offenbarung und Auslegung dieses Wortes." Only in the Prologue is this fact so clear, but it is the basis for John's whole view of kosmos. Schlier continues (p. 246) that although the theme of John is another, it is led step by step against this background in the Prologue. Schlier finds 1:3 and 1:10 parallel (p. 242). The kosmos is all that stands before man's eyes, all that he dwells on. "Sie ist die Zeit und der Raum, in denen sich der Mensch aufhaelt, der Umkreis und Schauplatz seines Lebens." Man not only lives in, but has a special relation to the kosmos and the kosmos to him. "Welt ist also auch das, von woher und woraus der Mensch lebt, der ihr zugehoert." Man and kosmos have an inner connection. "Welt ist das, was das Dasein des Menschen und seine 'Sprache' bestimmen kann, und was, so wie der Mensch in der Welt vorkommt, beide auch 'faktisch' bestimmt." Schlier continues (p. 243) that man lingers in the kosmos, takes hold of and understands himself from it, exists out of it. The more intensively man understands and uses it as a Life-principle the more intimate it appears. Yet kosmos appears in strangeness as a power which is master of man and indeed of itself. The kosmos is not just the alienated Woher of man. "Nicht nur aber ist die Welt das Worin und das Woher des Menschen, sondern umgekehrt ist der Mensch auch das, in dem und von dem her Welt ist." Man sees, hears, and understands the kosmos; the kosmos sees, hears, and understands man. The kosmos has its access to itself always only through the understanding of man. The kosmos is in the light and the word of man.

All of Schlier's remarks above are important, for he has shown that kosmos is both that which owes everything that it is or could be to the Logos and that which has committed and involved itself in a denial of that Logos. Kosmos and kosmos-men are inextricably involved with one another and are one another. But the kosmos is also inextricably involved with the Logos, and God's address will continue to call it into question and remind it of that fact. Since kosmos-man owes his existence to God, he is called into question in terms of that origin which he shares with the kosmos.

Barrett, p. 135, emphasizes the difference between 1:3 and 1:10b. He believes the sense in the latter is the responsible world--men.

³²Westcott, II, 83, finds a hint of times of darkness and failure which in due time must come (Matt. 24). Ultimately, that stern necessity will be removed (Rev. 21:25).

hardly forget, though, that if ever there were a light shining from God, it was surely his Son.³³

In a few of the instances cited above, kosmos may simply mean the inhabited world or the theater of human life. "To come into the kosmos" is a very common expression and there are rabbinic parallels both numerous and exact.³⁴ Yet only one of the many instances of this expression in John cannot refer to Jesus: there is joy when a man is born into the kosmos (16:21). When the people speak of the prophet who is to come into the kosmos, they say Jesus is that prophet (6:14). In John 1:9 the subject may be a man (as in 16:21) or the light (Jesus). In all other instances, Jesus, Christ, Logos, Son of God are subjects. Considering John's Christology, one cannot feel comfortable with Sasse's remark that these expressions have no specific theological content.³⁵

Similarly, the expression en tō kosmō may mean nothing more than "in the sphere of human life." But when it is Jesus who is in this sphere, all the men in that sphere get addressed by God, find their very existence in that sphere called into question. And that is highly theological (1:10a; 9:5; 17:11). That the disciples are also in the sphere of human life (13:1; 17:11) is a matter of no small consequence, either to them or to the kosmos.

Finally, it is very possible that John 13:1 and 16:28 simply mean that Jesus is leaving the sphere of human life. This is a common

³³This passage may also serve as a warning against making John's usage of houtos kosmos too consistent. Cf. also 13:1, where the expression kosmos and houtos kosmos seem to be used interchangeably.

³⁴Strack-Billerbeck, II, 358.

³⁵Sasse, p. 889.

rabbinic expression,³⁶ though of course Jesus is not leaving the kosmos in the usual way or even, in fact, leaving it at all.

Special Problems Relative to Kosmos

Creation

Barrett, Lightfoot, Dodd, and Hoskyns, among other commentators, stress no significant creation theology in John. Certainly such a theology would be hard to document without the Prologue. A few commentators find a strong and clear Creation (or New Creation) emphasis in the Prologue. Lee believes John sees the kosmos as the dwelling-place of mankind, thrown into a state of spiritual chaos by sin. Under the power of darkness and of the Evil One the kosmos is the object of salvation--the new creation. Parallel with Genesis, John begins with the commencement of the New Creation. Lee writes:

As in Genesis, the Only God is represented as consulting himself. In Genesis "the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep," so in the Gospel there lies before us a spiritual chaos which is enveloped in spiritual darkness. As in Genesis the first moment of creation is the creative Word, Let there be light, so in the Prologue the Word is the personal creator, and he also was light--a spiritual light, the light of men. By him a separation is effected between the different elements of the world, and order is brought out of chaos. But not only was he light; "in him was life." He brings eternal life to men, and this is thought of not as mere prolongation of physical existence, but as an entirely new and superadded gift, which has its beginning in the new birth. This new birth . . . is parallel to this first divine gift of physical life in Gen. 2:7. This life consists in the knowledge of and fellowship with God; it is truly possessed from the moment of new birth, and there is a development of it corresponding to the growth in knowledge. The detailed process of psychical life recorded in Genesis has its counterpart in the development of this spiritual life described in the Gospel. Furthermore, the separate moments

³⁶Strack-Billerbeck, II, 556.

of creation in both accounts are blended in the continuous operation of the Personal Word.³⁷

Lee's suggestions are not wholly convincing. That there are echoes of Genesis in John 1 seems clear enough. That John is consciously working with a "new creation" theology remains to be proven.

Boismard attempts to show that there are seven clearly marked days at the opening of Jesus' public life and Messianic ministry, corresponding to the seven days of Genesis. But even further, he finds the whole of Christ's life parceled out into seven epochs, "all connected with the principal feasts of the Jewish year, several of which last for exactly a week."³⁸ His approach, in all its involvement, seems forced.

Of course, any attempt to find creation theology in John involves

³⁷Lee, pp. 115-116. P. Hugolinus Langkammer, "Zur Herkunft des Logos-titels im Johannes-prolog," Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge, 9 (1965), 91-94, notes that behind the Logos, which is personal, lies the creative Word of God, as well as Wisdom, Torah, and John's own creative interpretation.

³⁸Boismard, p. 107. Boismard divides Jesus' ministry in this way: (1) the first week mentioned above; (2) the events of the first Pasch, 2:13; 4:54; (3) the events of the second Pasch, chapters 6 and 5; (4) the seven or eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, 7-9; (5) Jesus' discourses at the Feast of Dedication, followed shortly by the cure of Lazarus, 10-11; (6) Holy Week, the third Pasch, 12-19; (7) the paschal week, the time between the apparitions of Christ to the Apostles at an interval of eight days, 20. Boismard wants to conclude that "the structural scheme suggests to us that the Messianic ministry is harnessed between lines parallel to those of the creation in its first days" (p. 108). Nor does he stop there, but goes on to find the specific tasks of the seven days of creation reflected in Jesus' activity. He then (pp. 110-113) elaborates theologically on this scheme by asserting that John is dealing with two worlds, one following the other, that a new one will arise over which Christ can truly reign. He proceeds to buttress this thought of the world to come with thought which is wholly Pauline. The first conception of the new world occurs at Christ's resurrection, he concludes. In time, the two worlds exist simultaneously, but the new world will come into its own at the resurrection of the body. His really significant argumentation is Pauline, however, and he does not document that John is working with the idea of two worlds.

the question of Jewish background. Buechsel remarks that the Johannine thought in connection with kosmos is clearly Jewish-informed, rather than Hellenistic. Kosmos means everything that is not God. Everything that matters for the Greek conception is missing: not only is there no joy in the world's beauty and harmony, but the beauty of the world is to John only tempting and seductive.³⁹ Buechsel's remarks may misinterpret⁴⁰ John, but they are interesting for their insistence on the Jewish background of John's kosmos usage.

In an article on the church's proclamation to the world, Eicholz shows the fulness of the Prologue theology. He stresses the recognition of the Creator as one vital facet of Johannine Christology.⁴¹

A profound use of creation theology in Johannine interpretation is that of Bultmann. In the Johannine theology, Bultmann maintains,⁴² God does not belong to the kosmos, nor is he the kosmos as a whole. Rather he stands over against the kosmos, having created it. Kosmos is not an

³⁹Friedrich Buechsel, Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus (Guetersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1928), p. 101.

⁴⁰A superficial interpretation and misunderstanding of Johannine theology is especially evident in George Johnston, "Oikoumene and kosmos in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 10 (April 1964), 352-360. Johnston is sorry to find a Puritan strain in the attitude toward kosmos.

⁴¹"Die Verkuendigung der Kirche an die Welt," Theologische Existenz Heute (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1939), Heft 65, 21-29.

⁴²"Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," Glauben und Verstehen: Gesammelte Aufsätze (Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1954), I, 135-138. While Bultmann's attempt seems more sane and more easily documented than some of those cited above, it is sometimes difficult to determine if and where he crosses the border from exegesis to existential interpretation.. That question is not so easily answered, precisely because it is not a problem easily solved by the exegete.

existent arising from another existing cause (God). Kosmos is qualified as creation; it has this character. Ultimately kosmos means men. Men do not stand over against kosmos, but are kosmos: that is, kosmos is not a being in itself over against which man could stand in theoretical examination. To be kosmos means for man to be creation. That man is kosmos (creation) includes according to the Prologue that he can understand himself in his creatureliness. For the Word that made the kosmos is the light of men. This is not the light of reason or conscience that the Light brings, but recognition, knowledge of one's creatureliness. But this knowledge the kosmos has thrown away in favor of its own knowledge, world view, ethic, and orthodoxy. The kosmos no longer understands itself. It turns into what kosmos-men make of it. Men constitute the kosmos, and the kosmos, men. Yet the kosmos does not lose its character as creation. Indeed, therein is its possibility to understand itself and to misunderstand itself, to stand against God. And because it is creation, its blindness takes the character of rebellion against God. "Far from being grounded in a cosmological theory, the peculiar dualism of John grows out of his creation thought."⁴³ Now man comes to all that he does as one who is himself kosmos. The kosmos has forgotten its boundaries and no longer knows anything about them. Anything lying outside the boundaries it recognizes appears laughable and absurd. Man considers this his kosmos must have an upper storey (he believes in God), but he has no conception of what it means that in his very existence he is bound and limited by God. Man no longer knows God, for if he did he would see him as Creator and let himself be determined through him. The kosmos

⁴³Ibid., p. 136.

as such is constituted by the men who belong to it and they are answerable for it. The kosmos cannot free itself from itself. But in the possibility to know itself as God's creature the kosmos always has the possibility to grasp the Word to itself.

Cosmology

Is it possible that John uses kosmos seventy-eight times and yet is unconcerned with cosmology? It may unequivocally be stated that cosmology has not the interest for John that it does for John's Umwelt. John knows perfectly well that God created the world. The kosmos as creation exercises a controlling influence in his theology, but his chief concern is with what the kosmos has become, what God in Jesus Christ is doing about it, and how the kosmos will respond to what God is doing.

The Incarnation has set all thinking about the kosmos on a new course. That God addresses men, calls them into question, demands recognition of who it is who sends his Son—all this shows the heart of the kosmos problem, where the central emphases must lie. The last thing kosmos-men need is a new cosmology; already they have done too much navel-contemplating. Indeed any further effort of man to determine the source and course of his depravity or the way out would be the epitome of kosmos thinking. While for the Umwelt everything may hinge on the proper cosmological secrets, nothing of the sort matters for John. Even if it be granted that some Gnostics sought self-understanding and only used speculative cosmology as an aid, the point is the same: only in answer to God's address can man find the meaning of his existence. If the Greek valued the kosmos as an order to be imitated and the Gnostic

devalued the kosmos as a hostile order to be escaped, John denies both approaches. For the Incarnation has put God's finger on man, not on cosmology. It is man who must hear the Creator's address; it is man who must come to know the realities of God which the Revealer brings. It is man who must answer in faith, not with cosmological speculation. Not the kosmos nor cosmology needs to be proclaimed, then, but Christ, the Sent-One.

Because God took his kosmos so seriously that he sent his Son into it, John takes the kosmos seriously. He takes it more seriously than the Greeks, for he sees it directly responsible to its Creator, who stands over against it. And he takes it more seriously than the Gnostics, for he finds the root of its downfall not merely in its material, but in the very men who call the kosmos home. John takes the kosmos seriously by showing that kosmos-men must stop taking themselves seriously—except as God's creation and subject to his address to them. That "higher powers" play no role in John may result from his focus on God's pointed address to man. For the Greek, the eternal Ideas showed a way beyond this world which was better; for the Gnostics, the higher spirits had to be tricked as the redeemed fled by them on their escape from the kosmos. But the Johannine Christ demands and offers openness and response to God in this world.

If John keeps the kosmos in view and if believers are still very much involved with kosmos-men, this may be to show the permanent tension in which the kosmos exists, the eschatological address always demanding its decision. Even when men see themselves as living from the Creator, they remain very much in the kosmos—and John may be suggesting that the kosmos, like the Pauline sarx, remains very much in them. This is the ambiguity of life, of existence in the kosmos. There is no perfection

in the kosmos, though zōē aiōnios has already entered it. John's retention of kosmos may point to further eschatological expectations. There is no new kosmos; in the kosmos, even the believers still wait. As there are always kosmos-men, there are always believers in the kosmos (who have the kosmos in them). The life in the kosmos is God's life among men, but also life in ambiguity.

Dualism

Every commentator feels the necessity to deal with the problem of Johannine dualism. Is John's dualism metaphysical, cosmological, ethical, historical?

Mussner thinks John's dualism arises from his historical experience in his overview of the life of Jesus. As he saw a specific people relating to a specific historical person, so his writing reflects not an iron law of fate, but the decision of kosmos-men.⁴⁴ Schnackenburg emphasizes that John's perspective derives from a historical concept of the kosmos which has shut itself off from God, developed away from him, and placed itself under the rule of the evil one.⁴⁵

Percy is interested in distinguishing John's dualism from that of Gnosticism. He notes that the disciples are never said to be from above, but only Jesus. Any dualism is between God and man. But even such a dualism has no origin in a heavenly and earthly substance, but in the view of Jesus as the one who stands on the side of God over against men and therefore has his origin in God in a wholly different manner from men's. In Gnosticism, the Redeemer and the believers from the beginning

⁴⁴Mussner, p. 70.

⁴⁵Schnackenburg, Moral Teaching, p. 310.

belong together in their common origin in a higher world.⁴⁶ Bratsiotis compares John's dualism to the Pauline sarx and finds no similarity to Gnostic dualism in either of these apostolic approaches. Kosmos is man acting in history, even as the Synoptic anthropos opposes God in history.⁴⁷

Wikenhauser⁴⁸ and especially Schlatter call John's dualism ethical.

Schlatter writes:

Not a single sentence of John employs naturalistic categories. On the contrary, it is ethical categories which are used when the opposition is at its sharpest, and it is precisely these categories which, according to John, give to the antithesis against the world its uncompromising severity.⁴⁹

Similarly, Bultmann sees the cosmological dualism of Gnosticism become a dualism of decision in John.⁵⁰ Voelkl believes that John has thus demythologized Gnostic dualism. He has escaped the ascetic-libertine tendencies of Gnostic dualism as well as Gnostic indifference. Voelkl finds the breadth and greatness of John's conception in the fact that with the help of Gnostic terminology and thought world John has formed anew the message of salvation and above all the relation of salvation to the world--without succumbing to Gnostic dangers.⁵¹ Voelkl also carefully

⁴⁶Ernst Percy, Untersuchung Ueber den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei, 1939), pp. 136-138.

⁴⁷P. I. Bratsiotis, "Das Menschenverstaendnis des Neuen Testaments," Man in God's Design According to the New Testament (Newcastle: Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, 1953), p. 34.

⁴⁸Alfred Wikenhauser, Das Evangelium nach Johannes (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, c.1948), p. 143.

⁴⁹A. Schlatter, Die Theologie der Apostel, p. 172, quoted in Werner Georg Kuemmel, Man in the New Testament, translated by John J. Vincent (Revised and enlarged edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1963), p. 80.

⁵⁰Theology, .II, 21.

⁵¹Richard Voelkl, Christ und Welt Nach dem Neuen Testament (Wuerzburg:

shows that the God-hostility of the kosmos lies in its inner worldliness, not in its matereality.⁵²

Odeberg takes a different approach. Defining kosmos as the human world he contrasts it with the lower, physical realities, which by nature and necessity belong to epigeia. God's love for the kosmos wills that it should not remain identified with the epigeia. Not of one essence with the earthly world, the human world has the latent potential of receiving the divine gift. This latent something is man's true nature. The human world in its ideal state belongs to the divine world; its object is to return to the divine. That only a few are saved means that only a few actuate the spiritual element in themselves.⁵³ While Odeberg rightly denies a metaphysical dualism in respect to man, he very definitely describes a dualism of man and the earthly world. His Platonism cannot find support in the Johannine data and disregards the creation framework of John's theology.

Barrett notes on John 3:21: "Such a man naturally comes to the light. His deeds have been wrought in God . . . and when he comes to the light he only returns to his own origin."⁵⁴ Barrett further remarks in this connection that men are divided into two classes, those doing evil and those doing the truth. The former inevitably reject Christ and the

Echten-Verlag, 1961), p. 439. Voelkl's description is correct. Whether John arrived there by demythologizing Gnosticism is open to question.

⁵²Ibid., p. 437. The Christian, Voelkl notes, fights not the world, but the kosmos within himself.

⁵³Hugo Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckerei [1929]), pp. 145-146.

⁵⁴Barrett, p. 182.

latter inevitably accept him. This distinction appears to exist before they are confronted with Christ himself and there appears to be no question of the evil men being changed into men who will do the truth. Barrett finds such a conception derived from the Old Testament doctrine of election, Hellenistic religion, and the primitive Christian faith.⁵⁵ It is difficult to see how the total Johannine theology could support such conclusions, at least as Barrett states them.⁵⁶

John's dualism is rather a dualism of terminology and approach, in a manner anticipatory of dialectic theology. He wants first of all to show the radical difference between God and man. The most significant way to do this is to show what God is able to accomplish (light, life) and what man can accomplish (death, darkness). Even in God's radical otherness and over-againstness he keeps the kosmos as his own, since he created it. There is no ultimate dualism. Further, John's zōē may be equivalent to the "age to come," an expression which John does not use.⁵⁷ The significance is that instead of this age over against the age to come, John shows a kosmos into which zōē⁵⁸ has already entered. Still there is no real dualism. Indeed, the dualism can be worked out dialectically:

⁵⁵Bultmann, Theology, II, 23, remarks that the Father's drawing does not precede the believers' coming to Jesus; it does not take place before the decision of faith. "John's predestination formulations mean that the decision of faith is not a choice between possibilities within this world that arise from inner-worldly impulses, and also means that the believer in the presence of God cannot rely on his own faith."

⁵⁶Disagreement expressed here with Barrett's latent Platonism is not meant to imply that John could not or did not employ Platonic thought categories to aid the presentation of his message.

⁵⁷Dodd, Interpretation, p. 146.

⁵⁸Synoptic parallel: Kingdom of God.

(A¹) Life is supposed to be happening in the kosmos, historically; (A²) but the kosmos has turned itself away from real life. (B¹) Into the kosmos comes the Logos to bring life which is to be lived historically; (B²) as kosmos, men reject this true life. A¹ and A² are antithetical, as are B¹ and B². But God holds both sides together in the kosmos: that is, the unrealized goal is a goal for the kosmos, not beyond the kosmos. A¹ and B¹ are God's intentions for the kosmos; A² and B² are the intentions of the kosmos for itself. Thus there is a twofold dualism: that between God and the kosmos and that in the kosmos itself (proper and improper life and response in the kosmos). Only God can solve this dualism in his kosmos, even though he will always retain his over-againstness toward all his creation. Two things are significant here: (1) There is no Greek metaphysics in the dualism between God and men, but only the facts of Creator and creature; (2) in the kosmos itself, there is neither metaphysical nor material dualism, for in God the antitheses within the kosmos are held controlled in the kosmos. The kosmos lives under the Creator, but always also under the Creator's critical question. But the question is addressed and properly answered within the kosmos.

Houtos Kosmos

Not unrelated to Johannine dualism is the problem of John's expression houtos kosmos. The strong assertions of Bauer and Holtzmann have few followers today. Bauer insists that this kosmos necessarily implies the thought of another kosmos. He finds this part of the Hellenistic impact on John's world view, that not the sensible appearances are truly real, but the super-earthly essences, whose reflected images

only are in the temporal world.⁵⁹ Finding the Johannine atmosphere wholly Alexandrian, Holtzmann sees the reigning Weltanschauung to be Philo's "Doppelgaengerei von Idealwelt und Naturscheinung, geistigen kosmos und sinnensaelligen Dasein, Himmel und Erde."⁶⁰ The material world formed through the Logos is houtos kosmos, which according to John 11:9 is understood as the sensible world. This kosmos necessarily implies another world and the words above and below in John 8:23 bear this out. Similarly, existence in the kosmos means existence on earth (9:5; 17:11,13; 12:32 is parallel to 13:1). The world above (Philo's kosmos noētos) is the Father's house (14:2), which is distinguished from the dwelling place of humanity. Everything spiritual in the lower world comes from above (3:3) and returns there again (14:3). As with Philo, the above and below are locally conceived. Similarly, earthly things are for John patterns of the heavenly. In Platonic fashion John contrasts heavenly and earthly things: wind (3:8), water (4:10; 7:38-39), procreation (1:12-13; 3:3-7). Only what is from above has worth.⁶¹ While these observations may at first seem to reflect the thought of John, a closer look reveals a much deeper theological outlook—one that goes to the heart of the kosmos problem in a way which the superficial Alexandrianism never did. The view of Bauer and Holtzmann does not bear up under scrutiny of Johannine theology.⁶²

⁵⁹Walter Bauer, Johannes, Vol. II: Die Evangelien II, in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912), p. 13.

⁶⁰Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie (Zweite neu bearbeitete Auflage herausgegeben von D. A. Juelicher und W. Bauer; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), II, 416.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 416-418.

⁶²Kuemmel, p. 73, rejects Holtzmann's metaphysical dualism.

In contrast, is Buechsel's contention that John's expression houtos kosmos is the most obvious indication of the Jewish subsoil of the Fourth Gospel. While John may use the expression in a Christian way, it depends on the 'ōlām hāzeh of Judaism.⁶³ Odeberg, too, believes that houtos kosmos is undoubtedly the literal translation of the Hebrew 'ōlām hāzeh. Indeed, he finds this a more literal translation than the Synoptic ho aiōn houtos; for the Hebrew term, in his opinion, has the sense both of kosmos and aiōn, with a frequent emphasis on kosmos.⁶⁴ Billerbeck notes that the rabbinic literature has an antithetical parallel for "come into the world": "go into that world."⁶⁵

Hartingsveld affirms that John's houtos kosmos has the same characteristics as the aiōn houtos and the rabbinic 'ōlām hāzeh. While John does not use ho aiōn houtos, the Synoptics do not use ho kosmos houtos. Paul uses both interchangeably (1 Cor. 3:18-19). Hartingsveld notes that 'ōlām in the Old Testament is a temporal concept, and heaven and earth are the correspondents for a spatial world. He argues that the local use of 'ōlām is first demonstrable at the end of the first century A.D. He concludes that houtos kosmos is a translation of 'ōlām hāzeh and that it simply takes the place of the houtos aiōn lacking in John.⁶⁶

⁶³Buechsel, p. 103.

⁶⁴Odeberg, p. 117.

⁶⁵Strack-Billerbeck, II, 536.

⁶⁶Lodewijk van Hartingsveld, Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums (Assin, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Vomp, N.V., 1962), p. 17. To bolster his arguments against Bultmann's interpretation of Johannine eschatology, Hartingsveld tries to show that John's addition in 12:25 of en tō kosmō toutō/en zōēn aiōniōn to the Synoptic parallels (Matt. 10:39; Luke 17:33; Matt. 16:25; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24) is highly significant for John since he is supposed to have eliminated the old eschatology. He concludes that

Noting the origin of the term in apocalyptic eschatology, Bultmann very decidedly rejects any temporal interpretation of houtos kosmos. He finds John using it to express the radical opposition between God and the world of men. Except in John 12:25 the contrast is never between two ages and John accordingly never speaks of this age, present age, future age, coming age.⁶⁷ Following Bultmann's lead, Voelkl insists that Entweltlichung for John is accomplished in faith and a complete turning toward life, toward the strongly realized eschatological Heilsgut. The contrast cannot, then, be temporal.⁶⁸ Noting Oliver Prunet's comment that the kosmos is what it is not through a tragic fall in the Urzeit, but through man's inner worldliness, Voelkl finds the opposition between houtos kosmos and God's world sharply expressed not in temporal terms, but existentially.⁶⁹ Mussner also notes that the lack of aiōn terminology

John knows and uses the Judaic terminology 'ōlām hāzeh/'ōlām hābō' and in a way deviating from other New Testament usage. But there is abundant variation in the New Testament. The fact which remains is that John places eternal life over against houtos kosmos. When one considers that the standing formula for eternal life is hāyeh hā'ōlām hābō', then this concept fits very well as the opposite of houtos kosmos. All this corresponds to the above/below of Johannine theology and one may conclude that houtos kosmos is the world below and eternal life is in heaven (pp. 21-23). Hartingsveld notes further that time is horizontal in John and space is vertical. On the horizontal time line are the foundation of the world, the Incarnation, Crucifixion, and the last day. But there is a verticality of space: The Son comes down from above in the Incarnation. At the conclusion of his earthly life, he returns up from below. At the last day it seems that he comes down again from above and then returns up from below, with his disciples (pp. 25-27). The weakest point in Hartingsveld's argument is his failure to see the depth and fulness of John's use of zōē aiōnios. He relies only on 12:25.

⁶⁷Theology, II, 15.

⁶⁸Voelkl, p. 437.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 398.

in John proves that John's concerns are not temporal, as in late Judaism but are with the essence of houtos kosmos—opposition to the Sent-One.⁷⁰

Cremer,⁷¹ Westcott,⁷² Lee,⁷³ and Percy⁷⁴ find houtos kosmos contrasted with the Kingdom of God. However, Westcott and Cremer seem to define the significance of the Kingdom of God as a higher order of things. Westcott and Lee emphasize a contrast between what is eternal and what is transitory. Sasse⁷⁵ also emphasizes the transitoriness of houtos kosmos. Percy sees a parallel between God and satan, God's Kingdom and houtos kosmos.

⁷⁰Mussner, p. 58. The use of aiōn in John and elsewhere in the New Testament is to be noted in this connection. John uses aiōn thirteen times. In all cases it means simply "forever," or, with a negative, "never." This usage has no affinity with the usage of kosmos. If John has no "this age," he does have fifteen times zōē aiōnios (all in chapters 3-12). The "ageless" life has already entered into John's kosmos. Revelation has the expression eis tous aiōnas tōn aiōnōn thirteen times, but never uses aiōn for "this age." Matthew uses aiōn once in the sense of "ever," but eight times with the sense "age" (this age in comparison to the age to come; cares of the age; close of the age). Mark uses aiōn twice with the sense "ever," once for the cares of the age, and once for the age to come. Luke uses aiōn four times in the sense "ever" and three times in the sense "age" (sons of this age; age to come; attain that age). aiōn is common in the Pauline corpus both in the sense "ever" and in the sense "age." In 1 Cor. 1:20 Paul uses aiōn and kosmos interchangeably. The Pastorals also reflect this dual usage. The same is true of Hebrews, where aiōn is even used with creation (1:2; 11:3). Gustav Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated by D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 153, thinks that kosmos eventually displaces aiōn in the New Testament. He thinks the correlative of John's houtos kosmos is eternal life (p. 148). Sasse explains that aiōn progresses from the sense of eternity, to the time of the world, to the world itself (TDNT, I, 202). The contrast of this age and the age to come may have been borrowed from Jewish apocalyptic, rabbinic usage occurring only after 70 A.D. (TDNT, I, 206).

⁷¹Herman Cremer, Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Graezitaet (Zehnte, voellig durchgearbeitete und vielfach veraenderte Auflage herausgegeben von Julius Koegel; Gotha: Verlag und Druck der ! Friedrich Andreas Perthes A.G., c.1915), p. 621.

⁷²Westcott, II, 123.

⁷³Lee, p. 164.

⁷⁴Percy, p. 141.

⁷⁵Sasse, III, 885.

Barrett is either unable to decide what John means or believes John conveys a variety of meaning with houtos kosmos. In John 12:31 Barrett sees kosmos houtos as the whole organized state of human society, secular and religious.⁷⁶ In John 12:35 he finds the primary meaning to be temporal (the present age), "but it is not without a quasi-spatial element."⁷⁷ In John 18:36 he thinks the metaphor is spatial rather than temporal, especially in view of the enteuthen at the end of the verse. The point is that the kingdom is not "of the fold (rather than period) in which humanity and the spiritual world are organized over against God."⁷⁸ On John 1:10 Barrett notes that the world of men and human affairs is not only contrasted with the future world, as in rabbinic theology, but also with a world already existing, a world above. "John seems to combine these ideas deliberately, so that Jesus appears both as the means by which an eschatological future is anticipated (as in the synoptic gospels) and also as an envoy from the heavenly world."⁷⁹ On John 3:3 he notes the early Christian belief that the Kingdom of God in Christ has already broken into this age. Such language Judaism had rigidly avoided because "it spoke in direct terms of the invasion of present human life by the power of God and thus annihilated the distinction between this age and the age to come."⁸⁰

The Alexandrian theories of Holtzmann and Bauer do not pay sufficient

⁷⁶Barrett, p. 353.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 447.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 135.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 172.

attention to the uniqueness of Johannine theology. While there is a certain parallelism of expression, significant Philonic thought finds no important parallels in John. Nor does a simple derivation from rabbinic sources explain John's usage. While John may very likely derive kosmos houtos from 'olam hazeh, the role this term plays in his theology is what matters. It is clear that John is not primarily interested in temporal distinctions and definitions. If the conclusions about kosmos reached in the first section of this chapter are correct, then it would appear most true to the data to conclude that the term kosmos houtos is simply part of the dynamic involved in John's concept of man without and against God. If he has chosen kosmos to signal this concept, and if man moves into action against God when God moves into action toward men, and if man thereby shows how drastically self-centered, finite, and artificial he has become, then kosmos houtos describes very well the utterly narrow-minded onesidedness of the creature who has forgotten who he is and given himself up to navel contemplation, in the belief that there lies the meaning of his life, religion, and existence. What is necessary is not that man should move up to another world, but that, in Old Testament terms, ge and ouranos should get together again, as at creation. And precisely this is accomplished when in Jesus Christ true life comes back into the kosmos--now.

Archōn tou kosmou

This term is more difficult. If, as seems likely, the archōn tou kosmou is the devil, the difficulty of the origin of the expression still remains. In the Martyrdom of Isaiah 2:4 Belial is the prince of

unrighteousness who rules over the world, and in rabbinic material of about 150 A.D. God says to the Todesengel, Satan: "Although I have given you power to be world-ruler over men, you may have nothing to do with Israel, my children." The difficulty is that the term prince of this world is also common, but never means Satan, but the Engelfuersten who stand for the natural life of the whole creation.⁸¹

The question arises whether an absolute dualism is involved in this expression. Voelkl insists that the devil is not a dualistic opponent precisely because he belongs to the kosmos and the kosmos is transitory. Further, there is no thought of an evil nature from all eternity; the interest in the archōn is in Heilsgeschichte, not in the Vorwelt. Also, his power continues only over those who give up to him.⁸²

Bietenhard notes that in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs Beliar is not simply the world-ruler. He does have a kingdom of demons under him, but "die Menschen sind nicht eo ipso ihm unterworfen, sondern nur insofern sie suendigen; der Gerechte ist ihm entzogen."⁸³ On the other hand, Matthew 4 shows Satan as the highest Voelkerengel, to whom power over the kingdoms of the world has been given. Before the eye of Jesus the kingdoms appear as a unity, over which evil has power. That the devil is called a liar and murderer in John 8:44 is highly significant:

Beide Bezeichnungen miteinander verbunden zeigen, dass der Herr der Menschheit nicht etwa wie in Voelkerengel der Juedischen

⁸¹Strack-Billerbeck, II, 552. On this basis, Barrett, p. 355, concludes that this expression does not derive from Hebrew or Jewish thought.

⁸²Voelkl, p. 397.

⁸³Hans Bietenhard, Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spaet-judentum (Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1951), p. 114.

Tradition die Sache der ihnen unterstellten Voelker, hier dann also der ganzen Menschheit, vertritt, sondern dass er der Menschheit feindlich gesinnt ist.⁸⁴

The origin and derivation of the term is still in question, even if the above comments about the meaning of the term are accepted. Hartingsveld notes that Beelzebub is ho archōn tōn daimoniōn (Matt. 12:24; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:5), but that this cannot be conclusive, since John knows no instances of casting out demons. Nor can Paul be of help since his demon "hat seinen Sitz im Luftraum."⁸⁵ To P. Volz's suggestion that Satan is used as a vehicle of contrast to the revelation in Christ, Hartingsveld objects that there is no proof for any personifying of the opposition. Hartingsveld also believes that Bauer's and Bultmann's conjecture of Gnostic influence does not give sufficient attention to the fact that the three New Testament usages are not congruent (Paul, Synoptics, and John) and neither are gnosis and the New Testament congruent.⁸⁶ Barrett, however, takes up the suggestion of Gnostic influence. He notes that in Gnostic texts the ascent of the Messenger means the destruction of the world and its rulers. But, he admits, the defeat of Satan by Jesus is also an essential element in the older Christian tradition.⁸⁷

Bietenhard mentions Schlatter's conjecture: The political and religious thought of the time contributed to John's expression. Rome had conquered the whole world, and its Engelfuerst was considered Lord over

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵Hartingsveld, p. 20.

⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 19-20.

⁸⁷Barrett, p. 355.

the Engelfuerst of everyone else. It became prince of the world. Rome's relation to Judaism and Christianity led to an identification of Rome's prince with Satan. In John the unbelieving Jews are put among the people of the world and under the Lordship of Satan.⁸⁸

No certain conclusions seem possible. That the kosmos or its essence or its prince is defeated in the lifting up of Jesus is clear enough in John. Exactly who the prince of this kosmos is, or what precisely it represents and whence this term is derived--these questions cannot in the light of present knowledge be resolved. That God's movement towards the kosmos turns to judgment when the kosmos refuses to answer God's address is undoubtedly connected with John's thought on the archōn tou kosmou. The theological point may be clear, then, even if the above questions are unanswered. It is possible that a step in the right direction would be taken if more concentration were given to the words tou kosmou, which is really the important qualification in the phrase archōn tou kosmou and most likely to yield the theological significance of John's usage.

Kosmos, God's love, the believers' love

God loves the kosmos. His love is Heilsliebe.⁸⁹ His love is universal. The fact that some men do not respond in faith does not detract from God's love. The very nature of agapē demands universalism. In Gnostic texts, love is a selection of those who are by nature pneumatic.

⁸⁸Bietenhard, p. 115.

⁸⁹Voelkl, p. 396.

The nous approaches only the holy and pure.⁹⁰ Yet, of the thirty-seven occurrences of agapao in John, twenty-five are in chapters 13-17. Of the seven occurrences of agape, six are in chapters 13-17. Barrett believes this corresponds to the fact that while God loves the world, "his love only becomes effective among those who believe in Christ. For the rest love turns, as it were, to judgment."⁹¹ Love in John is a reciprocal relation. There is love between the Father and the Son; between the Son and his own; and, among his own, for one another. John develops love as the nature of God himself and the means whereby the divine life is perpetuated in the community.⁹² To this same point, Voelkl notes that since John looks back on the decision of the kosmos against Christ and writes especially for Christians, he naturally speaks most often of God's love toward those whom the Father has given Jesus from the kosmos.⁹³

How does this affect the difficulty in John 17:9? That Jesus prays not for the kosmos need not mean a retreat from John 3:16. The dynamic involved in John's thought about men without God becoming men against God is caught in Barrett's comment: "The world cannot be prayed for because, as the kosmos, it has set itself outside the purpose of God. The disciples on the other hand belong to God as they do to Christ."⁹⁴ The exclusion of the kosmos is no limitation of God's love, but arises

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Barrett, p. 180.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Voelkl, p. 396.

⁹⁴Barrett, p. 423.

from the immediate circumstances of the prayer. Westcott notes that Christ's work is fulfilled in ever-increasing circles of influence; at the present he intercedes for those who have been prepared to continue his work.⁹⁵ The more important point, however, is that chapter seventeen is an oblique prayer for the entire world, since the salvation of the world or the scattered children of God will arise from the disciples' mission.⁹⁶ Barrett finds clearly expressed in chapter seventeen a mission of the apostolic church to the world, in which men will be converted and attached to the community of Jesus. The hope for the kosmos is that it should cease to be the kosmos.⁹⁷

The question is one of mission. How does the church, or how do the believers, act over against the world? Jowett notes on John 17:9: "The apparent exclusion is only a loving design for an ultimate benediction. . . . election of some for the benediction of the whole. . . . The elect are not called to a sphere of exclusion, but to a function of transmission."⁹⁸ With perhaps less reliance on Johannine theology he goes on to remark: "The unworldliness of the believer is to make the world believe in the dependableness of the Lord. Our moral elevation is to be the initial ministry in the world's salvation."⁹⁹ The Christian conduct should lead to the conviction, Jowett asserts, that it is possible to

⁹⁵Westcott, II, 248.

⁹⁶Hoskyns, p. 500.

⁹⁷Barrett, p. 422.

⁹⁸John Henry Jowett, "Saving the World," Interpretation, 5 (January 1951), p. 77.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 78.

resist the gravitation of the kosmos. The strength of the Christian's resistance placards God's dependableness.¹⁰⁰ More to the point, Hoskyns notes that "the church is the call of God to the world, because it is the manifestation of the love and glory of God in the world. What the incarnate Son of God had once been to the Jews, the Church is now to the world--the incarnate glory of God."¹⁰¹

Just as Jesus is sanctified by God for a mission (10:36), the disciples are set apart for a mission to the world.¹⁰² In John 17, the apostolic mission is "taken up into the supreme moment of the mission of the Son in which the task appointed him by the Father is completed."¹⁰³ Through the witness of the Holy Spirit and the disciples the world is to be invited to enter this circle of prayer and love.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, the love shown in the Christian body has as its supreme task the manifestation of the divine life to the world.¹⁰⁵ Barrett notes the pattern of divine activity:

The Father sends the Son, and in his works the love of the Father for mankind is manifest, because the Son lives always in the unity of love with the Father; the Son sends the church, and in the mutual charity and humility which exists within the unity of the Church the life of the Son and of the Father is manifest.¹⁰⁶

Of course, there is inevitable imperfection in the church's witness,

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹Hoskyns, p. 505.

¹⁰²Barrett, p. 426.

¹⁰³Ibid.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 427-428.

an imperfect response from the world, and both must remain under the judgment and mercy of God.¹⁰⁷ Voelkl notes that there are no Gnostic parallels for a Redeemer who sends the chosen out into the kosmos. The Gnostic Redeemer is interested only in his friends.¹⁰⁸

Voelkl insists that the Johannine ethic is not ascetic or world-fleeing;¹⁰⁹ John has no "ascetic program." Rather, Voelkl insists,

Die Reinigung des Christen bedeutet weder juedische noch gnostische Reinigung, sondern die Befreiung von den Suenden. Die Bewahrung dieser Reinheit ist daher ein Sichbewahren von der Suende, inr Ziel ist das "Fruchtbringen," d.h. aber ein Leben in der Erfuellung Gebote Jesu und besonders des Liebesgebotes. Die Reinigung fuehrt also nicht aus der Welt heraus, sondern verpflichtet zur lauterer Lebensfuehrung in der Welt.¹¹⁰

Jesus never fled the world, but only the claim of worldly men who wanted him for a Kingship of this world.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 428.

¹⁰⁸Voelkl, p. 417.

¹⁰⁹Voelkl finds in 1 John 2:15 a prohibition against inner worldliness. He sees a No pronounced against a God-oposed self-understanding of men, a No to man's "Selbstherrlichkeit und seinem letztlich teuflischen 'Begehren' gegenueber Gott" (p. 410). He sees a difference between material things not bad in themselves and an eros-concentration upon them. The things of the kosmos are always earthly and transitory in comparison with the world of God, he states (p. 410). Voelkl adds: "Wenn sich der Mensch der Welt hingibt, wenn er ihr 'dient' statt Gott und den Bruedern, dann will er--entsprechend der 'Selbstliebe des kosmos'--immer das Seine, 'dient' er letztlich nur sich selbst. . . . Die wesenhaft vergaenglichen, 'sinnlichen' Schoenheiten und Freuden und die materiellen Gueter gehoeren zwar zur Welt und sind in einer gefallenen Welt keineswegs 'harmlos,' aber nicht sie, sondern die 'innere Weltlichkeit' macht das Wesen des kosmos aus. Das Verbot der Weltliebe beinhaltet dann nichts anders als der schon erweahnte 'Entscheidungs-Dualismus'; der Christ kann sich mit seiner ganzen 'Existenz' nur fuer Gott oder fuer die Welt entscheiden" (p. 411).

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 412.

¹¹¹Ibid. Richard Loewe, Kosmos und Aion (Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1935), p. 73, notes on 1 John 2:15: "Der kosmos ist nicht

Agapē, then, is the "Wesengesetz der johanneischen Lebensmystik."¹¹²

The Johannine mysticism is ethical, not visionary. There is never an Identitätsmystik. Resting on the historical action of God in Christ, the Johannine mysticism has to work itself out in the "history" of the Christian life and can hardly be world-fleeing. John has an agapē mysticism, not an erōs mysticism.¹¹³ "Das Interesse kreist nicht um das Verhaeltnis zwischen 'meiner Seele und meinem Gott,' sondern um das Verhaeltnis gearde zum 'Bruder' in der Welt, in dem sich die Liebe zu Gott bewahrt."¹¹⁴ John's mysticism is inner-worldly.¹¹⁵

nur der Ort der schaedlichen Lust, sondern bring sie auch hervor, so wie der Vater anderseits Glauben und ewiges Leben hervorbringt." (One might say that the kosmos not only displays its wares, but even hawks them!) To be kosmos is simply the systematic substitution of creatures for the Creator. Loewe sees "die systematische Verdichtung des Weltbegriffes von objektiven Dingen zu subjektiven Strebungen in der Klimax: ho kosmos--ta en tō kosmō--ta ek tō kosmō--e epithumia tou kosmou" (p. 75), the latter being a subjective gentivie.

¹¹²Voelkl, p. 413.

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 413-414.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 414. But what of 1 John, which, if not by the same author, certainly belongs to the theological sphere of the Fourth Gospel? Does not the author of 1 John appear to encourage love only toward fellow Christians? It is clear that 1 John does not, like Qumran, demand hatred toward the sons of darkness, Voelkl thinks (p. 405). Schnackenburg, Moral Teaching, argues that for John love is the completely universal characteristic of the children of God, in contrast to the world's hatred. "If he is reproaching the world for its hatred towards the Christians, it would be unintelligible of him to limit the Christian's love to the circle of the community of the Church" (p. 328). Schnackenburg believes that John's love of the brother is parallel to the Synoptic love of the neighbor (p. 328).

Voelkl notes that in 1 John to love is to be born of God who sends his Son into the kosmos; that 1 John speaks of love generally and brings brotherly love only as a concrete example; that the contrast between invisible God and visible brother tends toward a Menschenbruder concept. 1 John is working with the specific problems of a given Christian community. The problem is not brotherly love or neighborly love, but brotherly

The Choice of Kosmos

Why did John choose kosmos to signal what he wanted to say about man? It is probable that the Hebrew Old Testament has no equivalent for kosmos because for the Greeks kosmos was not originally simply "world," but a concept of natural philosophy, elements, systems, and metaphysics. The Hebrew Old Testament only wanted to assert God as Creator. It is clear that John, too, makes that affirmation. John's choice of kosmos, then, repudiates all pantheism in the Stoic sense of "immanence" of God and the Greek view of God as a "principle" of the world.¹¹⁶

John therefore uses a word which was extremely common in the Umwelt. Kosmos was an opening for John's message. As the word is drawn into relation to the Incarnation, John can use it both in affirmation and denial.

With kosmos John affirms the universal meaning and address of God's

love or brotherly hate (p. 414). More important is Voelkl's argument that hate draws one out of the inner-community conception of love, for hate is the great Verweltlichung, the ethos of the kosmos. Hatred of brother or neighbor is the same. "Wer die Nichtchristen aus dem Bereich der Liebe ausschliessen wollte, wuerde sich auch darin dem 'kosmos' angleichen, weil er nur das ihm 'Wesensgleiche' lieben, d.h. aber wieder, weil er wie die 'Welt' alles 'Fremde' hassen wuerde" (p. 415). The world not to be loved is not the world of men, as in Qumran. John's love is different also from the Gnostic, who loves only the "unweltlichen Kern," not the concrete individual. Such a love is basically eros, based on a common unity in a strange world, using the other as a vehicle for one's own Entweltlichung (p. 415). For John, the Christian loves his brother in the world, in a wholly concrete, here-and-now manner, in humble service and helpful action (p. 415). But Voelkl warns: "Die Weltaufgabe der Kirche ist eine missionarische, nicht eine im innerweltlichen Sinne sozialreformerische oder kulturelle" (p. 438). One might add that whenever any "social Gospel" wants to meet the kosmos on kosmos terms, that Gospel has been subjected to a kosmos approach. Voelkl remarks that the Botschaft is never angenehm (p. 416).

¹¹⁶William Henderson, "The Ethical Idea of the World in John's Gospel,"

Sent-One. With kosmos John affirms creation and God's continued love and intent for his world. With kosmos John affirms that the light and life from God shall be realized now, within God's world. With kosmos John affirms a continued mission in and to the world and an in-the-world ethic. With kosmos John affirms that God addresses men in his world and calls them to live their lives from God, in God's world.

But John denies that the kosmos is self-contained, a perfect whole, in harmonious and natural relation with the gods (classical Greek and Hermetic writings). John denies that the true realities and the real calling of men are in the kosmos noetos (Philo, Hellenistic Greek, Hermetica), by showing that there is only one kosmos and all that is kosmos falls under God's address and questioning. John denies that the world is intrinsically evil and should be escaped, that the solution to man's problems lies in cosmology (Gnosticism, Mandeism). John denies by using kosmos instead of ge that the Old Testament ge is perfectly adjusted to God and that man can automatically lay claims to God's blessings by tying him to the "land" (Jewish). No privileged status exempts one from God's question addressed to man in Jesus Christ.

The most important thing John could say about the kosmos was that God loved it and entered it in Jesus Christ.¹¹⁷ Because of that event

(Unpublished Th.D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1944), p. 98, notes: "The Greeks began with the idea of a perfect world and ended with the idea that the world was evil because they had no doctrine of human sin. The Hebrews with an innate sense of personal sin began with a good world peopled with evil men and ended with a good material world and a human world largely evil and apart from God."

¹¹⁷Odeberg, p. 129, contends that John's usage is not dissimilar from that of Jewish, Hermetic, and Mandaean literature. He sees John merely adopting the language of the times, which shows the kosmos both as the object of God's attention and as opposed to God and under judgment. "He

the kosmos would never be the same.

simply adopts, and finds appropriate, the duplicity in the current use of the world." John's usage, Odeberg thinks, best corresponds to Jewish usage. If Odeberg only wants to show that John is not the first writing in history to claim that the world is both under judgment and under God's (loving) attention, he may be correct, although whatever dual attitude the Hermetic and Mandaean literature may show is quite different from that of the Old Testament. But Odeberg's remarks seem to slight the overwhelming role that the Incarnation plays in Johannine theology and the inevitable effect it must have in shaping John's usage of kosmos.

CHAPTER IV

KOSMOS IN JOHN: KOSMOS DEFINED THROUGH KOSMOS-MEN

Justification for this Procedure

The evidence submitted in the third chapter indicates that John, with reason, chose kosmos to signal his concept of men without God, men in need of God, men in rebellion and decision against God when confronted with God's Sent-One. The purpose of this chapter is to show how John develops and defines these men without God, in action against God. Such a procedure is required because John is not primarily interested (or at least not only interested) in the word he chooses to signal a human reality, but in that human reality itself.¹ John is writing about a problem of men, not a cosmological problem. Therefore, with no little subtlety and skill, he shows humanity in conversation and action. The implication of the Prologue was that when the Logos came to what belonged to him, his own should respond to him. Yet they failed to respond, to recognize his claim. What follows (at least 1:14-12:50) is the story of kosmos-men in thought and action against God's Sent-One. There is also the story of men from the kosmos who in faith answer God's address. This is the real stuff of John's "concept" which he usually signals with kosmos. To interpret John theologically is precisely to see this kosmos in action in the face of God's address.

The Jews

¹Kosmos, therefore, is used throughout this chapter, even though the term itself does not occur in the data examined.

John's treatment of the Jews is the best example of the procedure outlined above. They are "representatives of 'the world' in general which refuses to respond to Jesus with faith."² In John's perspective they are merged with the world. The opposition of kosmos-men to Jesus is most clearly and readily seen in the open opposition of the Jews.³

Mussner shows how the Christusgeschichte of John gives rise to this concentration on the Jews. He notes that the word kosmos increases in frequency as the confrontation of Jesus with the Jews grows more acute. What began in the Prologue as a non-recognition⁴ has developed into a full-fledged hate. While the Jews are only a part of the kosmos, the sense of kosmos over against God is especially sharp with respect to them.⁵ "Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit hat die Erfahrungen der Christusgeschichte nur weiterhin bestaetigt; gerade diese Erfahrungen duerften dem Ton, der bei Johannes auf dem Begriffe hoi Ioudaioi teilweise liegt, die Faerbung gegeben haben."⁶

Schlier shows that John is using the Jews as a type of kosmos-men. For instance, the whole kosmos which goes after Jesus (12:18) is really

²Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955), II, 5.

³Edwyn Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, edited by Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947), p. 173.

⁴There has been much debate about John 1:11. Does it refer to the Jews, Christ's own people, or the whole world, which belongs to Christ as his possession, having been made by him? The question cannot certainly be answered, but if the Jews appear as a paradigm of the kosmos, no great difference results from either interpretation.

⁵Franz Mussner, ZOE (Muenchen: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952), p. 59.

⁶Ibid., p. 60.

the Jews, and the kosmos to which Jesus has openly shown himself (18:20) again is the Jews. Schlier might also have mentioned that when the Jews demand a King for themselves, Jesus makes it clear that he is no king of this kosmos. The Jews are a paradigm of kosmos-men. The Pharisees and priests are authorities and as such are designated the representatives of the kosmos. The crowd is the unknowing representative of the kosmos, not knowing where it belongs. So much do the Jews appear under the view of typical representatives of the kosmos that when some have distanced themselves from the kosmos in faith they no longer appear as Jews. John the Baptizer, for example, does not really appear as a Jew, and Jesus himself speaks to the Jews of "your law."⁷

⁷Heinrich Schlier, "Welt und Mensch nach dem Johannesevangelium," Besinnung auf das Neue Testament (Freiburg: Herder, c.1964), II, 244. Gregory Baum, Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic (Revised edition; Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, c.1965), has treated at some length the alleged anti-Semitism of John. He calls attention to the great abuse of John by ecclesiastical authors who were writing for and shaped by a given social or religious situation in a particular Christian community, but he insists that any anti-Semitism in John itself is only apparent and that to find John justification for any contemptuous attitudes toward the Jewish people is to misread John. He finds not anti-Semitism, but the judgment of God on all that is wickedness, falsehood, hatred (pp. 136-138). Yet one can only wonder at Baum's conclusion: "Whatever the reason for the Jewish unwillingness to accept the Gospel today, it is certainly not the blindness or stubbornness that characterized the original conflict. Conscious of the development on both sides the Christian Church today cannot regard itself, as it was able to 1900 years ago, as the fulfillment and continuation of Jewish religion. For this reason the Christian must learn to respect and honor contemporary Judaism not as a stage to Christianity, but as an independent, though related religion existing in its own right" (p. 178). While the demand for historical perspective and understanding is necessary, Baum does not appear to view the problem theologically. Failing to interpret theologically, he has missed the solution to the problem. To the extent that Jews or Christians or anyone else are kosmos, they need to hear God address them in Jesus Christ. The question is not whether Judaism is incomplete without modern ecclesiastical Christianity, but whether anyone is complete without answering God's questions addressed in Christ. What is the kosmos-malady in John? Who of us still suffers from that malady? This is the approach to take. The problem may be that we want John to be neither anti-Semitic nor anti-kosmos!

Kosmos ConversationKosmos thinking

As men come into dialogue with Jesus and converse with one another about Jesus, John pointedly shows what it means to be kosmos.

The kosmos wants a guarantee before it believes. It will not risk a losing cause. Its characteristic posture is the demand for a sign. Amazed at Jesus' spring-temple-cleaning, they demand a sign which shall prove Jesus' right to do this (2:18). With proper insurance and a no-risk guarantee, the kosmos might have let Jesus get away with anything. The kosmos had a good thing going with Moses, a guaranteed bread allowance from heaven. Willing to try a new prophet, the kosmos wants to know what investment the prophet demands (6:28). Challenged outright to believe in Jesus whom God has sent, the kosmos wants a sign of good faith, an assurance of further performances (6:30) and continued benefits. If the signs are present, the kosmos offers belief (2:23).

The kosmos wants full explanations to religious questions. Its quest for the how is actually a will to be master of its own situation. If the religious quest is reasonable and the results a sure thing, the kosmos is ready to act. Confronted, however, with a Spirit as uncertain as the wind, the kosmos wants instead to find out how (3:9). Excited about food for the body, the kosmos misses Jesus' food for thought, and concerns itself with the how of getting a man's flesh for food (6:52).

The kosmos knows the facts of life. The kosmos knows what to expect from Nazareth (1:46), how long it takes to build a temple (2:20). It knows a good meal when it smells one (6:26), and it knows how God will

and will not raise up the Messiah (7:27,41,52). The kosmos knows how God spoke to Moses and expects him to keep on speaking that way (8:29). It knows that the Christ will live forever and certainly not get involved in any losing causes (12:34). The kosmos considers itself fully informed about Jesus (7:28): it knows his father Joseph (6:42);⁸ it knows Jesus has not studied enough to speak so well (7:15); it knows where he came from (7:27); it knows how much one can expect of a man of his age (8:57). In actual fact the kosmos cannot see beyond its own nose; it is hopelessly confused by the way things look to its crossed eyes. Judging according to the flesh (8:15), the kosmos concludes that Jesus is a Samaritan and has a demon (8:48) or that he is mad and has a demon (10:20), that he breaks the Sabbath and cannot be from God (9:16), that he is a sinner (9:24). Blinded itself, the kosmos cannot see that because of Jesus a blind man can see (9:18).

The kosmos wants an appealing prophet, its own kind of man. It likes someone it can understand in its own terms and who asks for simple approval as a kosmos-man (5:44). The kosmos wants a man who will fit in with the kosmos, not challenge it, a man who will talk like a kosmos-man and ask for recognition as a kosmos-man (7:18). The kosmos values its own approval and assumes that any religious peddler will want to take out a license with it (7:4).⁹

⁸Elsewhere the kosmos is more sure of its own paternity (8:41).

⁹Hoskyns, p. 311, notes: "Their supreme misunderstanding lies in their distinction between glorious and inglorious, bold and cowardly. There will be a public ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem . . . but it consists in the public exposition of the sin of the world and the provocation of its hatred. . . . There is also a glorious display of power, but it consists in secret obedience to the will of the Father and in the transmission of the truth to the disciples in private . . . and is displayed completely in the death of the Christ."

The kosmos has an interest in religion (5:39).¹⁰ Called into question by a prophet from God and offered living water, the kosmos suggests a forum on the doctrine of worship (4:20).¹¹ The kosmos is scrupulous about law and feels threatened when anyone tampers with the Sabbath (9:16).¹² It wants to squeeze its life from the law. It has turned God's Word into its own law and forced it to be the security for the religious life.¹³ The kosmos also loves its kinship with Abraham and makes the most of it (8:33).¹⁴ The religious leaders of the kosmos are absolutely certain that the best guides to approved belief are religious leaders, who are in the know (7:48). Just as surely the religious leaders know that the opinions of a man who has not mastered the niceties of canon law cannot be worth considering (9:34; 7:49). Indeed, the religious leaders like to run every new religious upstart through a colloquy (1:19-28) and occasionally;

¹⁰Richard Voelkl, Christ und Welt Nach dem Neuen Testament (Wuerzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1961), p. 422, mentions the studies of Emmanuel Hirsch in which he shows the Jews in John as representatives of that serious and zealous churchliness which "immer in Gefahr ist, seine Mitgliedskarte mit der Einlasskarte in den Himmel zu verwechseln."

¹¹Bultmann, Theology, II, 19, notes that in John 4:23 there is a "hendiadys which means that true worship of God is solely such worship as is brought about by God's power and his own revealing of himself."

¹²Voelkl, p. 425, notes: "die Selbststaendigkeit gegenueber Gott wirkt sich in der 'Ethik' aus, im Vertrauen auf die das Leben sichernde Gesetzerfuellung . . ."

¹³Bultmann, Theology, II, 27, remarks: "The decision that arises from the will to exist of and by one's self perverts truth into a lie, perverts the creation into the world. For in their delusion men do not let their quest for life become a question about themselves so as to become aware of their creaturehood, but instead they give themselves the answer so as to have a security of their own. They take the temporal for the ultimate."

¹⁴Voelkl, p. 424, compares the Jews who rely on their kinship with Abraham and refuse to do the works which belong to the new existence with the Gnostic Pneumatics, who have an inner-worldliness of self-justification resting not on works but on their special chosenness.

if necessary, offer one up on the altar of expediency (11:50). No man is worth a temple, and sometimes one has to give up a prophet to save the establishment (11:48). Kosmos religion is prepared to go all out, when necessary, to uproot improper religious attitudes and destroy up-setting religious figures, but it is careful to do so without transgressing its own canons (18:28; 19:31).¹⁵

The kosmos has a heart condition and is unaware of it. It refuses to know the one whom the Father sends (1:10). It does not know the Father either (7:28; 16:3) and never did (8:55). The kosmos rather prefers to define its spiritual condition in terms of the past: sons of Abraham, indebted to no one (8:33) and loyal disciples of Moses (9:28). Finally, in a sudden stroke of spontaneous insight, the kosmos diagnoses its own condition: it has no ruler but Caesar (19:15).

Even the believers are not unaddicted to kosmos-thinking. Forgetting that Jesus has food they do not even know of (4:32), Philip and Andrew speculate before the gathered five thousand how far two hundred denarii,

¹⁵Richard Loewe, Kosmos und Aion (Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1935), p. 61, notes that unlike the Greeks, the Jews should have been prepared by the Old Testament for the New Testament dialectic between God and man: "der Grieche sucht Gott in der ewigen Welt, entwickelt ihn als innerweltliche Idee, der Jude weiss den ewigen Gott ueber der Welt als deren Schoepfer, Lenker, Richter und Ziel." But the Jews had hardened themselves for their response into a powerless nomism. "Die Waffe des Kampfes und Protestes gegen die Verweltlichung wird zum Instrument der Mechanisierung und Rationalisierung der Gottesbeziehung, also wiederum einer Verweltlichung" (pp. 61-62). Loewe continues (p. 62) that with such an attitude they damned the heathen and humanized and externalized their election-consciousness. As divine grace was more and more misunderstood in separatistic Judaism, the hope of a divine break-through was changed in terms of a human "Wunschbilder und Welterneuerungstraume, immer gluehender im Wuenschen und trotz aller Apokalyptik ferner von der Erkenntnis wirklicher 'Offenbarung.'"

Challenged to become free in their life in God's world, they bound themselves more securely--taking offense at Jesus' new approach to the kosmos problem.

five loaves, and two fish will go (6:7-9). On the way to Bethany Thomas decides they should take things into their own hands, loyally join a lost cause, and die with Jesus (11:16). Before the Son of God who gives life to the kosmos, Martha worries about the odor of death (11:39). Later some who saw that Life would not admit it because they wanted to keep up their kosmos-reputation (12:42-43). Certain that he knows what is proper, Peter denies Jesus the opportunity to wash his feet (13:8), then blusteringly misses the point again and asks for a bath. Relying on inner (kosmos) strengths, he asserts he will lay down his life for Jesus' sake (13:37), but all he can do is lay down his confession of Christ for Peter's sake (13:38; 18:17-27). Meanwhile, he had thought to meet the kosmos on its own terms by drawing his sword (18:10). Thomas' kosmos-mind cannot understand the way Jesus is going (14:5), and Philip thinks a vision of the Father would clear everything up (14:8). Just when the disciples claim to have everything figured out (16:29-30) Jesus warns that their clear "belief" will soon turn to flight (16:31-32). After the resurrection, Mary thinks the kosmos has made off with the body of the Life-giving Son (20:2), and Thomas demands proof of the resurrection that will stand up in the kosmos (20:25).

Kosmos misunderstandings

Seeing everything with a closed mind in a closed world, kosmos-men cannot understand one who comes from the outside. Limited to its own terms, the kosmos cannot fail to misunderstand. The kosmos cannot distinguish between a living body and a temple (2:20-21), wonders how the water of life can be drawn without a bucket and rejoices at the elimination of trips to the well (4:11-15), thinks being born from God's

resources will mean a return to the womb (3:4).¹⁶ Symbols of life lived from God are lost on the kosmos, which curves everything in on itself.¹⁷ It is kosmos-like to wonder how a man could be satisfied without a trip to the store (4:32-33), and it is kosmos-thought to see in Jesus only free meals for life (6:34), wondering how he will do it (6:52). The kosmos cannot imagine how anyone could get beyond its reach and assumes a journey to the Dispersion is as far beyond the local kosmos as one could get (7:35). When Jesus says they cannot come along, kosmos-men decide he must be going to Sheol (8:22). In a moment of splendid irony, the kosmos decides to call in Jesus' father as a witness, but cannot locate him (8:19). It turns out that they did not understand which father he was talking about (8:27), which is not surprising in view of the paternity Jesus suggests for them (8:44). Jesus suggests that the kosmos misunderstands him because it does not care to hear God's words (8:43,47). The kosmos still does not understand and finds it highly ridiculous that Jesus should talk of life forever when even Abraham dies: who in the world does he think he is (8:52-53).

¹⁶C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 172, notes: "The novelty of John's thought when compared with Judaism is not accidental, since the point of this paragraph is to bring out the fact that the Old Testament religion and Judaism . . . is inadequate; it cannot move forward continuously into the Kingdom of God. A moment of discontinuity, comparable with physical birth, is essential. Man as such, even the Israelite, is not by nature capable of the Kingdom of God." Barrett continues that the unusual mention of the Kingdom of God may be John's "criticism of that Judaism which was content to await the miraculous vindication of Israel in the Kingdom of God and to ignore the necessity for inward conversion or rebirth" (p. 173). Finally, Barrett notes (p. 175) that the flesh-spirit contrast at John 3:6 is not a contrast between lower and higher, but between human nature as such and the divine action and its orbit. Each produces results corresponding to itself.

¹⁷C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), p. 304, suggests that kosmos-men think on a lower level of existence.

Completely befuddled by a man whom they know to be under fifty, but claiming to have seen Abraham, the kosmos decides that a good stoning is the final solution (8:57-59). When Jesus describes two kinds of shepherds to the Jewish religious leaders, they are unable to penetrate the obscurity of a parable pointed directly at them (10:6). The crowd cannot understand how a Christ who lives forever would ever disappoint them by submitting to being lifted up (12:34). They are twice wrong, knowing neither what Christ must do for them nor what the crucifixion means for them.

Kosmos Action

Challenged by the Sent-One from God, who addresses God's questions to them and calls their present existence into question, the kosmos first balks and then, like a bull before a red flag, charges into frenzied action.

In the Prologue Jesus' own people do not receive him (1:11). The situation then becomes explicit. The kosmos prefers darkness to light because it does evil (3:19). The kosmos, which has turned religion into a profit-making (fund-raising) enterprise (2:16), seeks to kill Jesus because God could not possibly be like what Jesus claims to be (5:18). This is the significant point in the Jews' rejection: not that Jesus blasphemes and blasphemers must be killed, but that if Jesus is right that God personally sent him, then their ideas about God have been completely wrong. Who have they been worshipping all this time? It will be easier to put Jesus out of the way than to answer that question. When the kosmos is not trying to kill Jesus for calling the kosmos into question before his truth (7:1; 8:37,40), it tries forcibly to make Jesus into kosmos, insisting that he be king of the kosmos (6:15). The presence

of Jesus again and again drives the kosmos to action. The kosmos-leaders try to arrest Jesus when there is danger he may gain a following (7:32; 11:57; 10:39); they plot to kill Jesus (11:53); they threaten expulsion from the Synagogue to followers of Jesus (9:22) and they plan to kill Lazarus (12:10); kosmos-men try to stone Jesus (8:59; 10:31). Jesus has expected all this, for he knows the kosmos wants to do the devil's desires (8:44); he warns his disciples that the kosmos will persecute them just as it persecuted him (15:20,23,24). To excommunicate and kill the followers of God's Sent-One will seem a religious service (16:2). Ultimately the kosmos goes into action by seizing and binding Jesus (18:12); scourging, crowning with thorns, mocking, and striking him (19:1-3); demanding his death rather than that of Barabbas (18:40); crying for his crucifixion (19:6,15); and finally nailing him to the cross (19:18). Even then they want it made clear to all that this man does not represent the kosmos (19:21)! Let this prophet speak for himself and die for himself, not the establishment. With a last effort the kosmos takes from Jesus the only thing he has that is worth something to the kosmos, his clothes (19:23-24).

Kosmos and Non-Kosmos Personified

In this section two characters are examined who, it is usually thought, play very different roles from those considered here. Many scholars believe that John's portrait of John the Baptizer is a polemic against followers of the Baptizer around 100 A.D. and that John uses Pilate as a foil to show the guilt of the Jewish leaders. Neither agreement nor disagreement with these considerations is intended—only a look at these two figures in a different light.

Pilate, kosmos-man

Pilate is kosmos-man in bondage to the kosmos: trapped, hemmed in, unable to reach a free decision. He sees his future closed. He cannot risk himself without some guarantee, and he is afraid. He wants to do anything to avoid making a decision and getting more deeply involved in the very kosmos-bondage which he epitomizes.

As soon as the Jews bring Jesus, Pilate tells them to take him away and judge him by their own law (18:31). Cynical about Jewish politics and angry over being disturbed, Pilate sceptically asks if Jesus is a King (18:33). Convinced that there is no Truth in the kosmos and enslaved because no Truth has freed him, Pilate dismisses Jesus' witness to him with a rhetorical question (18:33-38). Finding no crime, and anxious to be out of his predicament, Pilate suggests Barabbas as an exit, putting more confidence in kosmos-decision than it deserves (18:39-40). Losing his first round, Pilate then fails in his chance to act in an un-kosmos way—he gives in and has Jesus scourged (19:1). Still proclaiming Jesus' innocence Pilate presents him to the Jews, guessing this sight will satisfy their thirst for blood (19:4). Pilate has again underestimated the kosmos. A little blood is not enough and they cry, "Crucify him" (19:6).

Pilate has no room to move in his kosmos-situation and in a feeble effort to extricate himself, he attempts to pass his responsibility to the Jews (19:6). They pass it back to him with good measure, adding another charge (19:7). Now Pilate is more afraid at the weight of the decision facing him. What if this is supernatural being? "Who knows

in what form divinity might confront one?"¹⁸ Now he needs a sign, a guarantee, so that he can be sure as he makes his decision: he asks Jesus the same question the Jews asked, "Where are you from" (19:9). When Jesus offers no prop for his decision Pilate becomes angry and desperate. In a classic overstatement he claims to have power over Jesus' life (19:10). Pilate has in fact no power over anything, especially over his own kosmos-situation. Angered at the Jews for crowding him into this bad situation, Pilate again tries to release Jesus, still putting off an absolute decision (19:12).

Confronted with a direct threat to his standing with his kosmos-superiors, Pilate succumbs. With a last feeble attempt to thumb his nose at the kosmos, which has him secure in its grasp, he presents Jesus to the Jews as King—neither he nor the Jews being remotely aware that they are bandying about the Lord over the kosmos. Finally, Pilate gives Jesus up to the kosmos (19:6), and himself as well, for he has been unable to be anything but kosmos. In a final effort to scoff at the petty people who have forced him into this predicament, Pilate insists on placarding Jesus as King of the Jews (19:19,22), not realizing that it is not he over against the Jews and their king, but he and the Jews in the same kosmos-situation over against Jesus.

John the Baptizer, non-kosmos-man

John is the example of the non-kosmos response. He claims no independent status. He proclaims not himself, but only witnesses to God's

¹⁸Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (14 Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 512.

action. All man's accomplishments come through the Logos. John is thus the antithesis to the kosmos.

He is sent from God (1:6) and lives to bear witness (1:7) not to himself, for he is not the Light (1:8), but to him who ranks before him and is before him (1:15). Uninterested in personal claims (1:20), John only calls attention to another, the Lamb of God (1:29), before whom John is utterly unworthy (1:27). Like the kosmos John does not know Jesus (1:29,33), but when he sees (1:32,34) he witnesses that this is God's Son (1:34). Through John's witness Jesus is to be revealed to Israel (1:31). Instead of rejecting God's Sent-One and preferring to witness to himself and to rouse the kosmos to do away with this un-kosmos man, John sees, believes, and points to Jesus. John's whole posture speaks as eloquently as his words when he tells his disciples, No one can receive anything except what is given him from heaven--a reversal of kosmos-thinking which finds itself complete (3:27). John rather finds his fulfillment in another, God's Son. John is only the friend of the groom (3:29). He rejoices at this breaking in of the new, rather than preferring the old. Freed from kosmos-thinking, John finds it natural that he should decrease and the Christ should increase (3:30). Jesus reminds the kosmos that John witnessed not to his own reputation but to the Truth (5:33).

Kosmos Antitheses

Throughout John men are making the response to God's address in his Son which the kosmos refuses to make. Such figures highlight the ineptness of the kosmos-response and further define, by negation, what it means to be kosmos.

Already in the Prologue appears the typically un-kosmos response.

Those who believe are born from God's will, not from flesh and blood or from men (1:13).¹⁹ Unlike kosmos-men with eyes riveted to their own reputation, these have gazed at the doxa of the Logos (1:14).

Sometimes lost in chapters 1-12 are the men who answer by believing Jesus who comes among them.²⁰ Two disciples hear John's testimony and

¹⁹It is important to note that nothing evil is here predicated of men. The point is that alone man is incomplete, insufficient, and needs to live from God, not from himself.

²⁰Bultmann, Theology, II, 86, calls faith desecularization, detachment within the world from the world. Voelkl, p. 438, notes that although for both John and Paul Entweltlichung is faith, for Paul faith is contrasted with good works and self-trust and for John, it is contrasted with Jewish and Gnostic theology and means knowing. For both faith is the recognition of God's action for salvation. For both love is an essential weapon in the Christian arsenal, and their ethic is not world-fleeing nor ascetic. One might question Voelkl's distinction between Pauline and Johannine faith. If for John faith is seeing oneself as creature by seeing God's creative action in Jesus Christ, this will mean giving up trying to live on one's own, trying to find religious security through law-manipulation. This does not appear far distant from Paul's concern that men do not manufacture their standing before God by reliance on good works.

Voelkl discusses the believer's victory over the kosmos through faith (p. 430). He notes that faith and love work together in overcoming worldliness (p. 430). Above all, the believer's fight is against inner-worldliness (p. 431). But this does not come through cultivation of the ethical life, through Stoic virtues, through Hellenistic civic ideals. "Der Sieg ueber die Welt ist . . . grundsatzlich errungen und muss doch immer wieder errungen werden im Glauben, in der Liebe und auch in der Hoffnung. In seinem Kaempfen und in seiner Ueberlegenheit darf sich der Christ niemals der 'Welt' angleichen, d.h. vor allem, er muss in Liebe ueberlegen sein, gruendet doch sein Sieg ueber die Welt in der Gemeinschaft mit dem Gott, der die Liebe ist und der die Welt geliebt hat" (p. 437).

Alf Corell, Consummation est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John, translated by The Order of the Holy Paraclete (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), pp. 128-132, summarizes his study of pisteuo in John and 1 John. Faith is a work of God (1:12; 6:44; 1 John 5:1,4). Faith is kindled through the words of Jesus (4:41; 8:30), the works of Jesus (2:23; 4:53; 6:36; 10:38; 14:11), the words of the disciples (4:39; 7:38; 17:20; 19:35). Faith's content is the confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God (16:27; 17:8; 20:31; 1 John 3:23; 5:5). Faith gives eternal life to men (3:16,36; 6:47; 7:39; 11:40; 1 John 5:13). Unbelief is sin (3:18; 5:37; 8:24; 9:41; 10:38; 14:9). Faith has great possibilities in the new life (14:12-13).

follow (1:37); Andrew rejoices at finding the Messiah (1:41) and brings his brother Peter to Jesus (1:42). Philip finds Nathanael and tells him he has found him of whom Moses and the prophets wrote (an exactly opposite response from the Jews who used religious books to protect themselves from God's address to them) and asks him to come and see (1:46). Nathanael confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, the King of Israel (1:50), although the Jews found Jesus the negation of all they held dear. When Jesus manifests his doxa the disciples, not counting their own doxa important, believe (2:11).

He who answers Jesus' call gets new life from above (3:3), of water and the Spirit (3:6).²¹ By contrast, the kosmos recognizes nothing beyond itself. The believer does what is true, comes to the light (3:21), and sets his seal that God is true by receiving Jesus (3:33). Believing, he has real life--eternal life (3:36).

Those who answer God's call in Jesus cease fighting over getting God into their establishment and worship him in spirit and truth (4:23). And Jesus abides with them (4:39-42). The official does not ask for Jesus' credentials, but believes him and goes his way (4:50). The man sick for thirty-eight years asks not for a certificate from the Synagogue, a how or a why, but takes up his pallet and walks (5:9). To the crowd which gathers, Jesus says that the believer hears his word and sees that God sent him (5:24). The healed man sees that Moses pointed to Jesus as Israel's fulfillment (5:46).

The only real work of God is believing in Jesus whom God sent

²¹Barrett, p. 173, notes that in the Corpus Hermeticum 13, the puzzled disciple inquiring about rebirth learns that the will of God acts as Father, the seed is the true Good, and the mother is the Wisdom of the Mind. (The disciple gets cosmology, not proclamation!)

(6:20); all who are taught of God come to Jesus (6:45), eat the living bread he offers, and live forever (6:51). The disciples do not wish to return to being kosmos, for Jesus has the words of eternal life (6:68). The believer follows Jesus and thereby avoids the darkness (8:12); he knows Jesus and the Father (8:19). Continuing in Jesus' words, he knows the truth and is set free by it (8:31-32). The blind man responds without question to Jesus' command (9:7); he believes (9:38) and confesses that this man is from God (9:30-34).

The believers are like sheep who hear the shepherd's voice (10:27); they know Jesus is the Son of God (11:27) and that what he asks from God will be granted (11:22). Even from afar, men come seeking Jesus (12:21). All who hate their former kosmos-life receive eternal life (12:25); they serve and follow Jesus (12:26) and do not remain in darkness (12:46). Long before Isaiah saw Jesus' glory and spoke of him (12:41)--in marked contrast to those who now manipulate the sacred writings in defense of the status quo.

In chapters 13-17 is described the intense kind of life lived out of God. Everything that the kosmos is not and needs to become, this circle of believers is or can be, as they live from the Father.

They are ready humbly to wash one another's feet (13:14) and to love one another in imitation of their Master (13:34). Truly knowing the Father as they have known the Son (14:7), they will be able to do the wondrous works that only come from God (14:12). They love Jesus, keep his commandments (14:15),²² know the Spirit and experience his indwelling

²²Voelkl, p. 418, notes that love to God and Jesus documents itself in keeping the commandments, which action is "die Hingabe des Geschoepfes an seinen Schoepfer und damit die Absage an jeden Eigenwillen." The

(14:17). Unlike the kosmos, the believers will see Jesus beyond the crucifixion and will live as he does (14:18). Loving him, they will see his manifestation, the manifestation denied to the kosmos (14:21). Indeed, the Father and the Son will make their home with the believers (14:23) and the Spirit will teach them all things (14:26), reminding them always of Jesus, who leaves his peace with them (14:27).

Cleansed by Jesus' word (15:3), the believers bear fruit as they live in Jesus (15:4), and this fruit abides forever (15:16). Their joy will be full because it will be Jesus' joy in them (15:11; 17:13), a joy the kosmos cannot take away (16:22). Sharing Jesus' love, they will love one another (15:12). They are fortunate to have come to know all that Jesus brings them from the Father (15:15; 16:25), and they know that all he brings them is from the Father (17:7-8).

The whole life of the believers is a witness to him who has been their life (15:27), and the Spirit aids them (15:26), guiding them into all truth (16:13). Though troubled in the kosmos they will have peace in Jesus (16:33). They will find eternal life as they know of the Father and his Son Jesus Christ (17:3). They are made one with the Father through that oneness which exists between Jesus and the Father (17:11). They are kept from the evil one (17:15) and sanctified in the truth (17:17). As Jesus has given them the doxa he received from the Father in order that they may be one in the oneness of Father and Son (17:22), so one day they will be with him eternally to behold his doxa (17:24). The very love the Father had for the Son shall live in the believers, even as Jesus lives in them (17:26). All their lives the believers may

believer has turned from the world of "geistig-willentliche Eigenmaechtigkeit des Menschen." Ultimately, Voelkl shows (p. 421), the Jews responded in the opposite way: murder not faith was their answer to God's address.

share their joy by bringing it to the kosmos, for Jesus sends them into the kosmos, even as the Father sent him (20:21). They go not alone, however, but with the Holy Spirit (20:22).

CHAPTER V

KOSMOS IN JOHN: JESUS AND THE KOSMOS

No comprehensive Johannine Christology is presented in this chapter, nor are the numerous problems connected with John's presentation of Jesus taken up. Instead, the kosmos is examined in its relation to Jesus because the Incarnation focuses the kosmos over against God, examines and addresses it, defines it by antithesis, shows its fundamentally wrong situation, completes it, saves it, judges it.

Logos, Sent-One, Savior

The Logos¹ has been from the beginning, has been with God, and is

¹A thorough discussion of the "Logos problem" is given in C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), pp. 263-285: The most important meanings of Logos in Greek are "thought" and "word," which are not distinct as they are in other languages. "Word" is that determined by a meaning and conveying a meaning; "thought" is an articulate unity of thought capable of intelligible utterance.

In the Septuagint Logos almost always renders davar, which is God's word of revelation to men. Revelation is considered under the analogy of speaking and hearing, as distinct from vision.

Logos in John may be words; a saying, statement, or discourse; a collective for the whole of what Jesus said (the word uttered with its meaning or rational thought--John considers the uttered words of Christ to have life-giving power); or the Word of God as self-revelation to men. In Christ the Logos has become incarnate.

Is the Logos to be translated word and the entire conception to be understood in terms of Hebraic thought or has Logos a sense approximating the Stoic rational principle as developed in Philo? Deriving from Hebraic thought the Logos will be that which God's utterance (in Genesis) brought into being and which exists substantively, mediating creative power. This word existed with God and was distinguishable from him. This word is light or revelation in all of creation. This word came through Moses and the prophets to Israel, and Israel rejected it, though a faithful remnant received it. With the word become flesh is associated the typically Hebrew "glory" of the Lord. The orderly progression of thought may then be: "By the word of the Lord all things were made. It was manifested in the world as life and as the light of revelation, which is open to

God. Through the Logos God brought the kosmos into being; in the Logos God has always been in the kosmos, addressing the kosmos; now as the Logos becomes flesh, God uniquely and ultimately addresses the kosmos.

every man born. But mankind as a whole failed to recognize the word of God. He then sent his word to Israel through the prophets, but again Israel rejected the word, apart from a faithful remnant, to whom the word of God gave the right to sonship. Finally, the light which is the word of God was focused in an individual who was not one of a community of children of God, but his unique Son, monōgenēs para patros" (p. 272). Without great difficulty the Logos doctrine can be interpreted from Hebraic thought—except for two propositions: theos ēn ho logos and ho logos sarx egeneto.

The Logos usage may derive from the Wisdom literature as well, since there are so many significant parallels. Logos may resemble the concept of Wisdom, the hypostatized thought of God projected in creation and remaining as an immanent power within the world and in man. While the Incarnation is indisputably unique, in the Wisdom literature there is a matrix for the conception: ho logos sarx egeneto.

But what of theos ēn ho logos? Philo may clarify this usage. Any reader of John who belonged to that age would find inevitably suggested in John's Logos the Philonic conception of the "meaning, plan or purpose of the universe, conceived as transcendent as well as immanent, as the thought of God, formed within the eternal Mind and projected into objectivity" (p. 277). Only in Greek has a term been available meaning both thought and word.

"The ambiguity which (from our point of view) enters into the Johannine conception of the Logos could be understood if we assumed that the author started from the Jewish idea of the Torah as being at once the Word of God and the divine Wisdom manifested in creation, and found, under the guidance of Hellenistic Jewish thought similar to that of Philo, an appropriate Greek expression which fittingly combined both ideas" (p. 278).

It may be objected that nowhere else is Logos used in a Philonic sense. But John deals with cosmology only in the Prologue. Elsewhere the Logos is not merely uttered word, but word with rational content. The use of symbolism and especially alethinōs implies a metaphysic not unlike that of Philo. Christ is spoken of as Son of Man, which may replace the Philonic usage of Logos since the emphasis is on God's mediation to man. A Logos-doctrine similar to that of Philo, then, is present throughout the Gospel and the Prologue usage falls readily into place in the rest of John.

The opening statements of the Prologue, then, may be saying that the Logos is "the rational principle in the universe, its meaning, plan or purpose, conceived as a divine hypostasis in which the eternal God is revealed and active" (p. 280)—suggesting associations with the Old Testament Word of the Lord, Stoicism modified by Philo, and the Wisdom literature.

The Incarnation is prepared for "in the thought of the Logos immanent in man, as the equivalent of the divine, essential humanity, alēthinōs anthrōpos, as well as in the doctrine of that divine Wisdom who, passing

Pollard insists that the egeneto (1:3) is not cosmological, but the meaning is: Everything happens through him. The Logos is the

into holy souls, makes them to be friends of God and prophets, the Wisdom which, like the Logos here, 'tabernacles' with men" (p. 281).

John 1:9-13 may be predicated of the pre-incarnate Logos and mean that the divine Wisdom pervading the world was unrecognized except by a few. "If this be the intention of verses 9-11, then the incarnation of the Logos appears as the final concentration of the whole creative and revealing thought of God, which is also the meaning of the universe, in an individual who is what humanity was designed to be in the divine purpose, and therefore is rightly called the 'Son of Man,' that is to say, ho alēthinos anthrōpos" (p. 282). But verses 11-13 might just as well refer to the incarnate Logos, who comes to his own people, the Jews, who do not receive him. Those who do receive him become his children and adhere to him (as the Christian Church). Indeed, verses 9-10 might also just as well refer to the incarnate Logos. In fact, the historical ministry of Jesus could be pushed back through verse 4, so that only verses 1-3 refer to the pre-incarnate Logos. This is improbable since a Hellenistic addressee would have no clue to interpret these verses thus until he reached 1:14.

Yet John may be written on two levels. The solution may lie in the fact that the Logos became sarx. "The life of Jesus therefore is the history of the Logos, as incarnate, and this must be, upon the stage of limited time, the same thing as the history of the Logos in perpetual relations with men and the world. Thus not only verses 11-13, but the whole passage from verse 4, is at once an account of the relations of the Logos with the world, and an account of the ministry of Jesus Christ, which in every essential particular reproduces these relations" (p. 284). Such double significance is quite characteristic of John's method.

The significant point, which distinguishes John from Philo and all other cosmologists, is that the eternal Logos is apprehended on the basis of that life which is recorded in the Gospel--not otherwise. That life expresses what the eternal thought of God is, what the meaning of the universe is. John starts not with cosmology but with faith in Jesus, "which involves the recognition that the meaning which we find in Him is the meaning of the whole universe--that, in fact, that which is incarnate in Him is the Logos. . . . Only he who knows God in Jesus Christ knows what the Logos is, by which the world was made" (p. 285).

Unlike the Gnostic, who sets out to communicate cosmology as the way to knowledge of God, John is saying: "Let us assume that the cosmos exhibits a divine meaning which constitutes its reality. I will tell you what that meaning is: it was embodied in the life of Jesus, which I will now describe" (p. 285).

One may conclude, then, that "the Prologue is an account of the life of Jesus under the form of a description of the eternal Logos in relations with the world and with man, and the rest of the gospel an account of the Logos under the form of a record of the life of Jesus; and the proposition ho logos sarx egeneto binds the two together, being at the same time the final expression of the relation of the Logos to man

Mediator of all God's activity ad extra. This places Christ not in a cosmological setting but in the widest possible setting as the Mediator of all God's activity toward the kosmos. This, after all, is the emphasis of John itself.²

Jervell³ has shown that a Redeemer⁴ who calls the kosmos his own possession is in direct contradiction to Gnostic thought. The use of idia results from creation, and here the Creator and Redeemer are inseparably linked.⁵

and his world, and a summary of the significance of the life of Jesus" (p. 285). John fills in with concrete detail the Weltanschauung of the Prologue present in barest outline.

²T. Evan Pollard, "Cosmology and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel," Vigiliae Christianae, 12 (1958), 147-153. Pollard finds an emphasis on the co-eternity of God and the Word in verses 1-2; the Word mediating all God's activity, verse 3; the work of the Word revealing God to men, verses 4ff. He mentions 1:10b only in passing.

One might note that God's first action ad extra was the creation of the kosmos. It would, then, seem difficult to eliminate any creation idea from the egeneto in 1:3. But Pollard's point is still important: throughout history God has continued to move toward the kosmos in the Logos; in fact, all his movement toward the kosmos has been through the Logos.

³Jacob Jervell, "Er kam in sein Eigentum," Studia Theologica, 10 (1956), 14-27.

⁴Richard Voelkl, Christ und Welt Nach dem Neuen Testament (Wuerzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1961), p. 395, remarks that the Incarnation of the Redeemer in Gnosticism is not itself a revelation which addresses man here and now and enlightens, but only a cosmic occurrence. The Gnostic Redeemer is no historical person at all, but the "Urmensch, der streng genommen nicht seinen Leib und sein Fleisch, sondern das Fleisch ueberhaupt traegt." He does not redeem man where he is, but collects the scattered particles of light, leads them upwards and away, and frees their real selves.

⁵Voelkl, p. 394, notes: "Nicht erst als Erloeser, sondern auch als Schoepfer bring er diese Erkenntnis. Die Schoepfung ist daher urspruenglich verstaendlich in dem Sinne, dass der Mensch um seinen Schoepfer wissen, dessen Anspruch an ihn erkennen und sich als Geschoepf verstehen kann." Voelkl follows Bultmann in insisting that John will admit of nothing but a creatio ex nihilo. Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (14 Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 20,

As the drama of John develops, the emphasis shifts to the Logos as God's Word of address to the kosmos, the personal Word, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, sent by God.⁶ Himself love, life, light, and truth come into the world, Jesus is the witness that there are none of these realities which do not take their origin from God. God addresses men and calls them to range themselves on the side of the realities embodied in Jesus or against them.⁷ While the Jews are frequently represented as sitting in judgment on the Sent-One, they are far from being his judges. They are in fact on trial in his presence.⁸ Welcome would be the proper response to Jesus, if the kosmos followed the origin of its being.⁹ Yet the kosmos does not care to welcome Jesus, but rather takes offense at him. As the kosmos exists from Nothing, "the encounter with the Revealer calls into question whether this existence-from-Nothing is existence at all."¹⁰

asserts on John 1:3: "ueber das Wie und Wann aber fehlt jede Reflexion. Das egeneto ist reiner Ausdruck des Schoepfungsgedankens und schliesst den Emanationsgedanken ebenso aus wie die Vorstellung von einer urspruenglichen Dualitaet von Licht und Finsternis und von der Entstehung der Welt aus einem tragischen Zusammenstoss dieser beiden Maechte. Ausgeschlossen ist auch die griechische Anschauung, die die Welt aus der Korrelation von Form und Stoff begreifen will; die Schoepfung ist nicht die Ordnung einer chaotischen Materie, sondern die katabole kosmou (17:24), creatio ex nihilo."

⁶That Jesus is God's own emissary is clearly shown by the continually recurring usages of apostello and pempo. John uses these verbs about fifty times as an official designation of Jesus.

⁷R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, edited by C. F. Evans (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 118.

⁸Ibid., p. 130.

⁹Ibid., p. 83.

¹⁰Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955), II, 23.

Once the Sent-One is called soter (4:42; compare 1 John 4:14). While for the Old Testament this title has the sense of deliverer and for Hellenistic thought it is a common title of pagan gods, it seems best to follow Dodd's conclusion that since John offers no explanation, the reader is left to gather from the tenor of the work as a whole in what sense Jesus is Savior.¹¹ What the soter tou kosmou means for the kosmos will become clearer in subsequent sections of this chapter.

Life--Death

Corell concludes from his study of zoe in John: (1) The origin of life is God or Christ (1:4; 5:26; 1 John 5:11,20). Zoe is not opposed to physical life, but it is life in its perfection, including physical life. There is only one life, the life given in creation. Birth from above,

¹¹Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 238-239. Edwyn Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, edited by Francis Davey (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947), p. 248, insists that soter is not merely borrowed from Hellenism, but shows John's capacity for crystallizing the Christian tradition into a short and pregnant phrase. Such a phrase has its roots in the earlier Christian tradition. Freidrich Buechsel, Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus (Guetersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1928), pp. 44-45, notes the common occurrences of soter in Hellenism (Zeus, Asclepius, and Apollo were so called; Egyptian royalty and Roman ceasar cultists used it as a title; Isis, Osiris, Serapis were so called; it belongs to the general Heilandswartung as in Vergil's Fourth Eclogue), but concludes that the content of John's usage necessarily places soter in a Jewish context. "Auch bei ihm wird hinter dem soter das alttestamentliche-juedischen goel stehn. Aber er wird das Wort mit der Absicht brauchen, dass die 'Griechen' in Jesu die Erfuellung ihrer Heilands-erwartung finden" (p. 46). One should first, of course, speak of the Samaritan expectations. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 204, believes John's terminology is drawn from Hellenistic usage, but that he has in view the Old Testament conception of and hope for salvation, as well as the primitive Christian conception that the hope was fulfilled in Jesus. Through Jesus God wills to save the world. "This is not a rank enjoyed by him independently of his action in obedience to God's will. In the Old Testament God is characteristically a God who saves his people . . ."

for example, is the realization and fulfillment of created life. There is a continuity between created life and redeemed life. (2) Life is given in Christ (5:21; 10:10,28; 17:2; 1 John 4:9). There is no life except through Christ. (3) Life is given to those who believe (3:15,36; 6:40,47). (4) Those who do not possess life are given over to death (5:24; 8:51; 1 John 3:14; 5:16). Death is not considered over against immortality, for neither athanasia nor aphtharsia are used in John. Zoe is not a metaphysical or philosophical term but a purely theological one. (5) Jesus is the light, water, and bread of life; he is thus the necessity without which there can be no life. Zoe as eternal is limited neither to the present nor the future. Zoe appears to be present (3:36; 6:47; 5:40; 6:33; 10:10,28; 17:3), future (14:19; 5:29; 12:25), either present or future (6:51,57; 12:50; 1 John 2:25), both present and future (11:25; 26; 5:24,25). Zoe is not spiritual life contra physical life, but life contra death, according well with life both present and future. As the resurrection of Christ links inseparably his earthly life and glorified life, so the Christian lives an eschatological life, possessed in the present and fulfilled in the future.¹²

Dodd has noted that the word aionios, used so frequently with zoe, is qualitative¹³ and thus is applied to life already.¹⁴ The thought of zoe is never the abstract static quality of Greek or Hellenistic mysticism,

¹²Alf Corell, Consummatum est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John, translated by The Order of the Holy Paraclete (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), pp. 140-143.

¹³Dodd, Interpretation, p. 149.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 147-148.

but Hebraic action, movement, and enjoyment.¹⁵ Such a life is indeed accessible here and now, though it implies for its fulfillment an order of existence beyond space and time.¹⁶

In contrast to zoe is the condition of the kosmos, to which Jesus must bring zoe. The antithesis is not primarily to be seen in apothnesko, nekros, or thanatos. Generally, these words refer to a physical death, as of Lazarus or the official's son, though they take on theological significance when it is said that Jesus must die (12:33; 18:14,22; 19:7), is raised from the dead (2:22; 20:9; 21:14), and that the Father raises from the dead and gives life (5:21). No doubt there is also a theological point to the fact that the fathers who ate manna in the wilderness died, while Jesus offers a life-giving bread (6:49-51). The real contrast, however, is between the zoe which Jesus brings and the existence out of nothingness which now characterizes the kosmos. The kosmos no longer seeks its life from God, the Creator of life. Jesus gives to the kosmos the life originally given in creation, the life from which the kosmos had turned away to its own emptiness. Schlier notes that the kosmos had entered on a self-powerful and self-lording existence, which had dragged it into nothingness. This self-chosen existence has torn kosmos-man away from the reality of life made certain through the Logos, who already was in the beginning. John further develops this picture in terms of darkness and falsehood.¹⁷

¹⁵Ibid., p. 150.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 201.

¹⁷Heinrich Schlier, "Welt und Mensch nach dem Johannesevangelium," Besinnung auf das Neue Testament (Freiburg: Herder, c.1964), II, 250.

Light--Darkness

Jesus, the incarnate Logos, is light (1:4,5). He has come into the kosmos as a light (1:9; 3:19; 12:46); calls himself the light of the kosmos (8:12); offers the light of life to those who follow him (8:12), and sonship in light to those who believe (11:36). John the Baptist is not really the light (5:35), but witnesses to the light (1:7,8). While Jesus is in the kosmos, men are confronted with a choice between light and darkness (3:19,20; 9:5; 11:9,10; 12:35,36).

For the Greeks light was a common predication of God himself and a metaphor for his relation to the universe (radiation, emanation).¹⁸ The Hebrew used light of God; a single man, especially Adam; Israel; Torah and Temple; and Jerusalem.¹⁹ Light was the ultimate blessedness which is God's gift to men.²⁰ The archetypal light of God, which shone in the darkness of not-being, ignorance, error, and resisted the assaults of darkness, became manifest in Jesus Christ, who is the light in which we see light.²¹ The glorious manifestation of God's presence, his doxa, is inescapably connected with light.²² The Jesus in controversy with the Jews (8:14) claims to be the light of the kosmos, the genuine light. Light is known by itself alone; it is self-evidencing. The claim to be

¹⁸Dodd, Interpretation, p. 202.

¹⁹Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924), I, 236.

²⁰Dodd, Interpretation, p. 202.

²¹Ibid., pp. 203-204. Dodd's language here seems closer to Hellenistic metaphysics than to Hebrew cosmology.

²²Ibid., p. 205.

light could only be substantiated by shining.²³ In the same connection, Lightfoot notes that Jesus is the light of the kosmos not by showing men how to discover things which they wish to find, but by himself irradiating human existence with knowledge of its nature, meaning, and purpose.²⁴ Whatever the significance of light in the Umwelt of John, the description of Jesus as the light does not convey cosmological status, but soteriological function.²⁵ To this same point Barrett remarks:

Light is not a metaphysical definition of the person of Jesus but a description of his effect upon the cosmos; he is the light which judges and saves it. In him only the world has its day in which men may walk safely; in his absence is darkness.²⁶

The kosmos into which Jesus the light comes lies in darkness. The light shines in darkness and the darkness is not able to comprehend or overcome it (1:5).²⁷ The followers of Jesus shall not walk in darkness (8:12; 12:46), and he who walks in darkness does not know where he is going (12:35). Jesus warns men to walk while they have the light (12:35), but many have loved darkness rather than light (3:19).

Lee finds Genesis motifs in the Johannine darkness and sees a new creation emphasis. John, he believes, sees the world as an object requiring salvation out of the evil into which it has fallen, and this ethical condition arose historically as described in Genesis. Conceiving the darkness after the analogy of the chaos which preceded the

²³Ibid., p. 205.

²⁴Ibid., p. 189.

²⁵Barrett, p. 279.

²⁶Ibid., p. 296.

²⁷Hoskyns, p. 143, notes that two nuances can be present: grasp with the mind and grasp with the hand.

The point seldom noticed is that this is a Gospel statement.

material creation, John shows the present world as the object of God's saving work, the matter of a new creation.²⁸ Whether or not a Genesis motif is clear, it is certainly true that John wants to offer in his light--darkness antitheses no insight into the metaphysical structure of the kosmos, but only the Person and Work of Christ.²⁹

Schlier believes John wants to predicate darkness as the actual factual condition of the historical kosmos, in contrast to the kosmos which should be living by, in, and from the Logos of the Prologue. While John does not use the concept of powers of darkness, the "darkness very clearly shows itself as exercising itself over men,"³⁰ as lie, sin, and death. Yet the darkness is not imposed on kosmos-men, Bultmann writes. Darkness is the peculiar nature of the kosmos in which it is at ease and at home. "Just this--that the world appropriates to itself its darkness--can come to expression in the judgment that men are blind, blind without knowing it and without wanting to acknowledge it. . . . Kosmos, then, is in essence existence in bondage."³¹ To love darkness is sin; to be blind is to be left stuck in one's sin; and this is to be under the sway of death. The bondage to death is enmity to life, and this is the opposite of love.³²

²⁸Edwin Kenneth Lee, The Religious Thought of St. John (London: SPCK, 1962), p. 113.

²⁹Franz Mussner, ZOE (Muenchen: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952), p. 66.

³⁰Schlier, p. 246.

³¹Bultmann, Theology, II, 15-16.

³²Ibid., p. 16. By this sequence Bultmann is able to show the ethical meaning of darkness and fit this thought pattern into the entire Johannine ethic of love. Bound to death man is not free and open to make the response of love in the world and among his fellow men.

Truth--Lie

Truth is God's reality as revealed to men--either the reality itself or the revelation of it.³³ From his study of aletheia in John Corell concludes: (1) Truth is the message which Jesus delivers (8:40, 45). The opposite is sin, not lies. (2) The Message and the Messenger are identical (1:14; 5:33; 14:6; 18:37). (3) Truth is received by the chosen ones (3:21; 18:37). (4) Truth is the mark of the Church (4:23, 24; 8:32; 16:7,13; 17:17,19; 8:44; 1 John 5:7).³⁴ In sharp disagreement with Bultmann's identification of truth as divine reality, Corell finds it to be the truth about the death and resurrection of Christ. He wants to show that such truth is revealed and comprehended only within the sphere of the life of the Church, the eschatological situation in which the risen Lord reveals himself to the faithful.³⁵

Bultmann is not necessarily saying something wholly different from this when he finds truth to be divine reality. Truth is different from the reality in which man first finds himself and by which he is controlled. Truth discloses itself and is thus revelation. Bultmann notes

³³Dodd, Interpretation, p. 177.

³⁴Corell, pp. 159-161.

³⁵Ibid., p. 161. Corell goes on (p. 162) to reject the interpretations of Pilate's question which suggest scepticism, scorn, or the neutrality of the state before the religious question. The question is not left unanswered by John. There is no verbal answer, but action making clear for all men what truth is--the Cross. This is not an unimportant question, but the most important of questions: it is the real question about life and redemption. It is no coincidence that the Roman governor asks the question. He represents not only the Empire with all its political and cultural resources, but humanity seeking redemption. He, of course, does not realize the significance of his question nor understand the answer given to it.

that the reality of God is opposed and inaccessible to human existence as it has constituted itself through the Fall. Truth takes place only in obedient faith. What is not determined by truth leads to death. That Jesus speaks truth means both that he speaks the truth and that he brings revelation in words.³⁶ As revelation, truth is the object of ginoskein or eidenai. Not cosmological or soteriological speculation, truth is an address fulfilled in concrete encounter; it cannot be separated from the person of Jesus and the events fulfilled in his history. Jesus brings truth in himself and is not just a means to that end.³⁷

The kosmos lacks God's truth, which Jesus brings in his work and person. The opposite of truth is not just wrong facts, but the lie, the final and ultimate denial of divine reality.³⁸

Schlier says the kosmos is ruled by an appearance, and this appearance is the wilful pretence, which it allows itself, that it is a world powerful out of and in itself.³⁹ In contrast to the secure reality of life opened up by the Logos who was in the beginning, the devil's way is the untruth of Eigen-Maechtigkeit and Eigen-Sucht. The lie is that existence is possible out of self and that one can achieve a certainty not made through the Logos. Schlier writes:

Die Welt, die sich doch dem Wort schuldet, erhebt sich in angeblich ungeschuldeter Selbstherrlichkeit, im maechtigen Glanz eines Willens

³⁶Rudolf Bultmann, "Aletheia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964), I, 245.

³⁷Ibid., p. 246.

³⁸Dodd, Interpretation, p. 177.

³⁹Schlier, p. 247.

aus sich selbst und zu sich selbst, der ein Selbst-sein-koennen und Selbst-sein-muessen vortaeuscht.⁴⁰

Schlief shows that this Lie shows itself in works. While the form of sin is concretely adikia (or, in 1 John, anomia), the essence of sin is differently described. The kosmos loves its own. "Die Suende ist selbst-suechtige Bindung der Menschen an sich selbst als an das Zu-Eigene, und darin Bindung an die Unwahrheit und Unwirklichkeit."⁴¹ The essence of sin is slavery--not having the freedom to be, to do the truth. While truth frees, sin binds one to the life of Selbst-sein-wollens, expressing itself in unfaith or disobedience. In view of the truth, man refuses to abandon his tie to the Eigenmaechtige.⁴²

Fulfiller--Incompleteness

The kosmos appears totally inadequate and incomplete, incapable of living God's life on its own. It needs to have and does not have God's life, light, and truth. To the insufficiency of the kosmos comes Jesus, who is full of grace and truth (1:14). And from his fulness all may receive (1:16). In the actions of the One Sent from heaven the Scriptures are fulfilled (2:17; 12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24,36), for they have witnessed to him (5:39); Abraham looked for his day (8:56); and John the Baptizer's joy was fulfilled in him (3:29); already Moses wrote of God's Sent-One (1:45; 5:46). Jesus is the King of Israel (1:49), the fulfillment of Samaritan hopes (4:25); he is healing for the man who had

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 248.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 249.

⁴²Ibid.

waited thirty-eight years (5:8,9) and the voice of life to those who have been dead (5:25). When Jesus sets table, the crowds eat their fill (6:12), and he bestows bread which makes all other seem inadequate (6:33). For those who find their fulfillment in him there is no longer hunger and thirst (6:35); indeed, rivers of living water flow from those who believe in him (7:37-38). But for those who prefer their own (in-) completeness, there is no life (6:53). Jesus puts new light into blind eyes (9), invigorating wine into Jewish water pots (2:1-11), and fresh life into stinking tombs (11).

All this Jesus does because he is from above, from beyond the kosmos of incompleteness; kosmos-men in their present state of incomplete and unrealized existence can only be described as "from below" (8:23). They must find their life given to them from above (3:3), from that one alone who has seen heavenly life (3:13), who, lifted up, will draw all men to him (12:32). As on the Cross he unites the below with the above,⁴³ the believers from the kosmos too shall see the heavens opened for them (1:51) and they shall find freedom to live in God's reality (8:32). They shall be filled by the Holy Spirit (14-16) and, grafted to him who is God's fullness, they will truly bear fruit (15:2). What is required of kosmos-men? They must see beyond themselves; they must see their incompleteness and the fulfillment God intends for them. But the kosmos instead only wants to be self-complete.⁴⁴

⁴³Dodd, Interpretation, p. 439.

⁴⁴Barrett, p. 169, notes: "Judaism cannot simply move forward over a level plain to achieve its goal in the Kingdom of God. This goal cannot be reached either by learned discussion between its distinguished teachers (such as Jesus and Nicodemus), or by waiting for an apocalyptic denouement in which the kingdom shall suddenly appear."

Dependent Son--Independent Kosmos

Jesus derives his existence from the Father. Everywhere he is the antithesis to the self-proclaimed independence of the kosmos. As Jesus lives from the Father, the kosmos lives on its own.

Davey has examined in detail the "dependence of Christ." Whatever one may think of his ultimate conclusions or of the other problems which continually get his attention in this study, he does present a case for the dependence of Christ on God, in John. He notes Christ's dependence for power, for knowledge, for his mission and message, for being, destiny, nature, for authority and office, for love, for glory and honor, for disciples, for testimony, for the Spirit and other gifts, for guidance, his dependence illustrated by his obedience, seen in his relationships with God and men, and illustrated by his prayers and his titles.⁴⁵

Others have not failed to note this emphasis. Manson, for example, notes that John uses Father for God one hundred seven times. He states:

The whole system of his thought centres in the experience of God as Father. It is this experience which becomes the central and creative dogma of his Christianity. It is in the light of this experience that he sees what light is and what darkness is, what is truth and what lies, what love is and what hatred.⁴⁶

Manson insists that this Fatherhood of God is no abstract "belief." God-the-Father is a datum in this theology, not a conclusion. In sharp contrast to the filial consciousness stands the condition of the kosmos.⁴⁷

⁴⁵J. Ernest Davey, The Jesus of St. John (London: Lutterworth Press, c.1958), pp. 90-157.

⁴⁶T. W. Manson, "Introduction," On Paul and John (London: SCM Press, Ltd., c.1963), pp. 90-91.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 91.

Similarly, Barrett notes: "The ministry of Jesus has no significance apart from the will of the Father; it is not the independent achievement of humanity, but the fruit of submission."⁴⁸ Throughout John the words and works and authority of Jesus are not those of a learned, influential, or distinguished man, but are of the Father.⁴⁹

In poor contrast stands the kosmos in its proud, self-proclaimed independence. The kosmos is, in fact, slowly dying from lack of light and nurture, having cut itself off from the vine. Preferring to go its own way, the kosmos is stumbling in its blindness and dying in its sin.

Doxa

Ultimately, one might say, the confrontation between Jesus and the kosmos is a confrontation between God's glory and the honor and reputation man claims for himself. For the Old Testament kabōd was the brilliance of Yahweh's revelation and also the divine power whereof this brilliance was an expression. This majestic splendor, revealed in the Egyptian miracles, the giving of the Law, the tabernacle, and at other great moments in Israel's history, the prophets hoped to see exalted above all the earth and seen by all nations.⁵⁰ That doxa is now seen in Jesus Christ. This glory which Jesus had before the foundation of the kosmos (17:5) is being manifested to those who believe (1:14); it is the glory of the only-begotten of the Father. Already Isaiah saw it

⁴⁸Barrett, p. 201.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 262.

⁵⁰Hoskyns, p. 148.

(12:41) and now the disciples see it (2:11). One day the believers will see Jesus' glory in its fulness (17:24).

But kosmos-men, too, claim glory. They like to make their reputation with one another (5:44), and so do not seek the glory which is from God alone. Jesus does not receive glory from men (5:41), but seeks the glory of him who sent him (7:18). A basic conflict continues throughout Jesus' ministry. The kosmos wants to go after its own glory (8:50), but Jesus never seeks glory for himself with the kosmos. Even the "believers" often love honor among men above the glory of God (12:43). What the kosmos cannot understand is that only the Father can glorify.

Wherever doxazō occurs, either the Father is the subject or Jesus is the subject--being glorified by the Father or glorifying the Father. Corell notes that John's use of doxa points to the union between Father and Son and refers to the work of Jesus on earth, especially his death and resurrection, as at once the expression of the power and glory of the Father and the fulfillment of all eschatological expectations.⁵¹ Dodd sees John developing together the meanings of glory and honor. The crucifixion then both honors God by complete obedience and gains honor for Christ; but the honor which he gains is the glory with which the Father has invested him: that is, the revelation of the eternal majesty of God in his love for mankind.⁵² Odeberg notes that the Son is the Gift of God to the kosmos. There are no divine gifts apart from him, for the Father gave him all things. Even in the past all divine gifts came through

⁵¹Corell, p. 155.

⁵²Dodd, Interpretation, p. 208.

the Son and so all hearts are directed to the one perfect and true gift, the Son.⁵³

But precisely this is too much for the kosmos. Kosmos-men want someone to reflect their own doxa. They reject the incarnate Christ because they have too high an opinion of themselves. They deserve better. If Gnostic kosmos-men yearned for an eternal spark from the world beyond, kosmos-men in John clamor for something impressively powerful, wonder-working, and kosmos-pleasing. But neither will have anything to do with mere sarx. The supreme event of the cross is both the moment of Jesus' glory and the judgment on all the glory which the kosmos seeks. Lightfoot notes: "Since He is not the embodiment of those ideas of divinity which are commonly held among men and are natural to them, much will depend on men's ability to abandon in His presence their preconceived notions of greatness."⁵⁴ But kosmos-men do not care to be called into question. While they should seek approval or standing before God, they take honor from each other, in their need for standing.⁵⁵ If someone came offering his own credentials, they would welcome him because of his likeness to themselves.⁵⁶ They will not seek God's glory and renounce their own personal security.⁵⁷ Instead of rejoicing in God's glory and finding in it fulness of joy, the kosmos only sees its own honor at stake.

⁵³Hugo Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wisells Boktryckeri, [1929]), p. 130.

⁵⁴Lightfoot, p. 85.

⁵⁵Bultmann, Theology, II, 31.

⁵⁶Lightfoot, p. 147.

⁵⁷Dodd, Interpretation, p. 380. Voelkl, p. 424, describes a Gnostic thinking which instead of being an Entweltlichung is in fact a thorough-going

Division

The decision over the glory of God or the honor of the kosmos divides men. Whenever the kosmos is confronted with Jesus, the necessity of decision divides it (7:43; 9:16; 10:19). Barrett notes that already at John 3:16 the kosmos is split into components. As kosmos-men make the wrong decision, they turn salvation into judgment.⁵⁸ Schisma summarizes the result of Jesus' mission. Division is the inevitable effect of his word.⁵⁹

Dodd relates the "book of signs" to the "farewell discourses" as the story of rejection to the blessedness of those who receive Jesus. He notes that with the departure of Judas the sifting is finally complete.⁶⁰ Noting the ultimate significance of the separation of the church and the world, Barrett says: "it means, since the world's attitude to the church discloses its attitude to God, the judgment of the world."⁶¹ Furthermore, the church can expect the same twofold response in its mission to the world.⁶² Lee sees this division as the first and fundamental effect of Christ's work of salvation, and asserts that John emphasizes the community in which salvation takes place, the community separated

Verweltlichung, "eine Korrektur des Glaubens aus dem Geist der Welt und ihrer Herrschers, die letztlich auf der innerlich-weltlichen Grundhaltung beruht, in der sich der Mensch anmasst, das fuer ihn aergerniserreigende Handeln Gottes mit seinem 'Denken' zu 'verbessern.'" But Jesus demands simply faith, the giving up of all inner-worldly reserve over against the action of God.

⁵⁸Barrett, p. 135.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 273.

⁶⁰Dodd, Interpretation, p. 402.

⁶¹Barrett, p. 403.

⁶²Ibid., p. 401.

from the world and adhering to Christ.⁶³ The kosmos, then, is no self-existing, independent entity. When the kosmos comes under God's address in his Son, it goes into action--some men responding to the call to be God's men and some men all the more vigorously lining themselves on the side of existence without God.

Judgment

For many kosmos-men the ministry of Jesus ends in judgment. The Hebrews thought of judgment as an act of God's sovereignty, rewarding and punishing. The Greeks stressed separation, discrimination. Dodd finds a Greek connection to judgment in the usage of light, the medium of discrimination. While the light has a positive purpose, its shining brings into view the ultimate distinction between truth and falsehood. Hence judgment results. In the presence of revelation, the powers of evil⁶⁴ declare themselves by their rejection of the light.⁶⁵ In John 9-10, Dodd finds the dominant theme not the coming of light as such, but its effect in judgment.⁶⁶

From a different point of view, Barrett notes that the Son of Man forms the connecting link between the earthly and heavenly spheres: "his earthly existence is the place where heavenly things become visible and

⁶³Lee, p. 164. In so easily speaking of the separation of church and world, Lee and Barrett seem to neglect the theological use of kosmos in John. On the other hand, this separation idea is undoubtedly present in John--though perhaps not in the terms "church and world."

⁶⁴Occasionally non-Johannine expressions (and thoughts?) creep into Dodd's presentation of Johannine theology.

⁶⁵Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 208-210.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 358.

also the place where heavenly things are rejected by mankind."⁶⁷ Barrett thinks the "already judged" of John 3:18 means that the absence of faith calls down condemnation upon itself or is itself an aspect of condemnation. Unbelief sentences itself.⁶⁸

A difficult problem arises with John 9:39: "for krima I came into the world." This appears to contradict John 3:17, where God sends his Son not to judge the world. Westcott notes that Jesus did not come to execute krisis, but that krima may issue from his presence. Krima is not found again in John.⁶⁹ Brown writes:

Nevertheless, the statement that Jesus did not come to condemn does not exclude the very real judgment that Jesus provokes. . . . The idea in John, then, seems to be that during his ministry Jesus is no apocalyptic judge like the one expected at the end of time; yet his presence does cause men to judge themselves.⁷⁰

Corell summarizes the use of krisis, krima, and krinein in John.

(1) Judgment is opposed to salvation (3:17; 12:47). (2) Christ is the judge (5:22,27,30; 8:16,26). (3) The crucial test in judgment is faith (3:18; 5:24; 12:48). (4) Judgment is in the present (3:19; 9:39; 12:31; 16:11). (5) There is at the same time a final judgment (5:29; 12:48; 1 John 4:17). Krisis always means katakrisis--condemnation. Judgment is eschatological.⁷¹ Judgment in John "is becoming pronounced already now de facto, and will one day at the Second Coming of Jesus be pronounced

⁶⁷Barrett, p. 177.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 181.

⁶⁹Brooke Foss Westcott, The Fourth Gospel According to St. John (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), II, 44.

⁷⁰Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to St. John (i-xii) in The Anchor Bible, Volume 29 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. c.1966), p. 345.

⁷¹Corell, pp. 162-164.

de jure."⁷²

Although the term judgment is not used, the best summary of this concept in John may be in John 3:34-36 and the total context: The Father loves the Son, the Son speaks his words, and the Spirit rests on him. The Father loves the kosmos, the kosmos loves its own deeds, and God's wrath rests upon it.

⁷²Ibid., pp. 164-165.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Following an examination of the usage and understanding of kosmos in the Umwelt of John, including the New Testament,¹ an intensive study was made of the usage of kosmos in John.

Kosmos is at the center of theological thinking in John. A syntactical study yielded the following conclusions: kosmos generally means men; the kosmos on its own cannot accomplish anything acceptable to God; the kosmos was originally acted upon by God and is still the object of his attention; in his kosmos God works out the salvation of the kosmos; in God's call through Jesus the kosmos gets the chance to live from God.

Fundamentally, John uses kosmos to signal men who are God's creatures, who must know their relation to God but do not, who live in a situation without God, who act as if they were autonomous and able to make their own life for themselves, who accordingly are lost. All these men whom God created through the Logos God addresses in his Son, offering them authentic life from God. Confronted with the emptiness, incompleteness, and inadequacy of their life apart from God, kosmos-men go into action against God's Sent-One. Kosmos comes to signal not just all men who have been living out of their own resources, then, but men responding negatively to God's address. Some kosmos-men who see God's love hate their present existence from their own resources and accept a life lived from God. They are called from their kosmos-situation and cease to be

¹For a summary of chapter two, kosmos in the Umwelt of John, see supra, pp. 60-64.

kosmos. The kosmos answers such men with hate. Yet these very believers continue to live in the kosmos, and Jesus sends them into the kosmos just as the Father sent him into the kosmos. While occasionally John may use kosmos without this concept of kosmos-men in mind, the predominance of the Incarnation makes it difficult for any usage of kosmos not to take on theological significance.

Several questions arise in connection with John's usage of kosmos. The extent of creation theology in John is debatable, but it is clear that God is not derived from the kosmos. Instead, he stands over the kosmos as its Creator, calling it into question. The kosmos is qualified as creation and God wants men to understand themselves as his creatures. Cosmology is not John's concern, but what the kosmos has become, what God in Jesus is doing about it, and how the kosmos will respond to God's address. In the Incarnation God puts his finger on man, not cosmology. John's dualism is a dualism of terminology and approach. John wants to accent the difference between God and the kosmos; yet God in his radical otherness keeps the kosmos as his own, for he created it. The dualism between God and the kosmos and within the kosmos is never metaphysical nor material, but is held controlled by the same Creator God. John uses kosmos houtos to heighten the utterly narrow-minded oneness of the creature who has forgotten who he is and sought the meaning of his life, religion, and existence in terms of himself. It is not now possible to determine the origin of the expression archon tou kosmou, but the qualification tou kosmou indicates its place in Johannine theology: all that the kosmos is falls under judgment as it rejects God's address in Jesus. God's love for the kosmos is indisputable. Through the

believers God continues his address to the world; the mission of the believers is precisely to be God's call to the kosmos. Hardly, then, can the Johannine ethic be world-fleeing, for agape is its essence, as it is informed by God's mission in Jesus.

John may have chosen the common word kosmos as an opening for his message. With kosmos John affirms the universality of God's love and address, God's creation of and continued love for his world, the realization now of light and life from God, a continued mission in the world and an in-the-world ethic, and God's call to men to live their lives from God in the world. With kosmos John denies that the world is a self-contained whole in harmonious relation with God, that the true realities and real calling of men are in a world beyond this visible world, that the world is intrinsically evil and should be escaped, that cosmology is the solution to man's situation, that a nation can automatically lay claim to God by tying him to the "land." The most important thing John says about the kosmos is that God loves it and enters it in Jesus Christ. The kosmos will never be the same.

John perceptively pictures the real problem of the kosmos by showing kosmos-men (using the Jews especially as a paradigm) in conversation and action. Kosmos-men demand guarantees before they believe, full explanations to religious questions, and an appealing prophet; they claim to know the facts for judging their own situation; they have a vested interest in religion; they are unaware of their own condition over against God. Nor does such kosmos-thinking leave the believers untouched; they continue to struggle in the kosmos with the kosmos in them. Limited to its own terms and insisting on them, the kosmos cannot fail to misunderstand

God's address in Jesus. Whenever the Revealer speaks, the kosmos misses the point. Nor can the kosmos simply contain itself in the presence of Jesus. If Jesus is truly God's Sent-One and his challenging and upsetting questions are authentic Word of God, what religion is it that the kosmos has been practicing? Easier than answering that question is going into action against Jesus. But throughout John are men responding in faith to Jesus in ways which highlight the ineptness of the kosmos-response. Such men answer God's address and find their life coming from God. They are able to rejoice in God's action for them and find in Jesus what their life in the world was meant to be. They live the life of believing--seeing God once again as Creator and themselves as creatures and children, as they see God's creative action in Jesus and Jesus' Sonship. In contrast to the kosmos, the believers know who God is and what he is doing in the world, who Jesus is and that he derives his life from God. Everything the kosmos needs to become the believers can be as they enter on a life of active service in the world. They live out of the fulness of their relation to the Father in and through Jesus and witness to the glory they have seen beyond the cross.

The Incarnation focuses the kosmos over against God, examines and addresses it, defines it by antithesis, shows its fundamentally wrong situation, completes it, saves it, and judges it. As God uniquely addresses the kosmos through the Logos, the kosmos is called into question by that Logos through whom God brought the kosmos into existence and in whom he has always spoken and acted toward the kosmos. The question between Jesus and the kosmos is: Is the kosmos-existence-from-Nothing existence at all? In Jesus God lets the life and light given in creation

once again break into the kosmos, which has turned from God to an existence in death. Into the self-appropriated darkness of the kosmos-situation God in Jesus comes and gives the kosmos its day once again by shining with a light which cannot be overcome. The kosmos which has tried to give the Lie to God's truth, God in the death and resurrection of Jesus recalls to his own reality. Not allowing the kosmos its pretence of self-power and self-existence, God comes in Jesus to give fullness for all; in the cross he brings man below the fulness from above. In his obedient Son God wants to let the kosmos see again what it is to live from God, for the kosmos in its self-proclaimed independence is stumbling in blindness and dying in sin. Ultimately, God in Jesus confronts the kosmos with a choice between God's glory and the honor and reputation men claim for themselves. Thus division results: some rejoice in God's glory and find in it fulness of joy; others see only the honor of the kosmos at stake. For those who must reject God's address, the ministry of Jesus turns to judgment.

The difficulty and genius of Johannine usage is that kosmos is used both for "world" and for "world of men without and against God." The preeminence of the Incarnation will not let "world" have merely non-theological significance. It is always a world standing under God's love and his address in Jesus. Whatever pejorative sense attaches to kosmos, then, is directly related to men as they constitute themselves without their Creator God and, ultimately, men as they answer with hostility and rejection the question God addresses to them in Jesus.

It is doubtful whether this is conveyed by the English term "world." Indeed, this term fails adequately to represent Johannine

theology on several counts. The focus of John's usage of kosmos is man and man is the focus of the kosmos-problem. Supremely the kosmos is the object of God's love, for the kosmos means all the men who should be acknowledging God as Creator. And the whole world itself, as the scene of man's situation, is laid claim to by God, the Creator. But "Puritan" and other such ethics have seldom been able to affirm precisely the world, and there is reason for that failure. Such an ethic fails to locate the source of distorted creation in every man; it deprecates God's creation by its rigorous purge of all "out there" (outside the believer's self-assured inner self) in its hunt for the malady; and, finally, it must fail to see God's love addressed to men and to the situation of men--all the men of the world who are the world.

Yet it is clear in John that the believers (the Church) live in and among kosmos men, that they are sent among kosmos-men and into the kosmos as envoys of God's love. The "world" as such never comes under condemnation. Indeed, it is possible only for the believer once again to affirm the world as creation, for hearing and answering God's question he has stepped back from the world and seen it properly for the first time. Affirming the world as God's creation and precisely the sphere of God's activity, he then gets busy with the problem of the kosmos. He sets about to bring God's love (or be an agent of God's love) into the situation of man turned in on himself and shutting his ears to God's address, man living in open disacknowledgment of his Creator. In the Johannine dramatic cycle God in Jesus affirms his creation and addresses in love the kosmos, through his Son. Some men, called believers, answer the call from the situation of being kosmos. Now knowing for the first time what their

existence in the world is all about, they are able to affirm in freedom this existence in the world, as Jesus did, and let God's love be addressed through themselves to other men still in the kosmos-situation. The world is reclaimed as God's world, and man is called in that world to live responsibly and address his fellowmen with God's love in that world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John. London: SPCK, 1965.
- , editor. The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Bauer, Walter. Johannes. Vol. II: Die Evangelien II in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912.
- Baum, Gregory. Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic. Revised edition. Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, c.1965.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. Edited by A. H. McNeile. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Bietsch, Hans. Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spaet-judentum. Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1951.
- Bigg, Charles. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1886.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. 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.
- Boecker, Otto. Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nach-biblischen Judentums. Guetersloh: Guetersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, c.1965.
- Bornkamm, Guenther. "Christus und die Welt in der urchristlichen Bot-schaft," Das Ende des Gesetzes. Vol. I of Gesammelte Aufsaezte. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963.
- Bratsiotis, P. I. "Das Menschenverstaendnis des Neuen Testaments," Man in God's Design according to the New Testament. Newcastle Upon Tyne 3: Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, 1953.
- Brooke, A. E. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1964.
- Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John (i-xii). Vol. XXIX of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Com-pany, Inc., c.1966.
- , "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, c.1957.

Buechsel, Friedrich. Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus.
Guetersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1928.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Aletheia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.
I. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German by Geoffrey
W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,
c.1964. Pp. 238-247.

-----". "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandaeischen und mani-
chaeischen Quellen fuer das Verstaendnis des Johannesevangelium,"
Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 24 (1925),
100-146.

-----". "Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," Glauben und Ver-
stehen: Gesammelte Aufsaezte. I. Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr,
1954. Pp. 134-152.

-----". Das Evangelium des Johannes. Fourteenth edition. Goettingen:
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

-----". Theology of the New Testament. Vol. II. Translated from the
German by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955.

-----". "Das Verstaendnis von Welt und Mensch im Neuen Testament und
im Griechentum," Glauben und Verstehen: Gesammelte Aufsaezte. II.
Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952. Pp. 59-78.

Chalmers, R. C. "Some Notes on the Biblical Doctrine of the World,"
Canadian Journal of Theology, 7 (1961), 222-231.

Charles, R. H., editor. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old
Testament. Vol. I: Apocrypha. Vol. II: Pseudepigrapha. Oxford:
The Clarendon Press, 1913.

Corell, Alf. Consummation est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of
St. John. Translated from the Swedish by The Order of the Holy
Paraclete. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

Cremer, Hermann. Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der Neutestament-
lichen Graezitaet. Zehnte, voellig durchgearbeitete und vielfach
veraenderte Auflage herausgegeben von Julius Koegel. Gotha: Verlag
und Druck der Friedrich Andreas Perthes A.G., c.1915.

Cross, Frank Moore. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical
Studies. Revised edition. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and
Company, Inc., c.1961.

Dalman, Gustav. The Words of Jesus. Considered in the Light of Post-
Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language. Translated from
the German edition of 1898 by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark,
1902.

- Davey, J. Ernest. The Jesus of St. John. Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel. London: Lutterworth Press, c.1958.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Light From the Ancient East. New and completely revised edition with eighty-five illustrations from the latest German edition. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. New York: Harper and Brothers, [1927].
- Dodd, C.H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954.
- , The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Eicholz, Georg. Die Verkuendigung der Kirche an die Welt: Versuch einer Exegese des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium. Heft 65 of Theologische Existenz Heute. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1939.
- Feine, Paul. Theologie des Neuen Testaments. 8. durchgesehenen Auflage. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1953.
- Galloway, Alan D. The Cosmic Christ. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1951.
- Grant, R. M. Gnosticism: A Sourcebook of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period. New York: Harper and Brothers, c.1961.
- , Gnosticism and Early Christianity. Harper and Row, Publishers, c.1966.
- Harnack, Adolf. History of Dogma. Seven volumes bound as four. Translated from the third German edition by Neil Buchanan. New York: Dover Publications, inc., 1961.
- Harris, J. Rendel. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. Cambridge: University Press, 1909.
- Hartingsveld, L. Van. Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Rudolf Bultmann. Assen, Niederlande: Van Gorcum & Comp, N.V., 1962.
- Hatch, Edwin. The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- , and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck--U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Henderson, William Griffin. "The Ethical Idea of the World in John's Gospel." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1944.
- Hendriksen, William. New Testament Commentary. Exposition of the Gospel According to John. Vol. I. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953.

- Holtzmann, H. J. Das Evangelium des Johannes. Vierter Band of Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893.
- , Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie. Zweiter Band. Zweite neu bearbeitete Auflage herausgegeben von D. A. Juelicher und W. Bauer. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947.
- Howard, Wilbert Francis. The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation. Third edition. London: The Epworth Press, 1945.
- Humphries, A. Lewis. "A Note on eis ta idia (John 1:11)," The Expository Times, 53 (August 1942), 356.
- Huppenbauer, Hans Walter. Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten. Zuerich: Zwingli Verlag, c.1959.
- Jervell, Jacob. "Er kam in sein Eigentum," Studia Theologica, 10 (1956), 14-27.
- Johnston, Georg. "Oikoumene and Kosmos in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 10 (April 1964), 352-360.
- Jonas, Hans. Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist. Erster Teil. 3. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- , The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity. Second edition, revised. Boston: Beacon Press, c.1963.
- Jowett, John Henry. "Saving the World," Interpretation, 5 (January 1951), 76-79.
- Kuemmell, Werner Georg. Man in the New Testament. Revised and enlarged edition. Translated from the German by John J. Vincent. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1963.
- Langkammer, P. Hugolinus. "Zur Herkunft des Logos-titels im Johannesprolog," Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge, 9 (1965), 91-94.
- Lee, Edwin Kenneth. The Religious Thought of St. John. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Reprint of 1940 new (ninth) edition. Revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

- Lightfoot, R. H. St. John's Gospel. Edited by C. F. Evans. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Loewe, Richard. Kosmos und Aion. Ein Beitrag zur heilsgeschichtlichen Dialektik des urchristlichen Weltverstaendnisses. Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1935.
- Lowrie, Walter. The Doctrine of Saint John. An Essay in Biblical Theology. London: Longmans, Greek, & Co., c.1899.
- Manson, T. W. "Introduction," On Paul and John. London: SCM Press, Ltd., c.1963. Pp. 85-103.
- Meinertz, Max. Theologie des Neuen Testament. Zweiter Band. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Limited, 1952.
- Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Fourth edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Mussner, Franz. ZOE. Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im Vierten Evangelium. Muenchen: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952.
- Nock, A. D. and A. J. Festugiere. Corpus Hermeticum. Paris: Societa D-Edition Les Belles Lettres, 1945-1954. Four volumes.
- North, C. R. "World, the," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. R--Z. New York: Abingdon Press, c.1962. Pp. 873-878.
- Odeberg, Hugo. The Fourth Gospel. Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckerei, [1929].
- Percy, Ernest. Untersuchungen ueber den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei, 1939.
- Philo. De Aeternitate Mundi. Translated from the Greek by F. H. Colson. Vol. IX of The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- , De Opificio Mundi. Translated from the Greek by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Vol. I of The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Pollard, T. Evan. "Cosmology and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel," Vigiliae Christianae, 12 (1958), 147-153.

- Rad, Gerhard Von. Old Testament Theology. Vol. II The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions. Translated from the German by D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, c.1965.
- Rahlf's, Alfred, editor. Septuaginta. Two volumes. Seventh edition. Stuttgart: Wuertembergische Bibelanstalt, c.1935. Hergestellt, 1962.
- Redding, George Walker. "Kosmos in John's Gospel and Epistles." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1938.
- Sasse, Herman. "Aion," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. I. Translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1965. Pp. 197-209.
- "Kosmos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. III. Translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1965. Pp. 868-896.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "Welt und Mensch nach dem Johannesevangelium," Besinnung auf das Neue Testament. II. Freiburg: Herder, c.1964. Pp. 242-253.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. Das Johannesevangelium. Erster Teil. Freiburg: Herder, c.1965.
- Die Johannesbriefe. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953.
- The Moral Teaching of the New Testament. Translated from the German by J. Hollard-Smith and W. J. O'Hara. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.
- Schubert, Kurt. The Dead Sea Community. Its Origin and Teachings. Translated from the German by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, c.1959.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Jesus Christus, Herr ueber Kirche und Welt," Libertas Christiana. Friedrich Delekat zum 65. Geburtstag. Im Gemeinschaft mit E. Wolf besorg von W. Matthias. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957. Pp. 175-187.
- Scott, E. F. The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920.
- Scott, Walter. Hermetica. The ancient Greek and Latin writings which contain religious or philosophical teachings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus. Edition with English translation and notes. Four volumes. Completed by A. S. Ferguson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924-1936.

- Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Translated from the fifth German edition by John Marsh. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1963.
- Stewart, Roy A. Rabbinic Theology: An Introductory Study. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, c.1961.
- Strachan, R. H. The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment. Third edition. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1955.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Zweiter Band. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924.
- Voelkl, Richard. Christ und Welt Nach dem Neuen Testament. Wuerzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1961.
- Wendland, Heinz-Dietrich. "Die Weltherrschaft Christi und die zwei Reiche," Kosmos und Ekklesia. Festschrift fuer Wilhelm Staehlin. Edited by Heinz-Dietrich Wendland. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1953.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Gospel According to St. John. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. Das Evangelium nach Johannes. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, c.1948.