

**THE APPLICABILITY OF WEBER'S CONCEPT OF MYSTIC VIRTUOSI IN THE  
THIRD PHASE OF THE ROUTINIZATION OF CHARISMA IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.**

Submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the  
degree of Master of Theology  
in the department of Theological studies  
University of Natal.

By:  
Warren John Oxford.

Pietermaritzburg  
Date: 25 November 1995

## ABSTRACT.

John's Gospel has been the focus of attention of many scholars down through the ages. This thesis picks up this interest in the Fourth Gospel and tries to look at it from a new perspective. The sociology of Weber has also been used by many scholars not least of whom are biblical scholars. His work on the routinization of charisma and, in particular, his work on religious virtuosi is used in this thesis.

This thesis asks whether these models can be applied to the Fourth Gospel. The title, "the applicability of Max Weber's concept of mystic virtuosi in the third phase of the routinization of charisma in the Fourth Gospel" invites the question, "can one use Weber, in particular, his model of religious virtuosi in John's Gospel." The conclusion is an unequivocal, "yes."

The thesis has three main sections:

1) An investigation into the use of sociology as a tool for the interpretation of the New Testament. In this section Max Weber's theory is investigated and discussed. Additions are made from the work of Berger and Luckmann and comparisons are made with Kehelm Burrige and John Gager. At the end of this section a model is developed for use in the final chapter of the thesis.

2) The history of John's Gospel. This section is in turn divided into two sections.

A) The first deals with the background to the Gospel. The various influences on the Gospel as well as the question of authorship are briefly debated and evaluated. A detailed investigation into the unity and composition of the Gospel follows. Although these matters are far from certain, it appears that the Gospel is the work of a single author, but was written over a lengthy period of time. In this section I debate with Thomas Brodie, in particular his contention that John used the synoptics as literary sources for his Gospel. I do not think that this is possible.

B) The second section focuses on the aspects of the community behind the Gospel. This is not argued out, but only a summary of the evidence is presented. It seems that clearly that there was a strong sectarian character to the community behind the Gospel, and this greatly influenced the author.

3) Mystic virtuosi and the Fourth Gospel. This is the crux of the thesis and draws heavily on the preceding sections. This section opens by examining the very different presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, and uses this as a spring board into the application of the model developed in chap. 2. Key words are identified as applicable to certain characteristics of the model. The greater part of the chapter focuses on particular texts and using the model we are led into a deeper and new understanding of the Gospel. The importance of abiding in God, both for Jesus and the community, is highlighted. This leads to a unity with the divine, expressed particularly in chap. 17 and in chap. 20.

The conclusion draws all these sections together and then answers the question posed at the beginning of the thesis. Can one apply Weber's theories, especially his theory of religious virtuosi, to the Fourth Gospel? This thesis concludes that these theories and the models that are dependant on them can be valuably applied to the Fourth Gospel. This then leads into a deeper understanding of the Gospel.

The financial assistance of the Centre for Science Development (HSRC, South Africa) towards this research is hereby acknowledge. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the Centre for Science Development.



As required, I here by state that the whole thesis, unless specifically indicated to the contrary in the text, is my own original work.

.....

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION. ....	1
2. SOCIOLOGY AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. ....	3
2.1 Introduction. ....	3
2.2 Sociology and the New Testament. ....	3
2.2.1 Models. ....	5
2.3 Weber. ....	7
2.3.1 Weber on Authority. ....	8
2.3.1.1 The Three “Pure Types” of Authority. ....	10
2.3.1.2 Weber on Charismatic Authority. ....	10
2.3.2 The Routinization of Charisma. ....	21
2.3.2.1 The rise of a charismatic community. ....	22
2.3.2.2 The problem of succession. ....	23
2.3.2.3 Status honour and the legitimation of Authority. ....	27
2.3.3 Virtuosi. ....	28
2.3.3.1 Ascetic virtuosi. ....	28
2.3.3.2 Mystic virtuosi. ....	30
2.3.4. Conclusion. ....	34
2.4 The Sociology of Knowledge. ....	35
2.4.1 Critiques. ....	40
2.5 Model. ....	43
2.5.1 A model based on Weber. ....	43
2.5.2 The model for this paper. ....	44
2.6 Conclusion. ....	46
3. THE HISTORY OF JOHN’S GOSPEL. ....	47
3.1 Introduction. ....	47
3.2 Background to John’s Gospel. ....	47
3.2.1 Influences on the Fourth Gospel. ....	48

3.2.2 Authorship and date. ....	54
3.2.3 Unity and composition of the Gospel of John. ....	55
3.2.3.1 Explanations. ....	57
3.2.3.2 Relation to the synoptics. ....	61
3.3 Community in John's Gospel. ....	66
3.3.1 Sectarianism. ....	70
3.3.2 Various phases. ....	72
3.3.3 Evidence for the existence of the Johannine Community. ....	73
3.4 Conclusion. ....	78
 4. MYSTIC VIRTUOSI AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. ....	79
4.1 Introduction. ....	79
4.2 The presentation of Jesus. ....	80
4.3 Virtuoso: major characteristics. ....	85
4.3.1 A general overview of the Gospel. ....	87
4.3.1.1 A short summary. ....	96
4.3.2 Exegesis of certain sections. ....	96
4.3.2.1 John 1:29-51. ....	96
4.3.2.2 John 3:1-21 (The account of Nicodemus). ....	100
4.3.2.3 John 6:1-71 (The Bread of Life). ....	104
4.3.2.4 John 10:1-21 (The shepherd and the sheep). ....	107
4.3.2.5 John 13-17 (The Farewell discourse). ....	109
4.3.2.6 John 20. ....	118
4.4. Conclusion. ....	121
 5. CONCLUSION. ....	123
5.1. Summing up the discussion. ....	123
5.2. The proposal and result. ....	126
 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY. ....	128
6.1 Books: ....	128

6.2 Journals: ..... 133

7. APPENDIX ..... 137

7.1. Translation of John’s Gospel. .... 137

# 1. INTRODUCTION.

John's Gospel has always been a favourite of many Christians and has also been a favourite of mine. Having spent a lengthy period studying this Gospel in my theological education, I have grown to love it and have developed a desire to understand it as completely as I can. In this regard I decided to investigate the work of Weber and see if his work could be applied to this Gospel. In this regard I intend to test the applicability of Weber's concept of mystic virtuosi in the third phase of the Routinization of Charisma to the Gospel of John.

It is the proposal of this thesis that the author of the Fourth Gospel, in writing the Gospel, reflects a world which can be characterized by Weber's model of mystic virtuosi. This is the proposal which I wish to investigate using the theory of Max Weber. I will use Weber's model of Charisma and his concept of the 'virtuoso', both ascetic and mystic/contemplative. I want to show that John wrote his gospel in such away as to leave his community with teachings, techniques and mechanisms that they, the community, could use to find 'salvation' as Weber calls it, or to maintain the Charisma which Jesus originally embodied.

I will first discuss the applicability of the use of sociology as a tool for investigating the New Testament. I want to explain the model of Weber including in it his concept of the 'virtuosi.' This needs to be done so that I may have a model with which to work. This model will be developed by the additional use of other scholars such as Burridge, Gager, Berger and Luckmann. The world in which we live is a received world, and we very seldom question this world, and if we do question it, we do not question it seriously. This is because we believe it to be real. As time passes the view of the world that we have received changes. Sometimes we actively change it, and on other occasions we are changed by it. It is for this reason that a detailed study into the sociology of the New Testament will equip us to challenge the world which we have received as normative. It will equip us to put forward new and empowering concepts of the work of God, instead of the old and ineffective acceptance of things as they are.

Once this is completed, I will examine the Gospel of John. I begin by looking at the various influences on the Fourth Gospel, as well as a brief look at the authorship of the Gospel. This is

followed by an examination of the unity and composition of the Gospel. I want to look at whether the gospel is the work of a single author or the work of various redactors who developed the work of the author before them. At this point I debate with Thomas Brodie briefly. Once this is done, I will investigate the community behind the gospel, which is reflected in the gospel itself. This needs to be done to show how the author presented the life of Jesus to the community. The nature of this community would have influenced this presentation. Only the evidence for the existence of a community is presented in a summation, and then discussed.

In the main section of the thesis, I will bring together the model and the Gospel. I begin by looking at John's presentation of Jesus, and from this conclude that many characteristics of the model discussed above in chap. 2 are present in this Gospel. Various words are identified, which are then explored to show more clearly the benefit of using this model. I will then proceed to investigate individual sections to show this in more detail. The aim is to discover if John's Gospel reflects the characteristics of a mystic virtuoso, as they are set out by Weber. If this is the case then we can conclude that the author's writing reflects a world view which can be characterized by Weber's model, and the presentation of Jesus would have been perceived by the community in a similar light. ✓

## **2. SOCIOLOGY AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

### **2.1 Introduction.**

Over many years the Bible has formed, for those people who hold to the Christian faith, the yardstick and guideline as to what God's will might be in various and diverse situations. This has undeniably lead to differences of opinion about how the Bible should be interpreted or understood. Is it merely a document setting forth God's Word to us? Is it a purely historical document? Along with these diverse understandings of the Bible, different methods of "studying" it have developed. There have been the history-of-religions school, literary readings, historical critical readings, and sociological readings. It is this last method of reading (interpreting) the Bible that is the focus of this section of the thesis.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: There is a lengthy introduction to the use of sociology in the New Testament. After a short discussion the chapter continues to an in-depth discussion on Weber's concept of authority, and how it is shaped by Holmberg. It also looks at the process of the 'routinization of charisma' and a few critiques are offered and suggestions made which have particular reference to the New Testament. It finally looks at the concept of religious virtuosi and how this fits into the process of routinization. Before going on to develop a model, I investigate the work of Berger and Luckmann, and how their 'sociology of knowledge' can help us. Included in this section are a few brief critiques of this method of investigation. From there the chapter investigates the possibility of developing a model for the study of the New Testament using Weber's theories. A conclusion is then drawn up which brings together these strands and offers a way forward before we investigate the background to the Fourth Gospel.

### **2.2 Sociology and the New Testament.**

One of the numerous methods of delving into the Bible is to use the tools and methods developed by scholars of sociology. This is an important method of biblical scholarship, and can, and often

does, lead to different and new understandings of what is contained in the Bible, both New and Old Testaments.

There are useful definitions of sociology and these give us an insight into how sociology can be appreciated in the New Testament. Scroggs gives a useful, if narrow, definition of sociology.

Sociology thus depends upon data but works with them in ways that historiography does not. Sociology is comparative, since it will most often come to data with a model of dynamics taken from analyses of other groups and other data. It thus also tends to be synchronic rather than diachronic (1983:341).

For Tidball, sociological tools, when applied to the New Testament, keep

flesh and blood human beings at the forefront of the stage in all the complexity of their social relationships and turmoil of their social situations. So it makes it more difficult either to idealise what we read of the early disciples or to over-theorise about them. And we stand to gain fresh insights into the understanding of the New Testament (1983:12).

Elliott has stressed the importance of sociological inquiry into the New Testament. He places great value on the marriage between sociology and exegesis. This "marriage" gives rise to new and diverse understandings and interpretations of the New Testament. Even though the use of social science methods and models may still be at a very youthful stage of its development, it has displayed remarkable results. Elliott gives the following accolade:

It has stretched our personal and scientific horizons, alerted us to the limitations of our received exegetical wisdom, sharpened our perception and deepened our understanding of early Christian texts as media of social interaction. It has developed our awareness of behavioural patterns, pivotal values, social structures, cultural scripts, and social processes of the biblical world, the world within which and from which our sacred traditions draw their vitality and meaning. Such a contribution, notwithstanding, there is still much self-critical and self-corrective work yet to be done. (1986:2).



Having reviewed the opinion of these few scholars on the value of sociology applied to the Bible, and in particular, the New Testament, discussing the concept of models, their development and use is important, for this thesis<sup>1</sup>. The use of sociology has opened new doors into the study of the Bible.

### 2.2.1 Models.

Putting aside the great value of the sociological methods of reading the New Testament, there is an important need to clarify our terminology. Too often in social scientific interpretation of the New Testament, scholars have looked past each other because of a failure to clarify their tools, models, and methods. As the basis of this section is to formulate a model on Weber's theory of charisma, I need to clarify what is meant by a model. A model is similar to a metaphor, its purpose is to compare properties that may be similar, with the aim of advancing further imaginative understanding from what is well known to that which is less well known. However, a model is unlike a metaphor, in that it is more complex and comprehensive (Elliott 1986:4). A further, possibly more helpful definition could be given as follows: a model is a symbolic illustration of selected aspects of the behaviour of an intricate system for particular purposes. It is an abstract, simplified representation of some real world object, event, or interaction constructed for the purposes of understanding, control, or prediction. It has to be selective in order to focus on the particular (1986:4).

Models are thus conceptual vehicles for articulating, applying, testing, and possibly reconstructing theories used in the analysis and interpretation of specific social data. The difference between a model and an analogy or metaphor lies in the fact that the model is *consciously structured* and *systematically arranged* in order to serve as a *speculative instrument* for the purposes of organising, profiling, and interpreting a complex welter of detail (1986:5).

---

1. The entire thesis will hinge on a model that I will draw out from Weber, and others, in order to study the Gospel of John.

Because to some extent, all biblical interpretations are cross-cultural interpretations<sup>2</sup>, cross-cultural models will aid us in our interpretations. These cross-cultural models will assist us to determine our own respective cultural positions, and subsequently enable us to highlight the various points of comparison. Essentially we are looking for a model that will account explicitly for the interpreter as well as the social world being interpreted (Malina 1983:12).

According to Malina, any understanding and interpretation of a text is ultimately rooted in a social world, in a set of models setting out how the world works. And because of this, all interpretation requires models and in the end rests on models (1983:14). The depth of the relationship between texts and models does not end here. There is also a need for a relationship with history, as the texts we are studying are separated from us not only by culture but also by time. In order to interpret texts from the past, the interpreter has to "imagine" how the meanings functioned then.

Models of such operations and reactions are, at the bottom, models of society, social science models. The point to be underscored is that if interpretation of written language of any sort takes place, some domain of reference will be used by the reader. This domain of reference will be rooted in some model of society and of social interaction (1983:16).

One last thing about models: all people use them, in this they have no choice. All people use them in order to understand and categorise their own lives and the lives of others. The choice lies in whether they do this consciously or unconsciously. For it is far better to approach a text or a situation consciously aware of one's pre-understanding (i.e. one's pre-conceived models), than to approach a situation or text unaware of one's pre-conceived ideas and understandings. Models help make the interpreter aware of their own social location, and their own implicit presuppositions. As has already been mentioned, a model must make allowances for the pre-conceived ideas of the interpreter. All interpreters come to the text or the society with ideas about what they will find in it. If these ideas are known, then it fares well for the interpreter. If these ideas are unknown, then the interpreter will not know what comes from the text and what comes from their own mind. Models from the social sciences offer the interpretation of the New Testament tools

---

2. By this I mean that to some extent all the biblical texts come from a culture different from our own. Not only is the culture different, but there is also a great difference in time. All these elements need to be borne in mind when choosing a model with which to interpret the New Testament.

that are adequately sophisticated for determining and setting out the social systems that inhabit the world behind the texts that we read. No longer are guesses made at this world, often on the basis of ethnocentrism, but now the social world can be systematically investigated with tools that are open to all, and the results can be tested and verified<sup>3</sup>.

Concluding our discussion of social scientific tools, we need to understand fully how they work, and the implications of using these particular tools. Each set of tools has its own theoretical presuppositions and implications, and we need to be aware of these, and know if they can be applied to the data at hand (Scroggs 1983:339). These suggestions being met, the outcome should be a positive increased awareness of the Bible. However, in order to formulate our models better, we need to be aware that there are different types of social analyses. Not all of these types work with models, but models form an important element in their theory.

## 2.3 Weber.

Hill speaks of the central position of religion in Weber's<sup>4</sup> work, in his analysis of society. Alongside this, throughout Weber's work, there is an openly visible trace of irony, paradox, and a conception of the open-ended nature of history. Hill calls this, Weber's agnostic approach, and it colours all of his work (1973:260).

Hill describes Weber as revolting against the theory of positivism that was sweeping Europe at that time.

Weber's 'revolt against positivism' took the form of an emphasis on the *subjective* meaning for the participants of activities which could not be given an explanation purely in terms of empirical science (1973:261).

---

3. This may sound over confident, or over optimistic. But essentially models do provide a constant framework against which to compare results.

4. Nielsen encourages the use of Weber and Troeltsch, but is critical of previous scholars use of them. "When the horizons of earlier sociologists who did employ a civilizational level of analysis are used, they appear in truncated forms and are located within narrowly social structural, organizational, and social movement levels of analysis - ..." (1990:92).

The models that Weber constructed were intended to reflect social institutions or processes. These models would reflect the most characteristic features of these institutions or processes, and also highlight those features that were not typical.

Using one of these models it should then be possible to apply it to an empirical case in order to see how well it matched the general notion and to what extent it showed unique features. Such a model was called an *ideal type* - ideal not in the sense of the way it *ought* to look in real life but in the sense of a logically coherent and accentuated abstract construction (1973:262).

Weber bases his research on empirical study. His model is drawn up on what he sees happening.

The discussion on Weber is divided into two main sections. Firstly, I will discuss Weber's views on charismatic authority, and then later I will discuss Weber's views on the routinization of charisma. Included in both these sections is the opinion of other scholars.

Charismatic authority was an important subject for Weber. It formed one of his 'Ideal Types', and he seemed to be of the opinion that it formed a basis for other manifestations of authority. He gives much space to the discussion of charisma and charismatic authority. His "Sociology of Religion" and his "Economy and Society" are filled with references to this manifestation.

### 2.3.1 Weber on Authority.

For Max Weber, authority implies that there is a possibility that the person issuing the command or request will be obeyed, either by a particular person, or a group of people. He classifies the different types of authority by their claims to be legitimate. In order to come to a more complete understanding of 'authority' I have included a few comments from B. Holmberg<sup>5</sup> (1978). For Weber, according to Holmberg, a distinction needs to be made between 'power', which is simply the possibility that one person within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own

---

5. Holmberg makes the following comment: "A study of what the sociological literature has to say on concepts such as "power", "authority", "violence", "legitimacy", etc. shows that there is no uniform nomenclature. It seems necessary for every author working in this field to make his own definitions, or at least inform the reader of which definitions will be used." (1978:125).

will, and 'domination'<sup>6</sup> which signifies a power relationship that is legitimate and institutionalized. (1978:126).

Authority and domination also need to be distinguished:

Domination is a quality pertaining to a social system, while authority is a quality pertaining to a person or a group of persons. The bearer of authority is always (in the last resort) a human being. He exercises an active influence on somebody else who submits to this influence. The visible part of the relation is the empirical fact that one person gives an "order" and another "obeys" it. But the "invisible" and specific characteristic of an authority relation is that the ruler and the subordinate both consider it the duty of the latter to obey. The subordinate gives his assent to the order and obeys without questioning it on the principle that an order from a legitimate ruler must be obeyed. Social organization consists of such latent principles structuring the manifest relations of social life, and the latent structural principle of an authority relation is termed "domination". Authority is the manifestation of the latent domination. (1978:127).

Whereas leadership and authority are often equated, there is a distinction between them. Leadership, also in the way used below to describe 'charismatic leadership' is a temporary phenomenon normally limited to small groups. Authority, on the other hand, is a more permanent phenomenon following the principles highlighted above. A leadership relation is voluntary and a authority relationship is not<sup>7</sup> (1978:129). It will be seen that Weber often confuses the issue between 'authority' and leadership', particularly from the following discussion, but it will be sufficient to take note of this distinction when working with a leadership relation and an authority relation.

---

6. Domination and authority are roughly equivalent, with domination been restricted to existence of an administrative staff. (Holmberg 1978:126).

7. An authority relation is based on the internalized and socially upheld group norm. (Holmberg 1978:129).

### 2.3.1.1 The Three “Pure Types” of Authority.

Weber gives three “Pure Types” of legitimate domination. These claims are validated by appealing to different factors. Firstly, legal authority rests on rational grounds and is based on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those in authority to issue such commands; secondly, traditional authority resting on traditional grounds is based on the established belief of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them; thirdly, charismatic authority resting on devotion to an individual displaying exceptional heroism or exemplary character (Weber<sup>8</sup> 1978:216).

In the case of legal authority, obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal order. It extends to the persons exercising the authority of office under it by virtue of the formal legality of their commands and only within the scope of authority of the office. In the case of traditional authority, obedience is owed to the *person* of the chief who occupies the traditionally sanctioned position of authority and who is (within its sphere) bound by tradition. But here the obligation of obedience is a matter of personal loyalty within the area of accustomed obligations. In the case of charismatic authority, it is the charismatically qualified leader as such who is obeyed by virtue of personal trust in his revelation, his heroism or his exemplary qualities so far as they fall within the scope of the individual's belief in his charisma. (1978:216).

### 2.3.1.2 Weber on Charismatic Authority.

We turn our focus onto Weber's view of charismatic authority.

Again and again, Weber has been accused, in his concept of charismatic authority, of using a naïve notion of Great Men in history - ... - but what Weber in fact saw in charismatic authority was the intervention of new ideas, often in a period of crisis, which could be presented as a solution to the rest of society and could

---

8. The reference to Weber, unless otherwise stated, are from the two volume work entitled “Economy and Society”. Instead of distinguishing between the two volumes, the page reference will do so, as the page numbering used continues from volume one into volume two. Volume one has pages 1-640, and volume two has pages 641-1469.



induce some form of resonance in their audience, thus producing a new form of authority with the bearer of the message as a leader. Typically, the new ideas would be expressed in the form, 'It is written, but I say unto you ...'. In other words, it is wrong to see charismatic authority as merely a case of 'the medium is the message' (Hill 1973:263).

Despite this introduction by Hill<sup>9</sup>, we need to examine what Weber means by "charisma". Charisma is a certain quality of an individual personality by which that individual is considered extraordinary and treated as if that individual had certain supernatural or superhuman, or at the least, certain specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These qualities are as such not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as commendable, and on the basis of them the individual is treated as a leader<sup>10</sup>. Charismatic authority has a particular sociological nature. Whereas patriarchy and bureaucracy cater for everyday "normal" needs, and all extraordinary needs which transcend routine everyday economics are satisfied in an entirely heterogeneous manner. They are satisfied on a charismatic basis (Weber 1978:1111).

---

9. Hill concludes his discussion on Weber by admitting that the "pessimistic streak" in Weber got the better of him in the end, and it was this "pessimistic streak" that has helped "confuse" subsequent uses of Weber's theories, particularly the one concerning charismatic authority, by other sociologists. Weber's models seem to reflect the increasing rationalization of human society. It is this increasing rationalization that is slowly doing away with belief in myth and magic, and thus the slow demise of charisma, and charismatic authority. There is always the possibility that there will be an explosion of ideas, and some great new charismatic expression, but the opportunities for this are slowly disappearing, if they have not already (1973:264-265). These sentiments are reflected to a large extent by Bendix. He raises the applicability of the application of the term charisma in our modern secular orientated world. "Charismatic leadership depends upon a widespread belief in the existence of extraordinary or supernatural capacities, but such beliefs are at a discount in secular contexts. Though democratization has increased the plebiscitarian component of modern politics, the qualities of personality which attract voters indicate the popularity, but not necessarily the charisma, of a successful political leader. Accordingly, Loewenstein feels that today charisma in the proper sense is likely to be found in those areas of the world in which a popular belief in supernatural powers is still widespread, as in some parts of Africa or Asia" (1971:170).

10. These powers, in many circumstances are associated with those who give prophetic utterances in more primitive societies. And there is a variety of manifestations of these powers. They include the state of "berserk", those called "shaman's", and many others.

Spencer, using Weber's sociology of religion, divides charisma into three types'<sup>1</sup>. They are charisma in the sense of supernatural endowment of the leader; in the sense of the sacred awe-filled property of groups, roles, or objects; and the sense of referring to the qualities of the leader (1973:341). Supernatural charisma is an attitude of awe directed at persons or objects and conceptualized as a magical essence or divine gift that can be acquired, lost, objectivated, and transferred. Secular charisma is the same attitude of awe directed at persons or objects, but it has lost its conceptual supernatural belief.

In essence, supernatural charisma arises where the bearer of charisma persuades his followers that he possesses power of supernatural origins. The secular charismatic leader acquires his following by demonstrating his powers in a quite different fashion, but at the root of both varieties of charisma is the phenomenon of power and the world-ordering capacity that it implies. The secular charismatic leader, in becoming a leader exhibits *mastery* or *representation*, or both (1973:345).

Miyahara discusses the differences between the two definitions of charisma which are used by Weber. He compares the definition of magical (supernatural) charisma, found in Weber's sociology of religion, with the definition of charisma as found in his sociology of domination. In the second definition'<sup>2</sup> only persons are called charismatic, while in the first definition'<sup>3</sup> either people or objects can be designated as charismatic. In the second, Weber makes very explicit that

---

11. Miyahara supports Spencer in this discussion. Weber depicts the interplay of these three types of charisma throughout his sociology of religion. Magical charisma (supernatural charisma) is bound up with traditionalism. "It secures an everyday functioning of a community by satisfying, at least illusorily, various discrete needs (for rain, health, etc.) of the people. Prophetic charisma arises and suppresses magic, though the degree of the success in the elimination of magic depends largely on whether it is of an ethical or an exemplary type. At any rate, prophetic charisma pushes forward a further rationalization of religions by introducing systematic world-views and ways to attain salvation. It also creates a permanent association or religious congregation. There develops an office hierarchy among the people who succeed the prophetic movement. Thus, priestly charisma emerges in this process of routinization. It legitimates the salvation enterprise that the priests represent. At the same time, the mass of people tend to look for certain magical satisfaction from the priestly charisma. In this way, it tends to be infused with magical charisma. Against this tendency there may arise, again, the prophetic charisma of reformation, which breaks up the routinized priestly charisma and at the same time suppresses the remnants of magical charisma. In this way, according to Weber, the social worlds become rationalized and also disenchanting" (1983:370).

12. The definition found in the sociology of domination.

13. The definition found in the sociology of religion. i.e., the definition of magical (supernatural) charisma.



he regards a charismatic phenomenon as a relationship between the leader and the group<sup>14</sup>, while in the first definition, no such relationship is posited (1983:370-371).

There are marked differences between a charismatic organization and a bureaucratic organization. Within the charismatic organization, at least initially, there is no regulated appointment or dismissal, there is no career, advancement, salary, supervisory or appeals body. There is no local or purely technical jurisdiction and no permanent institutions.

Charisma is self-determined and sets its own limits. Its bearer seizes the task for which he is destined and demands that others obey and follow him by virtue of his mission. If those to whom he feels sent do not recognize him, his claim collapses; if they recognize it, he is their master as long as he “proves” himself. However, he does not derive his claims from the will of his followers, in the manner of an election; rather, it is their *duty* to recognize his charisma (Weber 1978:1112-3).

Continuing with the differences, charisma is a highly individual quality. Charismatic domination is the opposite of bureaucracy with regard to its economic substructure. According to Weber, charisma rejects as undignified all forms of acquisition that are methodical and rational. In its pure form charisma is never a means of personal income, nor is it used as an exchange of services, it is not used to meet the material demands of its mission. Instead of this manner of functioning, charisma, if its mission is peaceful, will receive the necessary means through its support base, either through sponsors or other voluntary gifts. If the mission of charisma is warlike, then the necessary means are achieved through conquest (1978:1113). As has already been mentioned, charismatic authority is opposed to all systematic economic activities. Weber even claims that it is the “strongest anti-economic force.” The reason for this is the temporary nature of charisma.

Charismatic authority is naturally unstable. Pure charisma does not recognise any legitimacy other than the one which flows from personal strength proven time and again. There is no office to

---

14. Miyahara calls this second definition “genuine” charisma. “The conception of genuine charisma in the sociology of domination is a generalization of that of prophetic charisma in the sociology of religion. Both are a recognized quality of individuals, both tend to disrupt existing norms and rules of conduct, and both contain a mission or message” (1983:371).

confer authority on the charismatic leader. The charismatic leader must gain authority from proving his/her powers in practise, repeatedly.

He must work miracles, if he wants to be a prophet. He must perform heroic deeds, if he wants to be a warrior. Most of all, his divine mission must prove itself by *bringing wellbeing* to his faithful followers; if they do not fare well, he obviously is not the god-sent master (1978:1114).

It is the recognition of these qualities which is decisive for the validity of charisma. This recognition is given, reasonably freely, where there is evidence of these qualities. But the genuine basis of charisma lies rather

in the conception that it is the duty of those subject to charismatic authority to recognise its genuineness and to act accordingly. Psychologically this recognition is a matter of complete personal devotion to the possessor of the quality, arising out of enthusiasm, or of despair and hope. (1978:242).

Following on from this, the rate of success of the leader will determine for how long he/she has a following. If anything arises which causes the followers to suspect that the charismatic person has lost contact with their charisma, then the followers will desert that leader. Another important element in being successful, is that the leadership must benefit the followers. If this does not happen, the followers are likely to desert the leader.

Although it appears from Weber's own writing, that the test for charismatic leadership is recognition and results, Reinhard Bendix (1971) suggests that it is not as simple as that. For Bendix it is the relationship between the leader and the followers that needs investigation.

But close examination suggests that both the recognition by the followers and the leader's own claims and actions are fundamentally ambivalent. For the charisma of a leader to be present it must be recognised by his followers, and in the ideal typical case this recognition is a matter of duty. But a personal devotion arising from enthusiasm, despair, or hope is easily contaminated by the desire for a "sign" which will confirm the existence of charisma. In turn, the leader demands unconditional devotion from his followers, and he will construe any demand for a sign or proof of his gift of grace as a lack of faith and a dereliction of duty. Yet his "charismatic authority will disappear, ... if proof and success elude the leader

for long.” It appears then that charismatic leadership is not a label that can be applied but refers to a problematic relation between a leader and his followers which must be investigated. For it is in each case a question of fact: To what extent and in what ways has the follower’s desire for a sign - born out of their enthusiasm, despair, or hope - interfered with, modified, or even jeopardized their unconditional devotion to duty? And similarly it is a question of fact: To what extent and in what ways has the leader’s unconditional claim to exceptional powers or qualities interfered with, modified, or even jeopardized by the actions which he construes as proof of his charismatic qualifications? (1971:175).

John Gager (1975) makes a useful comment, using Berger and Luckmann. He insists that religion is a method of world maintenance. In this, the charismatic figure or leader is involved in world-view reconstruction.

Human worlds by their very nature are social constructions. Although they first confront us in their objective form, our conceptions of meaning, value, goals, truth, reality, duties, social roles, etc., are not “out there” as eternal entities. They are the products of human creativity in the social order. As such, they must be constantly created, adapted, maintained, and legitimated (1975:9).

He gives emphasis to this aspect of world construction, because he believes that this process of world building is essentially rooted in the concrete communities (1975:10). This is a powerful statement, in that it states that without a community there is no social world, and without a social world there is no community (1975:10).

All new religions, then, are directed toward the creation of new worlds: old symbols are given new meaning and new symbols come to life; new communities define themselves in opposition to previous traditions; a new order of the sacred is brought into being and perceived by the community as the source of all power and meaning; new rituals emerge to remind the community of this sacred order by creating it anew in the act of ritual celebration; mechanisms are established for preserving this new world and for adapting it to changing circumstances; and eventually an integrated world view may emerge, including systems of theology, sacred scriptures, and ecclesiastical offices whose task is to give meaning not just to the community itself but to all other worlds as well (1975:11).

In discussing the charismatic figure then one is dealing with a person who is about changing the status quo, the current situation. Gager, perhaps, jumps ahead too quickly to the issue of community<sup>15</sup>, but as we will see later, the community becomes very important in discussing Weber.

Any group that is subject to a charismatic authority is generally based on an emotional form of communal relationships. The staff<sup>16</sup>, if any exist, are not based on social standing or technical training, but rather in terms of charismatic qualities.

There is no such thing as appointment or dismissal, no career, no promotion.

There is only a call at the instance of the leader on the basis of the charismatic qualification of those he summons. There is no hierarchy; the leader merely intervenes in general or in individual cases when he considers the members of his staff lacking in charismatic qualification for a given task. (Weber 1978:243).

The community tends to live on gifts, there being no established administrations. There may be agents, who have been provided with charismatic authority or may have some of their own.

There is no system of formal rules, of abstract legal principles, and hence no process of rational judicial precedent. But equally there is no legal wisdom orientated to judicial precedent. Formally concrete judgements are newly created from case to case and are originally regarded as divine judgements and revelations. (1978:243).

As such, charismatic authority is sharply opposed to rational and traditional types of authority. Rational authority is inextricably bound to a set of rules and regulations and a sense of being intellectually understandable while charismatic authority is intensely irrational and is foreign to all rules. Traditional authority is regulated by various precedents handed down over the years. Charismatic authority rejects the past and in this sense has a revolutionary forward looking focus.

---

15. Nielsen is critical of Gager: "In the same vain, one could site Gager's use of a rather simplistic version of Weber's notions of charisma and legal authority to analyse the emergence of early Christian organizational structures, without any effort to reconstruct the wider setting of Weber's concepts." (1990:92).

16. This staff consists of the primary followers of the individual. They later may form the initial members of the charismatic community and may influence any and all subsequent developments of that community.

Charismatic authority is also foreign to most economic considerations. It repudiates and despises economic exploitation of the gifts that the leader offers as a source of income. The charismatic authority despises the traditional everyday economising, the attainment of regular income by continuous economic activity devoted to this end.

Kenhelm Burridge (1969) has argued that periods of social unrest and/or social malfunction give rise to millenarian movements. These movements, and in particular, their leaders show remarkable similarities to Weber's theory of charismatic authority. Colonial oppression is particularly conducive to these activities. This often leads to the emergence of a 'hero' or a 'new man' who must conform to the popular image of a hero/prophet/messiah and must provide clear and acceptable solutions for the questions asked. Central to the emergence of a millenarian movement is dissatisfaction with the current system and a perceived oppression, which need not be external but may be internal to the system, as long as faith belies experience and given assumptions about power no longer reveal the truth of things (1969:10-13). This and other details about charismatic authority has led to the involvement of charismatic authorities in millenarian movements. Gager has called Christianity a millenarian movement. His description of early Christianity as millenarian has been highly criticised, and rightly so, I believe. Where Gager talks about Christianity as being millenarian, Bartlett has the following to say:

He then adds, "Without further argument at this point, we will take it as given that earliest Christianity meets these criteria and thus deserves to be designated a millenarian movement". Having thus conceded the first point to himself by default, Gager recognizes a problem - that Christianity does not meet the criterion of the brief life-span. The solution is obvious, claims Gager. Any millenarian movement which is to survive must become less millenarian; so Christianity started as a millenarian cult but did not survive as such (1966:111).

Periods of social unrest and weakening or disruption of the social order are situations where assumptions about power are weakening and provide unsatisfactory explanations, failed redemption. This leads to attempts to reformulate assumptions about power, so that they may account for the widening experiences of everyday life and provide the basis for a new mode of redemption. Millenarian movements are new-cultures-in-the-making, attempts to make a new kind of society and to define a new redemptive process.

This conflict often leads to the emergence of a “hero”, i.e., the emergence of the “New human Being.” The hero deals with the values of humans in relation to power structures. This may lead to the creation of alternative power structures (Burridge 1969:11-12). The disjunction between human values and power often leads to the formation of millenarian movements.

Millenarian activities arise from a competitive situation of unequal power relations but common value system i.e. where a powerless group shares the same goals and assumptions as a powerful one but is debarred from access to the rewards of the assumptions and cannot earn the redemption implied (1969:41).

Needless to say, there are certain characteristics within early Christianity that resemble certain aspects of millenarian cults. Gager is right to highlight these. Millenarian movements consisted of the disadvantaged<sup>17</sup>. Gager then goes on to give the causes of disinheritance in Palestine. He relates these to the general political, economic, and social context of the time.

The evidence from recent work on millenarian movements shows that new converts come from those who feel disadvantaged in some significant way. Early Christianity is no exception (1975:25).

Gager claims that all millenarian movements require a “prophet”, these leaders, in many cases, function as a symbolic focal point, rather than a source of authority.

It has also been customary to explain the authority of prophets in terms of “charisma”. Frequently this has been understood to mean certain types of personality, so that it has been thought possible to delineate a more or less objective profile of charismatic figures. Against this objectivist definition, Worsley proposes an interactionist model: To the sociologist, charisma ... can only be that which is recognised, by believers and followers, as a “charismatic” in behaviour of those they treat as charismatic. Charisma is thus a function of recognition: the prophet without honour cannot be a charismatic prophet. Charisma, therefore, sociologically viewed, is a social relationship, not an attribute of individual personality or mystical quality (1975:28).

---

17. This term also is used very vaguely by Gager, and later in his work when talking about the membership of the early Christian groups, he refines it to “relatively disadvantaged”, a term which he does not explain. Actual deprivation is always a relative terms since it must always be in comparison to something, or someone else.



Weber makes a pertinent comments on this also:

In traditionalist periods, charisma is *the great* revolutionary force. The likewise revolutionary force of "reason" works from *within*: by altering the situations of life and hence its problems, finally in this way changing men's attitudes towards them; or it intellectualizes the individual. Charisma, on the other hand, *may* effect a subjective or *internal* reorientation born out of suffering, conflicts, or enthusiasm. It may then result in a radical alteration of the central attitudes and directions of action with a completely new orientation of all attitudes towards the different problems of the "world". (1978:245).

Recognition of the personal mission of the charismatic leader establishes his power. Because of this mode of legitimation genuine charismatic domination knows no abstract laws and regulations and no formal adjudication. For this reason, in a revolutionary and sovereign manner charismatic domination transforms all values and breaks all traditional and rational norms. The major difference between revolution through bureaucratic means and revolution through charismatic means is their relationship to the social orders. Bureaucratic change comes from without, by first changing the material and social orders, and once these have been changed to then change the people through them. Because the power of charisma rests on the belief in "heros", and the conviction of certain manifestations, charismatic belief revolutionizes people from within and shapes social and material conditions according to its revolutionary will (1978:1116).

The bureaucratic order merely replaces the belief in the sanctity of traditional norms by compliance with rationally determined rules and by the knowledge that these rules can be superseded by others, if one has the necessary power, and hence are not sacred. But charisma, in its most potent forms, disrupts rational rule as well as tradition altogether and overturns all notions of sanctity. In-stead of reverence for customs that are ancient and hence sacred, it enforces the inner subjection to the unprecedented and absolutely unique and therefore Divine. In this purely empirical and value-free sense charisma is indeed the specifically creative revolutionary force of history (1978: 1117).

Within patriarchal authority, the patriarch benefits from the devotion of his followers and has authority as the bearer of norms which have been held since the "beginning of time." The charismatic leader enjoys loyalty and authority by virtue of the mission which he/she believes has

been entrusted to him/her. Whereas patriarchal power serves the needs of everyday life, charismatic authority arises out of anxiety and enthusiasm within a particular situation (1978:1117).

The social structure of charismatic domination does not imply an amorphous condition, as may be hinted at from the above description of charismatic authority. A charismatic leader may have a personal staff which is composed of a select group of adherents, who are brought together by discipleship and trust in the leader. They are chosen according to their charismatic proficiency (1978:1119).

For the charismatic subject adequate material contributions are considered a dictate of conscience, although they are formally voluntary, unregulated and irregular; they are offered according to need and economic capacity. The more typical the charismatic structure, the less do followers or disciples obtain their material sustenance and social position in the form of benefices, salaries or other kinds of orderly compensation, titles or ranks. Instead, insofar as the individual's maintenance is not already assured, the followers share in the use of those goods which the authoritarian leader receives as donation, booty or endowment and which he distributes among them without accounting or contractual fixation. Thus the followers may have a claim to be fed at the common table, and to share in the social, political or religious esteem and honour in which he himself is held. Any deviation from this pattern affects the "purity" of the charismatic structure and modifies it in the direction of other structures (1978:1119).

Strongly connected to this, is the completely different attitude to economic considerations of the charismatic. This has already been briefly discussed, but here must be added, that charisma is an extraordinary, and because of this, a non-economic power. Its vitality is endangered if everyday economic interests become predominant (1978:1120).

In one sense we have already intruded onto the field of discussion which I now wish to initiate i.e., a discussion on the "routinization of charisma." But there is a great need to discuss this phenomenon in more detail on its own. Firstly, the previous discussion has focused on charisma, and on Weber's understanding of it, with a few suggestions by other scholars. One of the key



elements of a charismatic figure or leader has been the complete difference to any other type of leader. This difference is carried over into the process of routinization, and the formulation of a charismatic community.

### **2.3.2 The Routinization of Charisma.**

Routinized charisma is radically different from genuine charisma. It is no longer revolutionary and it adheres to social institutions and not persons.

Routinized charisma is so far from being genuinely charismatic that one is tempted to ask whether it is charismatic at all. Yet, according to Weber, "We are justified in still speaking of charisma in this impersonal sense only because there always remains an extraordinary quality which is not accessible to everyone and which typically overshadows the charismatic subjects." (Miyahara 1983:372).

It is impossible for the original charismatic and his/her staff to maintain the complete 'otherness' of charismatic domination. Eventually, the need that caused the manifestation of the charismatic, is cared for, and everyday life flows back along its normal channels. The pure form of charismatic domination will eventually "wane" and turn into an institution (Weber 1978:1121). In this process of "returning to the everyday", it is transformed, sometimes into an unrecognizable structure.

Thus the pure type of charismatic rulership is in a very specific sense unstable, and all its modifications have basically one and the same cause: The desire to transform charisma and charismatic blessing from a unique, transitory gift of grace of extraordinary times and persons into a permanent possession of everyday life. This is desired usually by the master, always by his disciples, and most of all by his charismatic subjects. Inevitably, however, this changes the nature of the charismatic structure (1978:1121).

The process of losing its personal foundation, which is that characteristic which distinguishes it from other forms of domination or authority, is not a set process. However, this process of routinization often forms alliances with traditional authorities.

In such an alliance the essence of charisma appears to be definitely abandoned, and this is indeed true insofar as its eminently revolutionary character is concerned. It is the basic feature of this ever recurring development that charisma is captured by the interest of all economic and social power holders in the *legitimation* of their possessions by a charismatic, and thus sacred, source of authority. Instead of upsetting everything that is traditional or based on legal acquisition (in the modern sense), as it does *in statu nascendi*, charisma becomes a legitimation for “acquired rights.” In this function, which is alien to its essence, charisma becomes a part of everyday life; for the needs which it satisfies in this way are universal, especially for one general reason [namely, the legitimation of leadership and succession] (1978:1122).

### 2.3.2.1 The rise of a charismatic community.

The following does not necessarily have to happen after the death or disappearance of the original charismatic authority figure. The rise of a community, in particular, can happen during the life of the original bearer of charisma. However, the problem of succession, by definition, implies that the original charismatic authority has left the scene in some way, normally by death<sup>18</sup>. Because of the entirely “different” structure and routine of charismatic authority, a process of routinization has to take place if this structure is to take on a permanent rather than transitory character or form. In order to do this a “structured community”<sup>19</sup> of followers of some form or another has to develop. And in order for this to happen it is necessary for the character of the charismatic authority to become radically changed. It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalised or rationalised, or a combination of both<sup>20</sup>.

---

18. Burridge seems to indicate that the charismatic leader will always die, normally violently, in the process of the movement.

19. Although Gager focuses on all the gospels and not just the Gospel of John, he believes that the gospels can be used as sources for re-creating, what he calls, the “social world of early Christianity” (1975:8). Reflecting on the impact the various communities had on the texts of the gospels, Gager claims that there is very little that was not influenced by the communities.

20. Refer back to the other two types of authority.

There are two principle incentives underlying this transformation.

(a) The ideal and also the material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community, (b) the still stronger ideal and also stronger material interests, of the members of the administrative staff, the disciples,... or others in continuing their relationship. (1978:246).

Concomitant with the routinization of charisma with a view to ensuring adequate succession, go the interests in its routinization on the part of the administrative staff. It is only in the initial stages and so long as the charismatic leader acts in a way which is completely outside everyday social organization, that it is possible for his followers to live communistically in a community of faith and enthusiasm, on gifts, booty, or sporadic acquisition. Only the members of the small group of enthusiastic disciples and followers are prepared to devote their lives purely idealistically to their call. The great majority of disciples and followers will in the long run "make their living" out of their "calling" in a material sense as well. Indeed, this must be the case if the movement is not to disintegrate. (1978:249)

Because of this, the routinization of charisma also takes the form of the appropriation of powers and of economic advantages by the followers or disciples, and of regulating recruitment. This process is either a process of traditionalization or legalization, depending on what form it takes.

#### **2.3.2.2 The problem of succession.**

The interests of the community become very evident with the disappearance of the leader. In other words the community now has to face the problem of continuation or succession. Charismatic leadership, if it wants to transform itself into a perennial institution firstly needs to find a successor for the charismatic leader. It needs to channel charisma in a direction of legal and/or traditional authority. The way in which this problem is dealt with, if it is dealt with, determines the character of the subsequent emerging community. Weber lists six possible solutions to the problem of succession.

2.3.2.2.1 The search for a new charismatic leader on the basis of criteria of the qualities which will fit him for the position of authority<sup>21</sup>. In other words the legitimacy of the new leader is bound to certain characteristics. In other words the new leader is bound to a set of rules and traditions. The result is a process of traditionalising in favour of which the purely personal character of the leadership is reduced.

2.3.2.2.2 The search for a new charismatic leader on the basis of revelation. In this case the legitimacy of the new leader is dependant on the acceptability of the technique of the leader selection. This involves a form of legalization.

2.3.2.2.3 A new leader who has been designated by the former, and the acceptability of this by the rest of the community. Legitimacy is acquired through the act of designation.

2.3.2.2.4 A new leader designated by the administrative staff and the recognition of this by the community. This not to be equated with an "election" or a "nomination", it is not a matter of free selection but one rather bound by objective duty.

2.3.2.2.5 The understanding that charisma is a quality transmitted by heredity. In other words, the members of the original leaders family, particular close family, share in or participate in the charisma of the original leader. In this case attention is not given to the qualities of the charismatic individual, but attention is now given to the legitimacy of the position that person has acquired. This could lead to either a traditionalising or a legalising of authority.

2.3.2.2.6 The idea that charisma may be transferred by ritual means from one to another. This involves a dissociation of charisma from a particular individual, making it an objective, transferable entity. (1978:248).

This designation of a successor, by whatever means, has as a consequence, the continuation of the charismatic domination. However, the source of authority for the leadership has moved from

---

21. For example the search for a child with the characteristics of the reincarnated Buddha, in the process of choosing a new Dalai Lama.

autonomous leadership based on personal charisma, to leadership legitimacy based on a source (1978:1124). This search for a successor may not take place without conflict.

From a unique gift of grace, charisma may be transformed into a quality that is either (a) transferable or (b) personally acquirable or (c) attached to the incumbent of an office or to an institutional structure regardless of the persons involved (1978:1135).

We are justified in still speaking of charisma in this impersonal sense only because there always remains an extraordinary quality which is not accessible to everyone and which typically overshadows the charismatic subjects. It is for this very reason that charisma can fulfil its social function. However, since in this manner charisma becomes a component of everyday life and changes into a permanent structure, its essence and mode of operation are significantly transformed (1978:1135).

The most frequent case of a depersonalization of charisma is the belief in its transferability through blood ties. Thus the desire of the disciples or followers and of the charismatic subjects for the perpetuation of charisma are fulfilled in a mostly simple fashion. However, the notion of a truly individual inheritance was as alien here as it was originally to the household. Instead of individual inheritance we find the immortal household as property-holder vis-à-vis the succeeding generations. In the beginning, charisma too is hereditary only in the sense that household and lineage group are considered magically blessed, so that they alone can provide the bearers of charisma. This notion lies so close at hand that its genesis scarcely needs an explanation. Because of its supernatural endowment a house is elevated above all others; in fact, the belief in such a qualification, which is unattainable by natural means and hence charismatic, has everywhere been the basis for the development of royal and aristocratic power. For just as the charisma of the ruler attaches itself to his house, so does that of his disciples and followers to their houses (1978:1136).

Once charisma has been bound to a blood relationship, its meaning is altogether changed. Originally, the charismatic leader was "ennobled" by virtue of his/her own actions, now he/she is legitimated by the deeds of his/her ancestors. Linkage of charisma with an office, ensures its

survival. Permanent structures and traditions replace the belief in personalities. Charisma becomes part of the established social structure (1978:1139).

Once charismatic qualification has become an impersonal quality, which can be transmitted through various and at first purely magic means, it has begun its transformation from a personal gift that can be tested and proven but not transmitted and acquired, into a capacity that, in principle, can be taught and learned. Thus charismatic qualification can become an object of *education*, even though at first not in the form of rational or empirical instruction, since heroic and magical capacities are regarded as inborn; only if they are latent can they be activated through a regeneration of the whole personality. Therefore, the real purpose of charismatic education is regeneration, hence the development of the charismatic quality, and the testing, confirmation and selection of the qualified person (1978:1143).

Once the original charismatic leader has left the scene, the process of routinization which follows is "controlled" by the followers that are left behind. They may set up norms for recruitment. By definition, "charisma" can not be learned or taught, it has to be acquired or "awakened". Only those who have been "tested" and approved by the followers are then allowed to exercise authority.

The administrative staff may seek and achieve the creation and appropriation of *individual* positions and the corresponding economic advantages for its members. (1978:250).

Now, depending on whether the tendency is to traditionalize or legalise, three things can happen. Either there will develop (a) benefices, or (b) offices, or (c) fiefs. In the case of benefices, these may consist of the rights to various proceeds of income; in the case of offices, they may have more of a patrimonial or more bureaucratic character; in the case of fiefs, feudalism appears to be the end result.

### 2.3.2.3 Status honour and the legitimation of Authority.

The initial charismatic leader and the associated followers had an “anti-economic” character. In order for charisma to be transferred into an “every-day” phenomena, this anti-economic character needs to be transformed.

It must be adapted to some form of fiscal organization to provide for the needs of the group and hence to the economic conditions necessary for raising taxes and contributions. (1978:251).

It follows from this that the charismatically ruled organization is transformed into an organization which is much like any other in the operation of the authority within it. There may be a few small variations, but essentially, the authority within it is either like a traditional authority or a legal authority types.

As domination congeals into a permanent structure, charisma recedes as a creative force and erupts only in short-lived mass emotions with unpredictable effect, during elections and similar occasions. However, charisma remains a very important element of the social structure, even though it is much transformed. ... economic motives ... [are] largely [to] account for the routinization of charisma: the needs of privileged strata to legitimize their social and economic conditions, that is, to transform them from mere resultants of power relationships into acquired rights, and hence to sanctify them. These interests are by far the strongest motive for the preservation of charismatic elements in depersonalized form. Since genuine charisma is based neither on enacted or traditional order nor on acquired rights, but on legitimation through heroism and revelation it is radically opposed to this motive. But after its routinization its very quality as an extraordinary, supernatural and divine forces makes it a suitable source of legitimate authority for the successors of the charismatic hero; moreover, in this form it is advantageous to all those whose power and property are guaranteed by this authority, that is, dependent upon its perpetuation. However, the forms of charismatic legitimation vary according to the relationship to the supernatural forces which established it (1978:1146-7).



Weber goes on to demonstrate how a community that was originally charismatically led, eventually can lead on towards a democratic organization or community. During this transformation towards democracy there are stages in which individuals within the community long back towards the original ideals of the charismatic leader. These individuals are called religious virtuosi. They tend to bring about a reforming of ideas current at the time in an attempt to transform the community into a community that follows more closely that which the original charismatic leader intended.

### 2.3.3 Virtuosi.

It is only after the demise of the charismatic leader that rules and regulations become important:

Charisma in its *statu nascendi* is, by its very nature, opposed to rules. Even the question of economic maintenance is not governed by rules, but by the revolutionary charismatic leader. The staff of the charismatic leader may share his financial opportunism, but they may also take up paid employment on an *ad hoc* basis. The important thing is how such activity is regarded, i.e., that it is not of normative significance for the life of the community. Rules belong to a later stage of the evolution of charisma. (Draper unpublished:6).

Weber has distinguished between two types of religious virtuosi, the one being 'ascetic virtuosi', and the other being 'mystic virtuosi.' Weber discusses these two types in terms of salvation, as ways of routinizing the attainment of salvation. The following discussion introduces the topic in the same manner as it is discussed by Weber, firstly a break down of ascetic virtuosi, and then a discussion on mystic virtuosi, and it is compared with ascetic virtuosi.

#### 2.3.3.1 Ascetic virtuosi.

For the ascetic virtuoso, "Salvation may be viewed as the distinctive gift of active ethical behaviour performed in the awareness that god directs this behaviour..." (Weber 1978:542). The method of preserving the charisma is the equivalent of salvation, and the preservation of charisma is based on strict observance of various ethical regulations, of this there are two types:



Concentration upon the actual pursuit of salvation may entail a formal withdrawal from the 'world': from social and psychological ties with the family, from the possession of worldly goods, and from political, economic, artistic, and erotic activities - in short, from all creaturely interests. Called "World-rejecting asceticism"... The concentration of human behaviour on activities leading to salvation may require participation within the world (or more precisely: within the institutions of the world but in opposition to them) on the basis of the religious individual's piety and his qualifications as the elect instrument of god. Called "Inner-worldly asceticism." (1978:542).

The world is presented to the virtuoso as being his or her responsibility, and therefore the virtuoso has certain obligations towards it. These may be to transform the world in accordance with their ascetic/ethical ideals. Such a group of ascetics tends to become aristocratic, and excludes the people who do not form part of their "class." This ascetic virtuoso is accompanied by a view that the world constitutes a place of evil. And it is therefore beholden on the ascetic to renounce the world and all its claims upon the individual. Because of this, if the ascetic wishes to demonstrate their religious fidelity within the world, then the world remains such a place of sin and evil.

The world abides in the lowly state of all things of the flesh. Therefore, any sensuous surrender to the world's goods may imperil concentration upon and possession of the ultimate good of salvation, and may be a symptom of unholiness of spirit and impossibility of rebirth. Nevertheless, the world as a creation of god, whose power comes to expression in it despite its creatureliness, provides the only medium through which one's unique religious charisma may prove itself by means of rational ethical conduct, so that one may become and remain certain of one's own state of grace. (1978:543).

So it is within the world that the ascetic operates. Renouncing its pleasures and seeking to transform, it through their ethical teaching and behaviour. Any accumulation of wealth or of the pleasures of the world are forbidden. However, if wealth and good do accumulate to the individual it can be seen as the 'blessing' of the god upon that person.

The person who lives as a worldly ascetic is a rationalist, not only in the sense that he rationally systematizes his own conduct, but also in his rejection of everything that is ethically irrational, esthetic, or dependent upon his own emotional reactions to the world and its institutions. The distinctive goal always remains the alert,

methodological control of one's own patterns of life and behaviour. This type of inner-worldly asceticism included, above all, ascetic Protestantism, which taught the principle of loyal fulfilment of obligations within the framework of the world as the sole method of proving religious merit, through its several branches demonstrated this tenet with varying degrees of consistency. (1978:544).

Draper has classified the 'wandering charismatic' as an ascetic virtuoso. He identifies various marks of these world-rejecting ascetics<sup>22</sup>.

### 2.3.3.2 Mystic virtuosi:

However, the mystic virtuoso is quite different:

But the distinctive content of salvation may not be an active quality of conduct, that is, an awareness of having executed the divine will; it may instead be a subjective condition of a distinctive kind, the most notable form of which is mystic illumination. This too is confined to a minority who have particular religious qualifications, and among them only as the end product of the systematic execution of a distinctive type of activity, namely contemplation. For the activity of contemplation to succeed in achieving its goal of mystic illumination, the extrusion of all everyday mundane interests is always required. (Weber 1978:544).

This would seem to involve an absolute flight from the world<sup>23</sup>.

---

22. Among others they have a lack of concern for theological issues, or questions of ultimate meaning. The ascetic becomes god's tool and the success of their action is the success of god himself (Draper unpublished:8). "The ascetic, when he wishes to act within the world, that is, to practice inner-worldly asceticism, must become afflicted with a sort of happy closure of the mind regarding any question about the meaning of the world, for he must not worry about such questions. ... Thus, the inner-worldly ascetic is the recognizable 'man of vocation,' who neither inquires about nor finds it necessary to inquire about the meaning of his actual practise of a vocation within the whole world, the total framework of which is not his responsibility but his god's. For him it suffices that through his rational actions in this world he is personally executing the will of god, which is unsearchable in its ultimate significance." (Weber 1978:548).

23. There is a need to distinguish between "world-rejecting asceticism" and absolute flight from the world. World rejecting asceticism is primarily orientated towards activity within the world. Only such activity can help the ascetic attain or maintain that capacity for action by god through god's grace.

The mystic in contrast to the ascetic, primarily strives to achieve rest in the god. This entails inactivity and “in its most consistent form it entails the cessation of thought, of everything that in anyway reminds one of the world, and of course the absolute minimization of all outer and inner activity.” (1978:545). The mystic strives to achieve a union with the divine, a mystical union. This seems to hold out the promise of acquiring certain forms of knowledge. This mystical knowledge (Weber calls *gnosis*) is not something new, but rather an overall perception of the meaning of the world.

Such *gnosis* is basically a ‘possession’ of something from which there may be derived a new practical orientation to the world, and under certain circumstances even new and communicable items of knowledge. ...We may strongly emphasize here that the distinction between world-rejecting asceticism and world fleeing contemplation is of course fluid. For world-fleeing contemplation must originally be associated with a considerable degree of systematically rationalized patterning of life. Only this, indeed, leads to concentration upon the boon of salvation. Yet, rationalization is only an instrument for attaining the goal of contemplation and is of an essentially negative type, consisting in the avoidance of interruptions caused by nature and the social milieu. Contemplation does not necessarily become a passive abandonment to dreams or a simple self-hypnosis, though it may approach these states in practise. On the contrary, the distinctive road to contemplation is a very energetic concentration upon certain truths. The decisive aspect of this process is not the content of these truths, which frequently seems very simple to non-mystics, but rather the type of emphasis placed upon the truths. The mystical truths come to assume a central position within, and to exert an integrating influence upon, the total view of the world. (1978:545-6).

The concentration of thought together with other and various procedures for winning salvation is only a means towards salvation, and not salvation in itself. The illumination gained through this consists of a unique quality of feeling, or a felt emotional unity of knowledge and this provides the mystic with the decisive assurance of his/her religious state of grace - salvation - maintenance of the charisma.

There is a sense in which the mystic's survival depends on the continual "sinfulness" of the world<sup>24</sup>. This leads (may lead) to feelings of aristocracy with regards salvation. In that only the mystic has achieved salvation and those in the world have not. This may culminate in the mystic's abandonment of the world, the unilluminated and those incapable of illumination to their fate.

When the ascetic becomes involved in the world (inner-worldly asceticism) he has to close his/her mind to such questions that demand meaning from the world. The ascetic does not inquire and have a need to inquire about the meaning of the world.

The contemplative mystic is concerned with perceiving the essential meaning of the world, but he cannot comprehend it in a rational form, for the very reason that he has already conceived of the essential meaning of the world as a unity beyond all empirical reality. Mystical contemplation has not always resulted in a flight from the world in the sense of an avoidance of every contact with the social milieu. On the contrary, the mystic may also require of himself the maintenance of his state of grace against every pressure of the mundane order, as an index of the enduring character of that very state of grace. In that case, even the mystic's position within the institutional framework of the world becomes a vocation, but one leading in an altogether different direction from any vocation produced by inner-worldly asceticism. (1978:548).

Mystic contemplation does not affirm the world as it is. The mystic minimizes their activity within the world, by resigning themselves to the institutions of the world. They then live within these institutions 'quietly.' They strive to escape from the activity of the world to the 'quietness' of the god. The mystic who actually possesses a subjective appropriation of salvation may tend towards

---

24. The mystic appears, as far as the ascetic is concerned, to be thinking exclusively about himself. And because of this the mystic lives in an ever increasing inconsistency, because he must depend on the world for survival, and is therefore not able to flee the world. If the mystic lives within the world, this is all the more obvious and true. "There is a sense in which the mystic who flees the world is more dependent upon the world than in the ascetic. The ascetic can maintain himself as an anchorite, winning the certainty of his state of grace through the labours he expends in an effort to maintain himself as an anchorite. Not so the contemplative mystic. If he is to live consistently according to his theory, he must maintain his life only by means of what nature or men voluntarily donate to him. This requires that he live on berries in the woods, which are not always available, or on alms." (Weber 1978:547).

anomism. Therefore they may reject the various institutions of the world, not in action but in subjective qualities.

“For the ascetic, moreover, the divine imperative may require of human creatures an unconditional subjection of the world to the norms of religious virtue, and indeed a revolutionary transformation of the world for this purpose.” (1978:549) In this case the ascetic emerges as a prophet in opposition to the world<sup>25</sup>. The same can be said for a mystic.

Now a mystic may arrive at a similar position in relation to the world. His sense of divine inwardness, the chronic and quiet euphoria of his solitary contemplative possession of substantively divine salvation, may become transformed into an acute feeling of sacred possession by or possession of the god who is speaking in and through him. He will then wish to bring eternal salvation to men [*sic*] as soon as they have prepared, as the mystic himself has done, a place for god upon the earth, i.e., in their souls. But in this case the result will be the emergence of the mystic as a magician who causes his power to be felt among the gods and demons; and this may have the practical consequences of the mystic's becoming a mystagogue, something which has actually happened very often. (1978:550).

In the case of a mystagogue he/she may choose to bear witness to his god through doctrine alone. In this case their teaching (revolutionary in nature) becomes diametrically opposed to the world.

He will regard the absoluteness of his own universal acosmistic feeling of love as completely adequate for himself, and indeed regard this feeling as the only one acceptable to his god as the foundation for a mystically renewed community among men [*sic*], because this feeling alone derives from a divine source. (1978:550).

---

25. Weber does have a section dealing with prophets and charismatics (1978:457). However, it appears confused and not particularly useful for this thesis. Prophets are purely individual bearers of charisma, who by virtue of their mission proclaim religious doctrine. They are a feature of the later evolution of charisma. (Draper unpublished:12).



The typical mystic is normally not conscious of social activity, and is not prone to accomplish any rational transformation of the mundane order of things on the basis of a methodological pattern of life directed towards external success.

Wherever genuine mysticism did give rise to communal action, such action was characterized by the acosmism of the mystical feeling of love - despite the apparent demands of logic - to favour the creation of communities (*gemeinschaftsbildend*). ... The core of the mystical concept of the oriental Christian church was a firm conviction that Christian brotherly love, when sufficiently strong and pure, must necessarily lead to unity in all things, even in dogmatic beliefs. In other words, men [*sic*] who sufficiently love one another in the Johannine sense of mystical love, will also think alike and, because of the very irrationality of their common feeling, act in a solidary fashion which is pleasing to God. Because of this concept the Eastern church could dispense with an infallibly rational authority in matters of doctrine. (1978:550-1).

### 2.3.4. Conclusion.

It would appear in the Christian tradition that the apostle is the feature of the succession crisis accompanying the disappearance of the charismatic leader<sup>26</sup>.

The apostle is initially linked to the resurrected Christ, who is depicted handing over his authority to the disciples (Mt 28:15-20; cf. Lk 24:48-49). It is most clearly expressed in John's Gospel, where the handing on of the charisma is linked with the Holy Spirit, as in Luke, 'Jesus said to them again, 'Peace be with you. As the Father sent me, even so I send you. And when he had said to this, he breathed on them, and said to them, 'Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven, if you retain the sins of any, they are retained.' (20:21-22). In John's Gospel, the figure of the apostle has been Christologized and is developed as a legitimation of mystic virtuosi, but its roots are clear. In all the gospels, the tendency is to project this post-resurrection transfer of charismatic

---

26. A feature of conflict between prophet and apostle may be found in the document from the community of the Didache.

authority to the staff of the charismatic leader back into the earthly life of the leader (Mk 6:7-13; Mt 10:1-11; Lk 9:1-5, 10:4-11). The staff of the departed leader claim their authority over the institutionalized charismatic community on the basis of designation by the charismatic leader himself. (Draper unpublished:10).

It becomes all the more important to investigate the Gospel of John in the light of the possible existence of mystic virtuosi instead of ascetic virtuosi. Possibly this difference could shed more light on the Gospel, and its function for its own community. We move on now to the formation of a model.

## 2.4 The Sociology of Knowledge.

The ideas of the sociology of knowledge were originally formulated by Alfred Schutz. He claimed that the world is experienced and interpreted by others (e.g. significant others such as parents or ancestors), which we modify and/or are modified by. The features of the socially constructed understanding predict how an individual is likely to respond. The well known formulation of this theory is the one by Berger and Luckmann.

The historian, therefore, cannot rest content with the social description of such phenomena as economic factors, archaeological remains, social patterns, institutional forms, or even literary evidence in and of itself. Rather, the historian must seek to enter into the symbolic universe of the community that produced this evidence, and to identify both what the shared assumptions were as well as what explicit claims and norms were declared by the group. Unless this analytical approach is undertaken, it is virtually certain that the unconscious assumptions and values of the interpreter will be imposed on the ancient evidence. Perhaps that fault is not wholly to be avoided, but the approach defined by sociology of knowledge is an essential safeguard against guileless cultural imperialism on the part of the interpreter of another time and culture (Kee 1989:53).



This rather brief introduction to the work of Berger and Luckmann needs to be amplified for a fuller understanding. As this model plays an important role in my thesis here follows a relatively detailed breakdown of their theory.

Human interaction takes place in a specific setting. The interaction takes place by means of language, by this I mean more than just the spoken word. Language can be thought of to include gesture as well. Tied up in our language is the social store of knowledge, it is this which determines whether we understand each other, and if we are able to communicate effectively. Through our interaction we create our identity, in other words, one can only be someone in relation to others. In this interaction between, in principal, two people, any and all problems are mastered as a matter of routine. This is an unreflective process.

Man's specific humanity and his sociality are inextricably intertwined. *Homo sapiens* is always, and in the same measure, *homo socius* (Berger and Luckmann 1966:51).

What Berger and Luckmann are saying is that the process of becoming a human being takes place in an interrelationship with an environment. Our specific shape into which our humanness is moulded is determined by those socio-cultural formations and is relative to their numerous variations. It is possible to say that an individual has a nature, it is more significant, or more revelatory, to say that an individual constructs their own nature in society, or more simply, that an individual produces him- or herself in and through society (1966:51).

For Berger and Luckmann all human activity is subject to "habitualisation." The two authors use the example of two people staying on a deserted island<sup>27</sup>. Any activity that is created and then repeated on a repetitive cycle, eventually becomes a habit. It is these habits which give life a routine, and they play an important role in life.

---

27. The example is developed on page 56 of Berger and Luckmann's work. That two people "A" and "B" are on a deserted island. "As A and B interact, in whatever manner, typifications will be produced quite quickly. A watches B perform. He attributes motives to B's actions and, seeing the actions recur, typifies the motives as recurrent." The example is continued, but this will suffice for now.

Habitualisation provides the direction and the specialization of activity that is lacking in man's biological equipment, thus relieving the accumulation of tensions that result from undirected drives (1966:53).

The processes of habitualisation always precede any processes of institutionalization.

Institutionalization occurs whenever there is a reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors. Put differently, any such typification is an institution. What must be stressed is the reciprocity of the institutional typifications and the typicality of not only the actions but also the actors in institutions. .. Institutions further imply historicity and control. Reciprocal typifications of actions are built up in the course of a shared history. They cannot be created instantaneously. Institutions always have a history, of which they are the products. It is impossible to understand an institution adequately without an understanding of the historical process in which it was produced (1966:54).

With the need to socialize new members, the institution crystallizes and is experienced by the new members as "possessing a reality of their own, a reality that confronts the individual as an external and coercive fact." (1966:58). Institutions have a reality only because we create it and give it to them. The created order changes in the process of transmission to the next generation.

For the children, the parentally transmitted world is not fully transparent. Since they had no part in shaping it, it confronts them as a given reality that, like nature, is opaque in places at least (1966:59).

No matter how massive and overbearing the objectivity of the institutional world may appear to the individual, that institutional world is and was humanly produced and constructed objectively. Objectivation refers to the process whereby the externalized products of human activity attain an objective character (1966:60).

It follows that the expanding institutional order develops a corresponding canopy of legitimations, stretching over it a protective cover of both cognitive and normative interpretation. These legitimations are learned by the new generation during the same process that socializes them into the institutional order. ... The development of specific mechanisms of social control also becomes necessary with the historicization and objectivation of institutions. Deviance from the institutionally "programmed" courses of action becomes likely once the institutions have

become divorced from their original relevance in the concrete social processes from which they arose (1966:62).

Following on from this discussion, Berger and Luckmann proceed to discuss "reification." Reification takes place when the products of human activity, which have been objectivated, are apprehended as non-human or possibly supra-human products (1966:89).

It must be emphasized that reification is a modality of consciousness, more precisely, a modality of man's objectification of the human world. Even while apprehending the world in reified terms, man continues to produce it. That is, man is capable paradoxically of producing a reality that denies him (1966:89).

Once institutionalization has taken place the institution needs to be legitimated, especially in the eyes of a new generation of people.

Legitimation produces new meanings that serve to integrate the meanings already attached to disparate institutional processes. The function of legitimation is to make objectively available and subjectively plausible the "first-order" objectivations that have been institutionalized (1966:92).

Legitimation tells the individual why he/she should perform one action and not another; it tells him/her why things are what they are. The problem of legitimation only arises when the objectivations of the institutions have to be transmitted to a new generation. These institutions that need to be legitimated in the eyes of a new generation, are termed social universes by Berger and Luckmann.

In certain instances various procedures need to be implemented to maintain this social universe. This needs to be done if there is a problem within the social universe. As long as there are no problems, the symbolic universe is self-maintaining (1966:105). Deviants from the social universe can be dealt with in one of two ways.

Therapy entails the application of conceptual machinery to ensure that actual or potential deviants stay within the institutionalized definitions of reality, or, in other words, to prevent the "inhabitants" of a given universe from "emigrating" (1966:113).

Nihilation, ... uses a similar machinery to liquidate conceptually everything *outside* the same universe. The procedure may also be described as a kind of negative legitimation. Legitimation maintains the reality of the socially constructed universe; nihilation *denies* the reality of whatever phenomena or interpretations of phenomena do not fit into that universe (1966:114).

Berger and Luckmann proceed to explain how an individual (a new born baby, for example) is socialized into an already established social universe, which is legitimated. This is called primary socialization, and often a secondary process known as secondary socialization may follow.

In primary socialization, the individual's first world is constructed. The firmness of this world is to be explained by reference to the individual's relationship to his/her first "significant others"<sup>28</sup> (1966:135).

Primary socialization creates in the child's consciousness a progressive abstraction from the roles and attitudes of specific others to roles and attitudes *in general* (1966:132).

Meanwhile secondary socialization is

the internalization of institutional or institution-based "subworlds." Its extent and character are therefore determined by the complexity of the division of labour and the concomitant social distribution of knowledge (1966:138).

The process of secondary socialization always has to deal with an individual who has gone through a process of primary socialization. In some ways this presents a problem, because whatever new contents are to be supplied now have to be "superimposed" onto an already present reality. If any secondary socialization is to be successful, there needs to be some measure of consistency between the two realities (1966: 140).

---

28. Significant others; refers to those people in our lives who exert a remarkable influence over our development. In primary socialization, these significant others are most importantly our parents, perhaps one or two other relatives, and perhaps some of the ancestors. This differs in secondary socialization in that the relationship is not built on emotional ties, but is developed out of a desire to learn.

I wish to mention one last element of Berger and Luckmann's discussion, the process of alternation. This takes place when an individual moves from one social universe to another.

These processes resemble primary socialization, because they have radically to reassign reality accents and, consequently, must replicate to a considerably degree the strongly affective identification with the socializing personnel that was characteristic of childhood. They are different from primary socialization because they do not start *ex nihilo*, and as a result must cope with a problem of dismantling, disintegrating the preceding nomic structure of subjective reality' (1966:157).

The effect of this process depends on (a) creating boundaries i.e. separation and (b) on creating an effective plausibility structure i.e. it has to make sense, (c) and strong interaction (encapsulation and strong intra-group interaction).

I have set out in detail the theory of Berger and Luckmann, and I will draw extensively on it in the discussion later when I develop a model for this paper. But now there are certain critiques that need to be mentioned, these critiques relate to the use of sociological tools in general, and not only to the use of Berger and Luckmann, or Weber.

### 2.4.1 Critiques.

A scholar by the name of Cyril S. Rodd (1981:98), offers a scathing attack on sociological inquiry into the New Testament, especially sociological inquiry which makes use of sociological models. His starting point is a definition of sociology, which in itself is useful. Sociological theory is essentially a prediction of what is likely to happen, all things being equal. The researcher then, is required to test the validity of the hypothesis through experiment and observation (1981:98). Because of the historical "gap" between current researchers and the society of the New Testament, experiment and observation are impossible. Especially since the material which is used, viz. the texts of the New Testament and other such material, were never written to document social development.

I [Rodd] would claim that the attempt to apply sociological theories to biblical documents is not likely to be fruitful. The chance of testing a hypothesis is so slight as to be negligible. Thus what remains possible is either to accept the theory

as valid for the biblical period and then to use it to organize and interpret the evidence, even if we follow R. Scroggs, to posit parts of the model for which evidence is missing, on the grounds that the absence of such evidence is accidental and the entire model was a reality in the early church, or else to use the theories entirely heuristically to suggest lines of research, which then have to stand or fall on their own merit. The first is illegitimate, the second can be fruitful, but only so long as the research does not incorporate in his study assumptions derived from the theory (1981:104).

As much as I disagree with Rodd's position, there lies an element of importance within it. He stresses the need for a concrete link between history and sociology. The two need to work hand in hand.

Donald Nielsen (1990:87) has offered a critique of the current status of sociological inquiry into the New Testament. He wants to move from narrow analytical inquiry which emphasizes the social structures, functions, roles, communities, and social-psychological mechanisms. He claims that as a result of these foci the discussions relating to cultural phenomena are undertaken in a neo-functionalist method. As a result of this the cultural phenomena and processes are viewed in relation to the "needs" of the communities and/or from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge (1990:87). He continues to critique the recent results in the sociology of early Christianity. The many gains from the sociological study have been lost because they succeeded in isolating early Christianity from its wider dynamic civilizational environments. The same can be said about sociological studies of communities, they tended to ignore the wider dynamic social forces and settings within which the community operated. Another problem is that hardly any studies have tended to focus upon the 3rd, 4th centuries and the position of Christianity during these times<sup>29</sup> (1990:91).

---

29. I have no problem with the application of the sociology of knowledge. Nielsen is being rather conservative, and not allowing the application of these models their full inheritance within historical sociological study. In my opinion, Nielsen is trying to encourage a focus on the relationship between local change (particularly in individual communities), and change on a larger scale, such as the rise of the Roman empire. In this he encourages us to focus on more than just the particular, while we are studying the society of the New Testament. Nielsen suggests as a way forward, that sociologists need to have more contact with historical material in order to allow their neo-Weberian reconstructions to bear fruit. Sociologists need to be more deeply  
(continued...)

In his continuing critique against students of the sociology of early Christianity, Nielsen bemoans the process whereby many scholars tear up Weber's theories and apply them in an ad hoc fashion.

Finally, there is Kee's attempt to merge Weber's method of *Verstehen* into a phenomenological account of early Christian "world building" and belief in miracles, without any account of recent efforts by sociologists to move away from phenomenological reconstructions of Weber toward more developmental civilizational ones. In many respects, these efforts all reflect an interdisciplinary lag by students of the sociology of early Christianity behind recent reconstructive work of sociologists. In sum, the self-proclaimed "sociologists" of early Christianity are employing fractured and abstractive, even outmoded, interpretations of Weber's work at a time when sociology is moving toward wider developmental, civilizational, and inter-civilizational version of his work (1990:93).

It has been seen that there are differing views on the applicability of the sociological tools to the New Testament. It is not the purpose of this thesis to enter into the relative values of these tools, but to use what is available. In this I am making clear my pre-conception that I find these tools valuable. I have looked at the theory of Max Weber, and I have looked at the work of Berger and Luckmann, now it is time to put this information into a usable form in the shape of a model.

---

29. (...continued)

immersed in the writing of history and historians need to have an intensified analytical awareness. Using this as a starting point in sociological reconstructions is likely to be the most advantageous (1990:102). He argues for a broader investigation into the civilizational environment in which Christianity developed. This is a valid critique, and I have tried in my discussion on the Fourth Gospel to incorporate to some extent this broader civilizational environment. However there may be problems, by focusing on the broad aspects of the civilizational environment one may lose the specific context of the particular group that one is studying. The use of models in these studies could help, prevent these foci from becoming too broad to be of any use.



## **2.5 Model.**

This model is based on the above discussion on Weber, and includes elements from Burrige and Berger and Luckmann. The function of this model is to act as a guideline when working with Weber's theories on charisma and their subsequent development in the routinization of charisma and religious virtuosi. The next chapter on the background to John's Gospel will reflect some of this discussion on models. But the chapter on "mystical virtuosi in the Fourth Gospel" will make no explicit reference to this model.

### **2.5.1 A model based on Weber.**

If I simply limit myself to the above discussion on Weber, any model developed from that will reflect the following.

2.5.1.0.1A discussion of the historical situation, with particular reference to any elements which could or did give rise to feelings of discontentment.

2.5.1.0.2A discussion on a particular person that arose out of that historical setting exhibiting elements of charismatic leadership.

2.5.1.0.3Separate to the previous point will need to be an investigation into a group of followers of this charismatic leader. This discussion will have to look at all the aspects about the group.

2.5.1.0.4Then there will have to be an investigation into the activities of the leader and the group: did they go about changing the situation in which they arose

2.5.1.0.5Then I will have to investigate what happened when the leader died, or when the context which gave rise to the charismatic leader was taken care of.

2.5.1.0.6And finally, I will have to investigate what remains, if any, of the original group are still exhibited in the immediately following generations. Here the impact of religious virtuosi will be felt and will need to be investigated.

### **2.5.2 The model for this paper.**

It is necessary to develop a model that can be applied to the Gospel of John, and will also reflect the concern of this paper for the investigation of mystic virtuosi.

The various stages given below reflect a general breakdown of the model. The boundaries are not fixed between the various stages of the model. There is an ambiguity between the various phases. Each phase is characterised by definite elements, but the processes from the one to the other is not fixed and can take place in an undefinable manner. The only thing that is constant through the process is time. This all takes time, and there is nothing to prevent “set-backs” which could delay, if not derail, the process. I will expand the stage marked ‘religious virtuosi’ as this is the core of what I am investigating in this paper.

#### **STABLE TRADITION:**

The model begins and ends with a phase called “Stable Tradition.” This is the context in which charismatic leaders arise once a problem or discontentment, i.e., disintegration/malfunction, is perceived within this stable tradition. This is the problem that the leader will identify, and organize the people around, so that a change is implemented within that society. Here I will look at the background to the context, investigating the various influences on the particular society, and the people’s response to them. According to Berger and Luckmann, institutions are not created instantly, they always have a history (1966:54). In order to understand the institution of Christianity one therefore needs to have an understanding of the history that precessed it. In the section on the background to the Gospel I will investigate this more closely.

#### **CHARISMATIC LEADER:**

This is the phase in which the charismatic leader arises, and is identified, or reveals him/herself to the people. The leader will implement various strategies to bring about change in that society. Here I will investigate the characteristics of the charismatic leader, the people’s response to him/her, and what changes are brought about. One will also have to investigate the leader’s death, and how the community set about implementing a successor.

### CHARISMATIC COMMUNITY:

This brings us to the next stage. Through a variety of processes, which have been discussed, an institution is formed. The process may begin during the life of the leader, but is usually characteristic of the successor. Here it will be important to investigate the process of routinization or institutionalization. Here it will also be important to discuss what form of authority is left behind, whether legal/rational or traditional. I will also want to investigate the impact of this charismatic group on the society after the death of the charismatic leader. One will need to closely look at the leadership group of this group.

### RELIGIOUS VIRTUOSI:

In times of crisis there will arise within the group a desire to return to the original values of the charismatic leader, this has been discussed as a desire to maintain the charisma or attain salvation. This will be especially true if there is a great change in the group after the death of the leader. Also, if the needs of the group are not met by the succeeding leaders of that group, discontentment will arise. Again, this could be perceived as arising out of a stable tradition, or before a stable tradition is reached, there might be changes which reflect this desire to return to the values of the original leader. This stage has certain characteristics which can be described as follows: 'absolute flight from the world' this reflects a world view that is aided by the extrusion of all daily routines. Another characteristic will be a striving to achieve rest in the god, or the divine. This desire for a mystical union with the divine flows out of the 'absolute flight from the world.' Also there will be the possession of a mystical knowledge upon which intense reflection may take place. This contemplation of this mystical knowledge will result in the illumination of certain truths. This will result in a feeling of a unity of knowledge and volitional mood which provides the mystic with the assurance of his/her state of salvation.

## 2.6 Conclusion.

As we look ahead to the next chapters, we will see that there is great value in the sociological reading of the Bible. This chapter has shown the value of understanding sociological methods and models. These methods and models have been used by various scholars to delve the depths of the Bible and to produce meanings and understandings, not available before or without these methods.

We saw that there were various tools from the social sciences that could be applied to the New Testament. These tools all give different results, and this gives depth to ones understanding of the New Testament.

We then focused on Weber, and his sociology of authority, and in particular, charismatic authority. We discovered that a charismatic leader is person who arises in a time of disintegration of the stable tradition to address the needs of the people. There is an important link between the leader and the community. In this link lies the leaders authority, the community believes and the leader demonstrates the charisma. We looked at the process called “the routinization of charisma” and how this institutionalizes the community and in some cases the charisma itself.

### 3. THE HISTORY OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

#### 3.1 Introduction.

In the previous chapter I entered into a detailed discussion on the use of sociology in the study of the New Testament. This chapter demonstrates some of the results of the use of sociology when applied to the Fourth Gospel. This chapter looks at the background to the Fourth Gospel and the evidence for the existence of a community in John's Gospel. The section on the background focuses on three issues, viz., the various sources and influences on the Gospel, secondly, the authorship question is briefly touched on, and thirdly I look at the unity and composition of the Gospel. In this section I also enter into a debate with Brodie. Brodie has recently published two books on the Fourth Gospel, and I had the privilege of being lectured by him for a semester during this year. Brodie's position will be carefully set out and debated with. The second major section of this chapter, the issue of the Johannine community, focuses only on the evidence for the existence of such a community. I do not enter into any debate with any of the scholars, but try to summarise their views as succinctly as possible and then use this concept in the following chapter on mysticism in the Fourth Gospel.

The idea behind this chapter is to provide a backdrop against which to complete this thesis. Fundamental to my thesis is information and knowledge about the background of the Gospel, and this is needed to understand the next chapter.

#### 3.2 Background to John's Gospel.

In this, the first section of this chapter, I will investigate and examine the various items that relate to the background of the Gospel. Firstly I will investigate the various influences that may have had an impact on the Gospel, and on those people for whom the Gospel was written. The issue of sources does not come into this discussion, but features rather prominently in the discussion on the unity and composition of the Gospel. Secondly, I will look very briefly at the authorship and dating of the Gospel. This is mere presentation of a few views, and no debate is entered into. In

my opinion the question of authorship, as in trying to identify an author, is not essential to the thesis. The greater part of this section of the chapter is taken up by an investigation into the unity and composition of the Gospel. It is in this section that sources are discussed, whether the Gospel is the work of a single author or the work of a multiplicity of authors. With regard to the composition of the Gospel, I will enter into a debate with Thomas Brodie and examine some of his views, and shape my own.

### 3.2.1 Influences on the Fourth Gospel.

There are a number of proposed influences on the Fourth Gospel. Raymond Brown (1966) investigates Gnosticism (which he breaks down into Christian Gnosticism; and reconstructed pre-Christian Gnosticism); Hellenistic thought (in which he investigates Greek philosophy; Philo; and the Hermetic literature). He also examines Palestinian Judaism, here he focuses on the Old Testament, Rabbinic Judaism, and Qumran. Other scholars will refer to other influences, and I have mentioned these in the appropriate places.

Generally scholarship has tended to look beyond Palestine for the background to the Gospel, in keeping with the non-Jewish (or Palestinian) situation in which the Gospel appears to have been written.

And yet, though this may be true of the environment in and for which the Gospel was published, that is not to say that the Evangelist or the tradition he represents was native to that environment. When we look to the *background* of the Evangelist and his tradition, that is, to what actually lay behind him and shaped his thinking, rather than to the environment for which he was writing, I [Robinson] detect a growing readiness to recognize that this is not to be sought at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, in Ephesus or Alexandria, among the Gnostics or the Greeks. Rather, there is no compelling need to let our gaze wander very far, either in space or time, beyond a fairly limited area of southern Palestine in the fairly limited interval between the Crucifixion and the fall of Jerusalem. (Robinson 1962:98).

It is increasingly clear that within Palestine there was a great variety of traditions. Faithfulness to the Jewish tradition did not exclude an openness to other influences. As much as there can be found in the Fourth Gospel Hellenistic influences, the influences of the Old Testament must not be written off<sup>30</sup>. (Cullmann 1976:31).

### 3.2.1.0.1 Gnosticism

This discussion is broken down into a discussion on Christian gnosticism and reconstructed pre-Christian gnosticism. There is a major problem here in that Gnosticism as we know it is a nebulous concept. The concept of Christian Gnosticism is a second century phenomenon, and an investigation needs to be undertaken to examine which way the influence lies. (Brown 1966:liii). In other words, did John use the gnostic resources, or did the gnostics use John as a source. The second part of this discussion centres around reconstructed pre-Christian Gnosticism. This is Bultmann's proposal. He proposed the existence of 'Revelatory Discourse Source,' which was Gnostic in origins. This document was edited by an 'ex-gnostic' who made the document less

---

30. This does not mean that, "the current practise of seeking parallels between the Gospel of John and gnosticism, the Hermetic literature and Mandaeanism is by no means unjustified, even if the sources in which these parallels are thought to occur come from the Christian period and from areas outside Palestine. Still, some caution should be exercised in using writings of too late a date. The possibility must be considered that they have been influenced by the Gospel of John and not vice versa; the views developed in them could in fact derive from the Gospel itself" (Cullmann 1976:33). We may look for sources in that literature which definitely pre-dates the Gospel, such as Qumran, and perhaps a John the Baptist sect (if such a thing existed). Possibly also within the gnostic arena. "We reach the conclusion, then, that the milieu of the Gospel is to be seen as a Judaism influenced by syncretism in the area of Palestine and Syria. The home ground of the Johannine circle is to be sought here" (Cullmann 1976:38).



Gnostic. Another of Bultmann's inputs has been the doctrine of the "Redeemer Myth"<sup>31</sup> (1966:liv).

Despite a few similarities in language usage and a few similarities in form one cannot claim that John is dependent on a postulated early Oriental Gnosticism, the hypothesis does remain very tenuous and in some ways unnecessary. (1966:lvi). Brown hopes to show that these influences can be found in the influence of the Old Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.

### 3.2.1.0.2 Hellenistic thought

The discussion is here broken down into Greek Philosophy, the influence of Philo, and the influence of the Hermetic literature. The influence of Greek Philosophy (especially Plato and Stoicism) has been widely held by older scholars.<sup>32</sup> Undoubtedly these parallels exist, but again one needs to be aware that much of Judaism of the time was influenced by these thoughts. (1966:lvi). Barrett adds to this discussion by mentioning the so called 'Mystery Religions', he claims that there may be influences but there are no definite parallels (1978:36). In the case of Philo it is known that Philo was a contemporary of Jesus, but the evidence of his influence on first century Palestine is questionable. Brown argues that Philo represents the culmination of a long line of Jewish and Greek thought, built in the syncretism of Alexander. Wilson argues that this tradition was shared.

31. "The Gnostic view of the world starts out from a strictly cosmic dualism. Life and death, truth and falsehood, salvation and ruin of human life are anchored in the cosmos. In it the divine world of light and the demonic power of darkness stand over against one another. In the primeval time a part of the light fell into the power of the darkness. In order to be able to maintain their hold on the light, the evil powers created the world and human bodies. They divided the imprisoned being of light into mere sparks of light, and banned these parts of life to the physical world. In order to redeem and bring home this lost creature of the light, the good God of life sends the saving knowledge (Gnosis) into the world. By illuminating man as to his true origin and his true being, this knowledge bestows on him the power to return to the heavenly homeland after he puts off his body. In this connection the figure of a Redeemer is often met with, who is sent by the Father, mostly in the primeval time, to impact the Knowledge. Under his word men separate themselves into the children of light, who are from above, and the children of darkness, who do not bear any soul of light in themselves. After his completed work of redemption the Redeemer ascends again and so makes a way for the elements of light that follow him" (Bultmann 1971:8). Meeks agrees with Bultmann in that there is certainly some influence of gnosticism in the Gospel, but there is a question of dependancy. Meeks looks at the Redeemer Myth and acknowledges that the ascent/descent motif could reflect this, but its source is more likely to be in Jewish wisdom tradition. (1986:141ff)

32. This thought is also reflected by Barrett (1978:34-35). He claims that the influence of Plato is evident in John's Gospel. But this is not pure Platonism, but rather the perversion of Platonic thought brought about during the first century BC, and the first century AD.

The Philonian reflections on the *logos* are probably the culmination of a long history of such thought. Moreover, both Philo and John draw on the Old Testament, and in the concept of *logos* they both draw on the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament. It is not surprising, therefore, that at times their thought develops along parallel lines. But when one comes to essential methodological procedure, Philo and John are far apart. (1966:lvii).

The discovery of the body of literature known as the *Hermetica*, has caused widespread excitement. There are widespread parallels, but once again the literature is later than John, and the direction of influence needs to be examined. (1966:lvii).

### 3.2.1.0.3 The Old Testament.

Although John has less direct quotes than the Synoptic gospels, the evidence of the influence of the Old Testament is clear. Many great themes from the Old Testament are picked up by John, such as Moses and the Exodus. Many of John's quotations are references from the prophets. The Wisdom Literature<sup>33</sup> plays an important role in John's Gospel. (1966:lix). There are extensive uses of symbols from the Old Testament<sup>34</sup> (both LXX and Hebrew). "The Old Testament, therefore, so well known and understood that John could use it not piecemeal but as a whole,..." (Barrett 1978:30). The stream of apocalypticism was influential on John. Especially since it was currently moving in the Jewish tradition of the time.

It might seem at a first glance that John bears no relation at all to the apocalyptic literature; this, however, is not so. It must in the first place be recognized that apocalyptic is not exclusively concerned with the future. Apocalypse means the unveiling of secrets; very frequently the secrets disclose future events, but sometimes they make known present facts, especially facts regarding the life of heaven, divine and angelic beings, and the like. The two kinds of secret pass over into one another, since an unveiling of what is eternally present in heaven may well indicate what may be expected to happen in the future on earth... Certainly, in this place and in others like it John is not simply writing in the Old Testament tradition;

---

33. The reference to Wisdom in Proverbs 8 is seen to be reflected in the Prologue of the Gospel.

34. This can be seen in the reference to Moses lifting up the snake in the wilderness (Num 21:4) and in John 3:14 in Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus.

Greek and other non-Jewish influences have helped to mould his thought. But these influences were also at work upon Jewish apocalyptic, and the parallelism between John and apocalyptic writers is not invalidated by such facts (1978:31).

#### 3.2.1.0.4 Rabbinic Judaism and Qumran.

The emergence of Rabbinic documents are normally postulated as later than John, but the thoughts that produced these documents must have existed with Judaism at the time of John<sup>35</sup>. The strong influence of Judaism (whether Rabbinic or Old Testament) implies that the author was familiar with these traditions, and could have lived inside Palestine. (Brown 1966:lx). (See also Barrett 1978:32).

The discovery of the Qumran scrolls has greatly increased our understanding of the sectarian nature of various Jewish groups. This has again increased our awareness of the possible sectarian nature of John's community<sup>36</sup>. The greatest focus of the parallels between John and Qumran has been the dualism that the two communities seem to share. In 1QS 3<sup>37</sup>, we see that two Spirits are 'allotted' to humanity. A Spirit of truth (light) and a Spirit of falsehood (darkness). These are sometimes referred to as angels. Humanity then falls into either of the two 'groups' associated with these Spirits. There is constant conflict between these two groups. John assumes a dualism that is similar to this, but does not give many explicit details concerning the dualism found in the Fourth Gospel. Two worlds are assumed, the world above (ἄνωθεν) and the world below. The

---

35. Brown does not seem to raise the same objections to the influence of Rabbinic teaching as he does with the influence of the *Hermetica*. Both bodies of literature date from after the Fourth Gospel, so why is it alright for the influence of the Rabbinic teaching to be present in Palestine, while not for the influence of the *Hermetica*?

36. The sectarian nature of John's community is discussed later in this chapter.

37. 1QS 3:13-4:26. Here is a short section of this passage. "The Master shall instruct the sons of light and shall teach them the nature of all the children of men according to the kind of Spirit which they possess, the signs identifying their works during their lifetime, their visitation for chastisement, and the time of their rewards. From the God of Knowledge comes all that is and shall be. Before ever they existed He established their whole design, and when, as ordained for them, they come into being, it is in accord with His glorious design that they accomplish their task without change. The laws of all things are in His hand and He provides them with all their needs. He has created man to govern the world, and has appointed for him two Spirits in which to walk until the time of His visitation: the Spirits of truth and falsehood. Those born of truth spring from a fountain of light, but those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness. All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light, but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness and walk in the ways of darkness... (1QS 3:13-15). (Vermes 1987:64-5).

world above is the place from which all things come (John 1:3,10) and from which and to which angels ascend and descend (John 1:51; 3:13). The account of the trial before Pilate also plays on these themes. These two worlds have representative viz., Christ and the "world." James Charlesworth (1972) examines these similarities between the Fourth Gospel and Qumran and talks about a unique similarity:

The conclusion to our critical analysis and comparison of the dualism in 1QS 3:13-4:26 and the "dualism" in John is that John did not borrow from the Essene cosmic and communal theology. But this conclusion does not exhaust the possible relation between John and 1QS. We have seen that John has apparently been directly influenced by Essene terminology. Moreover, Qumranic concepts would have been refracted by the prism of John's originality and deep conviction that Jesus is the Messiah so that potentially parallel concepts would be deflected. It is precisely this prism effect that explains why there is no "Spirit of Perversity" in John, and why the term "perpetual life" appears, because of the cosmic dimension of Jesus' resurrection, as "eternal life". These observations lead me to conclude that John probably borrowed some of his dualistic terminology and mythology from 1QS 3:13-4:26. (Charlesworth 1972:104).

The parallels between John and Qumran can be explained by a common reference to the Old Testament. But there are parallels that are not to be found in the Old Testament and these must be examined<sup>38</sup>. It is these types of parallels that need to be investigated. Also these parallel other apocryphal writings, such as the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. Another parallel is the idea of "brotherly" love. "In our judgment the parallels are not close enough to suggest a direct literary dependence of John upon the Qumran literature, but they do suggest Johannine familiarity with the type of thought exhibited in the scrolls."<sup>39</sup> (Brown 1966:lxiii).

38. Articles on the relation between John and Qumran have singled out modified dualism as one of the most important parallels. In the Qumran literature there are two principles created by God who are locked in struggle to dominate mankind until the time of divine intervention. They are the prince of lights (also called the Spirit of truth and the holy Spirit) and the angel of darkness (the Spirit of perversion). In John's thought Jesus has come into the world as the light to overcome the darkness (1: 4-5, 9), and all men must choose between light and darkness (3:19-21) (Brown 1966:lxii) (cf Charlesworth 1972 and Leaney 1966).

39. Barrett would also add to this list of influences the possibility of a Judean source and a Passion source. This puts it in a slightly different category from mere influences. Despite this, Barrett concludes that the Fourth Gospel defies analysis into its sources. The only continuous source (other than Mark) cannot be traced. There is a general impression of unity, but also evident are indications of disunity (Barrett 1978:22).

At the end of this section we can see that there were a number of possible influences on the community of the Fourth Gospel. These influences extended from Gnosticism through to Old Testament traditions. In the process of interpreting and working with the Gospel all these influences need to be carried consciously in the mind of the interpreter. I shall endeavour to do this when I come to the next chapter on mysticism in the Fourth Gospel.

### 3.2.2 Authorship and date.

The Gospel itself gives no clear answer as to who wrote it. At the end of chap.21 the following statement is made: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία ἐστίν. Ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἓν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία (v 24-25). This would seem to imply that it is the Beloved Disciple who writes the Gospel. But this is by no means certain. Bultmann makes the following summary from the evidence that he studies: the Beloved disciple becomes equated with John, son of Zebedee, brother of James. This John is reported to have died at a very old age at Ephesus. However, John, son of Zebedee, was killed as a young man by the Judeans, this is attested to by several witnesses of the ancient church. (1971:11). The Gospel itself makes no claim to have been written by an eyewitness. Papias refers to a Presbyter John (possible author of Revelation). It is possible that this is the result of confusion between these two characters. There is no definite answer as to who the author is. Bultmann suggests that the time of composition be placed between 80-120 AD. The suggested place, based on Semitic style, is Syria. There is no evidence for composition in Egypt or Asia Minor. (1971:11-12).

If we look briefly at the external evidence, we see that the earliest papyrus (P<sup>52</sup>) discovered in Egypt, dates back to between 100-150 AD. And other early papyri (P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>) all found in Egypt, and all dating to the early part of the third century AD. Codices, generally dated later than the papyri, also give evidence of widespread use of the text of John's Gospel by the fourth century (N; B; C; D). This evidence points to a general usage, in Egypt at least, by the beginning of the third century. This means that John must have achieved some sort of reputation, and indicates a

relatively early date for writing. I, along with many scholars i.e., Brown, Meeks, Martyn, suggest between 90-100 AD. This date does not leave much room for the use of the other synoptics as sources, as they had only just been written as well. Mark about 70AD, and Matthew and Luke soon thereafter.

All this section does is show that the name of the author is vague, and cannot be known, and that the Gospel is later than the synoptics, but relatively early in comparison to other dates put forward. Any links between the author of this Gospel and the author of the book of revelation, remain speculative, and are beyond the scope of this thesis. I propose that for the sake of simplicity, that I continue to name the author as John, not implying an identifiable figure.

### **3.2.3 Unity and composition of the Gospel of John.**

The unity and composition of the Fourth Gospel is a question that has received wide investigation. For Brown the major question is, whether the Gospel of John is the work of a single person or not. He gives three reasons as to why this is improbable. Firstly, there are differences of Greek style in the Gospel. Secondly, there are breaks and inconsistencies in the sequence of events i.e., geographical jumps. Thirdly, "there are repetitions in the discourse, as well as passages that clearly do not belong to their context. At times, the evangelist's economy of style is truly impressive, but at other times what has been said seems to be repeated over again in only slightly different terms." (1966:xxiv). Barrett would add to this by discussing these various 'dislocations.'

The narrative does not always proceed straightforwardly; some of the connections are bad, and sometimes there are no connections at all. Occasionally a piece seems to be out of its proper setting. It is on the basis of these observations that theories of accidental displacement of parts of the Gospel, and of editorial redaction, have been founded (1978:22).

There is a problem in trying to distinguish these various 'dislocations'. Almost all those scholars who concern themselves about this, disagree on where these 'dislocations' occur. For example, Bultmann throws out much of the Gospel that seems to be sacramentally based. Is it not rather Bultmann's theology that causes him to argue in this way? Likewise with Barret, when he argues

that John was a 'profound theologian', what does he mean, and why? One can undoubtedly identify points in the Gospel which do not flow from previous points. But to base an entire hypothesis regarding 'dislocations' on this is seemingly futile. It is better to work with the Gospel as we have it, rather than to disregard a large portion of it. Bultmann's aversion to the so called 'sacramental redactor' has caused him to disregard a fair portion of the Gospel, and this is also linked to his theology<sup>40</sup>.

Neither displacement theories nor redaction theories are needed to explain the present state of the Gospel, in which certain roughnesses undoubtedly remain, together with an undoubted impression of a vigorous unity of theme... It shows the a genuine unity of language and style, which is no more than the outward expression of an inward unity of thought and purpose; but this unity was imposed upon material drawn in the first place from a variety of sources, and composed, it may be, over a fairly considerable period... The evangelist was, however, aided in his work by two principles which tended strongly towards unification. In the first place, he possessed an extraordinary grasp of the theological significance of the earlier tradition as a whole. He was able to see its total significance in its parts; to present, not a miscellaneous collection of the deeds and words of Jesus, but a unified conception of his person, which shone out in various ways in the several traditions about him. In the second place, he was impelled by a purpose which gave unity to his work. In an age when the first formulations of the Christian faith were seen by some to be unsatisfactory, when gnosticism in its various forms was perverting the Gospel and adopting it for its own uses, he attempted and achieved the essential task of setting forth the faith once delivered to the saints in the new idiom, for the winning of new converts to the church, for the strengthening of those who were unsettled by the new winds of doctrine, and for the more adequate exposition of the faith itself (Barrett 1978:26).

In the next section we investigate some of the solutions to the problems mentioned above.

---

40. Admittedly, my discussion will also ignore or work around certain passages which do not fit my method, but at least I will not claim that because they do not fit my method, they therefore should not belong to the Gospel. It is impossible to take account of every passage and every section of the Gospel. A certain amount will be worked around.



### 3.2.3.1 Explanations.

There have been various attempts to try and solve the differing problems encountered with the shape of John's Gospel. What follows is a setting out of a few attempts to solve these 'dislocations' and to produce a 'better' form of the Gospel.

#### 3.2.3.1.1 Theories of accidental displacements.

This theory is based upon the idea that the Gospel was arranged on sheets of paper, much as a book, and during the course of time these sheets of paper were placed in the wrong order. The solution would then be to rearrange these section to best fit the most suitable order.

Perhaps the simplest solution to the difficulties found in John is to rearrange parts of the Gospel. From the time of Tatian (ca. 175) to the present day, scholars have thought that by moving passages around they could put John into consecutive order. Their usual presupposition has been that some accident displaced passages and destroyed the original order, thus creating the confusion that we now find in the Gospel. Since there is absolutely no evidence in any of the textual witnesses for any other order than that which we now possess, it must be assumed that this accidental displacement happened before the Gospel was published. And generally it is assumed that it took place after the death or in the absence of the evangelist; for were he available, he could easily have restored his original order (Brown 1966:xxvi).

We need to be aware of three precautions when adopting the attitude that the segments of John's Gospel can be rearranged: Firstly, the rearrangements will reflect the interests and theologies of the commentator (as in the case of Bultmann above); secondly many scholars are convinced that the present arrangement does make sense (as in the case of Brodie below); thirdly theories of displacement do not account for how these displacements took place (the theory proposed by Martyn and amended by Brown). So in the light of these problems, there must be another method of looking at the problems with the Gospel of John.

### 3.2.3.1.2 Theories of multiple sources<sup>41</sup>.

Again, if one believes that the Fourth Gospel's sequence can be improved upon, then it could be that the evangelist used a number of different sources, which he combined.

If the fourth evangelist combined several independent sources, some of the stylistic differences, as well as the lack of sequence and the presence of duplications, can be accounted for. In the recent forms of the source theory it is customarily supposed that the evangelist composed none of the sources himself but received them from elsewhere. It is also usually proposed that these sources were written, for oral sources would have been rendered in the evangelist's own style and thus be more difficult to discern. Frequently a theory that conceives of the Gospel as the composite of a combination of sources has been joined with a theory that views the Gospel as having undergone several editions or redactions... (1966:xxix).

Bultmann is the famous scholar who proposed a number of sources, and set out the content of these different sources, among these proposals was the so called 'Miracle Source' or otherwise called the 'Signs Source', and the 'Discourse Source.' On this account it is presumed that the author used a revelation discourse from which he fashioned the speeches and discussions in the Gospel. One cannot define the exact content of this source, and in a similar fashion one cannot define exactly how the author shaped the source (Bultmann 1971:7).

The independent existence of such a source [a 'sign' source] cannot, Bultmann agrees, be demonstrated on linguistic grounds (though it may be confirmed by them), but it is possible to see from time to time indications of the evangelist's editing. Not for him the source's crude faith in the wonder-worker; rather, he understands the signs as a symbolic representation of the revelation made by Jesus, which like the discourses, challenged men to a decision about himself (Barrett 1978:20).

---

41. There is a distinction between a source and an influence although this distinction may at times become blurred. What I mean by influences, discussed above under section 3.2.1. is the impact various mind sets would have had on the Gospel. By sources, I am concerning myself more with the sources the author would have used for the work.

Barrett makes the following commitment about this<sup>42</sup>.

John's use of a Discourse Source is as unprovable as his use of a Signs Source; and the existence of the former is perhaps less probable than the existence of the latter. To say this however is not to deny either that synoptic and other *logia* underlie the discourses, or that the discourses (together with the corresponding signs) may have had an independent existence before the publication of the Gospel. The hypothesis that they were in the first place sermons delivered by the evangelist and subsequently arranged in the Gospel has much to commend it; but this is very different from the hypothesis that the discourse material was derived by John from an earlier source (1978:20-21).

If we adopt the theory of Bultmann, we need to be aware of the following criticism levelled at him by Brown: Firstly, the signs and the discourses are woven together; secondly, there are embedded in the discourses sayings which belong to Jesus, and when compared to the synoptics can be traced to the earliest tradition; thirdly the stylistic variations among the sources are not verifiable; fourth there is very little in the way of sources which support Bultmann's theory in antiquity (1966:xxxix).

The most obvious source for the Gospel would be the synoptic gospels. However, it is impossible to show that a literary dependency exists between the Gospel of John, and the synoptics. It is sufficient to presume that the author of John knew the traditions and drew on them without necessarily having them in front of him in literary form<sup>43</sup> (Cullmann 1976:5).

### 3.2.3.1.3 Theories of multiple editions.

Basically it states that the body of John's Gospel has been edited several times, either completely or in minor parts (Brown 1966:xxxix). This theory is often combined with the two already mentioned above. Cullmann suggests that chap. 21 reflects that at least two different people worked on the Gospel. (1976:2). Again at the end of chap. 14 there is a break in the flow indicating that chap. 15-17 were added later. We need to question whether this insertion was

---

42. I have included a section in which I dialogue with Brodie the relative value of all these sources.

43. I enter into a discussion with Brodie about this at a later stage.

made by the author at a later stage or by the redactor (editor) of chap. 21. Some suggest that the Gospel underwent more than one redaction. Some scholars suggest that the same author undertook this, and other scholars suggest that it was done by different people. These redactions are consistent with different times and places and theological developments within the author and/or the community ('circle'). (1976:3).

Nevertheless, we may keep in mind the factor which is important for the hypothesis of a 'Johannine circle': the author had disciples who appear as redactors in the production and revision of the Gospel. It can be demonstrated that even before, and during the composition of his book he could rely on a group of like-minded people and perhaps even on their written contributions. (1976:5).

Cullmann talks rather of Johannine traditions than sources. There is the common Christian tradition popularized in the synoptics, but then also special traditions only common to the Johannine circle.

The author was not content to merely put these various traditions together. He wanted to produce a unified work, and there amalgamated the sources in a unified way. (1976:7). This is not much different from the next solution that I will present, but this solution says very little about the stages of development of the community. I am, at the moment, taking for granted that such a community existed, though this is by no means a given, and I will discuss it later.

A slightly different approach to the problem has been undertaken by Brown. Rather than regarding the work as a series of editions, Brown also recognises that the work had multiple stages of development. The difference is slight, but it does shift the focus to the development of the Gospel. Brown proposes to comment on the Gospel in its present form. He proposes five stages<sup>44</sup>: First, the existence of a body of traditional material pertaining to the words and works of Jesus; second, the development of this material to reflect the Johannine situation; third, the organization of this material into a consecutive Gospel. This would be classified as the first edition; fourth, a second edition by the evangelist; fifth, a final edition by a redactor. Someone other than the evangelist. (1966:xxxiv).

---

44. As interesting as this idea is, it needs to be investigated more completely. Brown does not seem to provide the necessary information that would suggest why these various changes took place, or why two editions of the Gospel were written.

By all accounts, this solution seems to receive the widest acceptance, but there are some problems, and I will discuss these now. I am able to agree with Brown up to and including point three. There is no reason to doubt that the author collected material, whether oral or literary, and then amalgamated them into a Gospel, but because of the literary unity of the Gospel, and by all accounts the Gospel does seem to flow from beginning to end, there is no need for a multiplicity of redactors, depending on the various stages the community went through. The single author could have written the Gospel over a lengthy period of time, and in that manner incorporated the various outside influences into his/her Gospel. A key point is the relation of the Gospel to the context or situation of the community or author. As I will mention while dialoguing with Brodie later, it is not possible for a single person to shut himself up in a library and write a Gospel that is devoid of any relation to the outside world. John's Gospel more than any other, I think, reflects a close interaction of the text with the events or context of the community and author. It is my proposal that the author of the Gospel, wrote the Gospel over a lengthy period of time, and that he/she belonged to a close community of believers, and that the Gospel reflects the interaction, or lack of interaction of this community with the "world" outside.

### **3.2.3.2 Relation to the synoptics.**

There is an increasing tendency to take seriously the unique content of the Fourth Gospel. Brodie is one such person who believes that the Gospel is the work of a single author who carefully crafted the Gospel to suit his own theological purpose. In this section I will dialogue with Brodie and argue with the concept of literary unity. With regard to the question of dependency between the synoptics and John, Brown concludes that John tends to agree with Mark and with Luke more frequently than with Matthew.

If one cannot accept the hypothesis of a careless or a capricious evangelist who gratuitously changed, added, and subtracted details, then one is forced to agree with Dodd that the evangelist drew the material for his stories from an independent tradition, similar to but not the same as the traditions represented in the Synoptic Gospels (Brown 1966:xliv).

Bultmann would argue that there are differences between John and the synoptics and these include that John is more Semitic. This does not mean that John was written in Aramaic, but it does

suggest that there was a strong Semitic influence on the writer of the Gospel. The polemical situation also reflects a shift from that found in the Synoptics. The Judeans still remain in opposition to Jesus, but there is this contrast over-against them with Jesus (and his disciples) appearing as non-Judeans. Looking form-critically:

The collections of sayings in the Synoptic Gospels consist preponderately of isolated logia, frequently brought together, of course, to form sermonic compositions and parables. John's Gospel, on the contrary, contains continuous sermons, in which occasionally individual and originally independent logia may be found, firmly entrenched (Bultmann 1971:4).

For Bultmann the most striking difference between the Synoptics and John, is in their theologies. For the Synoptics, the focus seems to be on the sovereignty of God, the Son of man (the Human Being), the time of the end, the validity of the Law, the right of forgiveness of sins, ethical behaviour, missionary service, order in the community, the right sort of prayer, the use of sacraments, and many other subjects. In John, Bultmann claims the subject is singular, the person of Jesus<sup>45</sup> (1971:5).

Barrett would argue that there must have been some dependency between John and Mark. He assembles evidence that may reflect that John had at least read Mark before he wrote his Gospel. Although this does not amount to 'literary' dependancy, it shows a strong dependancy between John and Mark. Brodie agrees strongly with Barrett (1993b 30-33).

It cannot be said that the data that have now been collected amount to proof that John knew and used as a source our second Gospel, but they do seem sufficient to make plausible the view that John had read Mark, thought that it contained a suitable Gospel outline and often - perhaps involuntarily - echoed Mark's phrases when writing about the same events (Barrett 1978:45).

But Barrett qualifies his own view when he claims that the evidence cannot *prove* that John read Mark. One could base the evidence of similarities on the oral tradition or even an *Ur-Gospel*, and

---

45. This may or may not be correct, it is not the point. But the list of theologies for the Synoptics listed by Bultmann, seem to reflect his own theology. In order to determine the theologies of the Gospels one needs to be very aware of your own starting point. This is not an easy task.



the same arguments would come into play as are displayed in the so called 'synoptic problem'. There is also some similarities between John and Luke. (1978:45).

It seems that there are differences between John and the synoptics on the basic flow of history. According to Barrett, this may simply be that John changed the course of events and the dating of these events to fit in with his theology (1978:51)<sup>46</sup>.

Brown concludes by summarizing. The material narrated in John does not favour dependence on the Synoptics or their sources. John drew on an independent source of the tradition about Jesus, which was similar to that found in the Synoptics.

The primitive Johannine tradition was closest to the pre-Markan tradition but also contained elements found in the sources peculiar to Matthew (e.g., Petrine source) and to Luke. In addition to the material drawn from this independent tradition, John has a few elements that seem to suggest a direct borrowing from the Synoptic tradition. During the oral formation of the Johannine stories and discourses (Stage 2), there very probably was some cross-influence from the emerging Lucan Gospel tradition. Perhaps, although we are not convinced of this, in the final redaction of John (Stage 5) there were a few details directly borrowed from Mark (1966:xlvi).

Brodie advocates the concept of "free writing of sacred history". This is a novel idea, and finds much credence in the historical context. But the downplaying of the oral tradition to the extent of disregarding it all together, has its limitations. (1993b:41).

Brodie's starting point is the literary unity of the Gospel. The increased awareness and appreciation of this unity does away with the claims about processes of redaction and various other explanations as to the composition of the Gospel (1993b:25). Brodie argues for a literary dependence of John on Mark, and possibly other sources (such as Matthew, Luke-Acts, and Ephesians). He argues against the concept of 'independence' as an ambiguous concept.

---

46. The more I read Barrett, the more confused I get. He fits the facts into his theology and ideas. He is not being true to the evidence, there are contradictory statements in his work, and he is being rather fundamentalist.



The fact that he is so thoroughly independent of Mark and the other synoptics does not, in fact, settle the issue of whether or not he is also dependent on them, of whether or not, like an independent offspring, he has absorbed them into himself and rendered them into new form. What is needed therefore is close inspection (1993b:28).

The dependence of John's Gospel on Mark in particular, or the other synoptics in general, is argued forcibly by Brodie. He applies his thesis of a 'free-rewriting of sacred history' to John's Gospel.

The fourth evangelist was a wide-ranging writer, in some ways encyclopaedic, who sought to produce a new theological synthesis, and who in doing so used a diverse range of sources - some non-canonical material, the Old Testament, at least one epistle (Ephesians), and, above all, the synoptics, especially Mark. (1993b:30).

Brodie draws on the history of writing and literature for the bases of his thesis. He draws on the work of Virgil's Aeneid as an imitation and emulation of Homer's Odyssey and Iliad. He discusses the prevalence of this type of writing in the last half of the first century BC. He then examines how the author of the Gospel of John, in a similar manner, imitated and emulated the other gospels (particularly Mark) and other material, canonical and non-canonical (1993b:43ff).

These were not reclusive authors, to be discovered in later generations by esoteric literary circles. They were at the centre of public life. Even the retiring Virgil was well known and was befriended by the emperor; his work was being taught in Roman schools even before his death. (1993b:43).

As true as this may be, what evidence is there to suggest that John had access to such material and support that would have allowed him to become the equivalent of a recluse to sit and write a Gospel. Virgil, and undoubtedly Cicero had the support of at least one patron, possibly more, and were reasonably well kept, and financed so as to write their respective works. The same can be said of Josephus, who is closer to the time of the writing of John's Gospel, who was kept by the emperor Vespasian, whom he had 'predicted' would become emperor. It is unlikely that John would have had access to such resources in the writing of his Gospel. I am not suggesting that

John's Gospel is not a literary unit, I am just asking whether Brodies' hypothesis that John used a literary copy of Mark on which to base his Gospel is a valid hypothesis. When we discuss the literary dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark and Q, we base this discussion on the verbal similarities between these gospels, no such verbal similarities exist between Mark and John. If John was rewriting 'sacred history' as Brodie suggests, why does he not include direct verbal 'quotes' from Marks' Gospel?

Brodie gives a test case based on John 9 and Mark 8:11-9:8. Yes, there are certain similarities between John and Mark in these two sections, they both include a healing of a blind man. But unfortunately that is where the similarities stop. A surface reading of the two sections does not indicate any deeper similarity than that. Each section has literary merits of its own. One cannot deny that, but to argue that the advancing drama of Mark and John reflect a literary dependence of John on Mark is not based on the evidence of the text. One cannot start with theology as Brodie does, one must start with four separate gospels, each unique in content, except the three synoptics, whose similarities are well documented on verbal agreements. To argue using Hellenistic practises with regards to writing, when the examples of the New Testament that we have demonstrate a different method of constructing literature is not good. We have a perfectly good example of Matthew and Luke using Mark. One can't, I don't think, call it imitation and emulation, but that is how the other two gospels were constructed using Mark. Just because John is also a Gospel, telling a story based on the same person as recorded in Mark, does not mean that John used a literary copy of Mark's Gospel. Rather we should allow for a unique Gospel, that has no literary dependency on Mark or Matthew for that matter. A Gospel that tells a similar story in its own way reflecting its own situation and method<sup>47</sup>.

---

47. "At this point it is relevant to indicate the hermeneutical issue raised by the question of John's historical relationship to the other gospels. Whether or not the Fourth Evangelist wrote with knowledge of the Synoptics, and whatever his intention with respect to them, the church ultimately accepted John's Gospel as a part of the canon of scripture alongside and in conjunction with the Synoptic Gospels. Therefore, the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in its original purpose and intent is one thing, but the interpretation of that Gospel in its canonical content may be something else. The possibility, suggested by Käsemann, that the Gospel of John was accepted precisely because in the passage of time it was misunderstood, cannot be ruled out *a priori*. But if that is the case, is the interpretation of John in the church of necessity the continuation of that misinterpretation? On these terms a positive answer to this question can scarcely be avoided, at least in principle, but the sharpness of the question and the alternative it implies (historical or churchly exegesis) will be mitigated somewhat if it can be shown that the purpose and character of John is a function of historical circumstances different from those of the Synoptics, rather than of a fundamentally antithetical theological insight or intent" (Moody Smith 1977:371).

I am all in favour of regarding the Gospel of John as a literary unit. This literary unit could have been produced by a single author, and I am of the opinion that it was, but this is not necessary. But I would advocate, as I have above, that this writing took place over a long period of time, and that the changes in the authors' context were reflected in the writing. And so the Gospel functions in a particular way for the community in which and for which it was written (See below, Meeks). It is the intention to show that the function of John was different to the function of the synoptics. That the mysticism of John was perceived differently. This does not answer the question about the literary unity of the Gospel, I believe that there is a literary unity, but not in the way construed by Brodie. I go on now to examine the community behind the Gospel.

### 3.3 Community in John's Gospel.

The existence of a community behind the writing of the Gospel has long been debated. Many scholars such as Brown, Martyn, and Meeks take the existence of this community for granted. In this section of the thesis I will discuss, all be it briefly, the evidence that points to such a community. Through out this thesis I have translated the Greek word Ἰουδαῖοι with the English word "Judeans" in place of the normal translation of "Jews." This idea was developed in a series of lectures given by Thomas Brodie (1995), it is also found in his work on John's Gospel (1993a).

In opposition to the theory about the community of John's Gospel, Brodie presents the following picture. After his detailed analysis of the links between John, and Matthew, Mark, Luke-Acts, and Ephesians, Brodie proposes a new *sitz im Leben* for John's Gospel. For Brodie, John's purpose becomes an appeal to all Christians regardless of their diversity.

This universality of purpose is indicated by two main factors - universality of sources, and universality of applicability. Concerning John's sources their full range is not yet known, but even at this stage they show such a wide diversity that they imply an interest which is universal. Universality of applicability refers to the fact that to a significant degree the Gospel is organised on a basis which appeals to everyone - that of the structure of a human life. Furthermore it has been shown throughout the centuries, in thousands of diverse social settings, that this Gospel

does, in fact, have an extraordinary wide appeal. If it frequently confronts the unbelieving Jews, that does not make it narrow, for "Jews" has a further wider meaning, and the confrontation or challenge applies to everybody. The characters in the Gospel are such that, when one pauses to assess one's life, one or another of these characters can act as a mirror, critical yet sympathetic, for the state of one's soul. It was not without reason that, for a long period in the life of much of the church, the prologue was read at every Eucharist. And it is not without reason that, as Hoskyns (20) implies, John's Gospel may be read to all, including the poor and the dying. (1993b:142-143).

Brodie then develops his ideas on the community. Basically, he claims that there is no distinct community, but because of the universality of the Gospel, it has a universal community. He reduces the concept of the community from a particular specific group of people, to a universal non-specific world of people.

John is distinct in several ways, but most of all at the basic level of plot - the level which tells the story of Jesus. John's story is independent, quite distinct from the synoptics; and so the hypothesis has been put forward that John relied on an independent historical tradition (see esp. Dodd, 1963). Once it became credible that, apart from the mainline tradition of the synoptics, there was another tradition which was independent, then it was plausible to suggest that the distinct tradition was based in a distinct community. But the historical tradition found in John is not independent. The reliance on the synoptics is pervasive. What is independent is John's reshaping of the tradition, his reworking of it in order to develop his theological vision. In his own way he was just as closely involved with Matthew, Mark, and Luke as they were with one another. Thus the idea of an independent historical tradition is left without its foundation. This implies that in the quest for the historical Jesus, John makes no perceptible contribution. If he reflects the historical Jesus he does so only to the extent that he reflects aspects of whatever may be historical in the synoptics. If there is no tradition of independent history then the hypothesis of an independent community becomes less necessary. And what applies to history may be applied also to other aspects of the Gospel, particularly to its theology: the independence, though real, requires very little

explanation other than the evangelist's creativity in reworking diverse sources and forming a new synthesis. (1993b: 144).

Regardless of how dependent John might have been on the synoptics, surely some independent community must have existed, even if within that community the synoptic tradition was viable. John might have reworked a community synoptic tradition. This still gives rise to an independent community with an independent theology, with an independent history.

The social sciences provide important reminders that documents do not come out of the void; in varying degrees they reflect the contemporary situation in society, and, in varying degrees, by reading them carefully it is possible to discern something about their social setting. This is true also of the fourth Gospel; it reflects aspects of a specific social situation, and, to that extent at least, it reflects a specific community. But that need not mean either that the community was narrow, or that the community was the primary force in composing the Gospel. There is nothing, in principle, which prevents the community from being the whole human race. And there is nothing, in principle, which prevents the writer, despite an acute awareness of all of humanity, from being highly individualistic. (1993b:145-146).

Brodie claims that the community of the Fourth Gospel is a universal community, but no such universal community existed then, and even now no such thing as the 'whole of humanity' or an undifferentiated community exists. Even in our world of ever decreasing distances between people, no such global community exists, even though we talk about the 'global village.' However we may enjoy the Gospel as being universal, it was definitely not written as such<sup>48</sup>. The social sciences do require of us to ask questions that relate to the production of texts. In the case of John, these questions must be asked about the community behind the Gospel. These questions must be asked as to the relationship between the text when it was written and the context in which it was written. Not the context in which we read it today, a context of universality.

---

48. Even if the author claims to be writing for a universal community, that author cannot avoid writing in the context in which he/she is situated. And this context will impact on the work been written.



Brown encourages us to read the Gospel on different levels. On one level it tells the story of Jesus, on another level it tells the story of the community. "Wellhausen and Bultmann were pioneers in insisting that the Gospels tell us primarily about the church situation in which they were written, and only secondarily about the situation of Jesus which *prima facie* they describe." (Brown 1979:17).

Brown is critical of past research into the Fourth Gospel. He investigates a new approach, one which looks at the chronology of the development of the church or community of the Fourth Gospel. This new approach throws up three stages in the development of the Gospel: Firstly, the pre-Gospel stage and the origins of the Johannine community and their relation to Jewish and Jewish-Christian groups. (Mid first century); Secondly, at the end of the century, in the Jamnia period<sup>49</sup> when the Gospel was written, the relation of the Johannine community to the synagogues and to other Christian communities; thirdly, post-Gospel developments which reflect an attempt to understand the Gospel. These are more widely reflected in the Johannine Epistles. Brown inquires as to what the Gospel tells us about the origins of the community.

*Primarily*, the gospels describe how an evangelist conceived of and presented Jesus to a Christian community in the last third of the first century, a presentation that indirectly gives us an insight into that community's life at the time when the Gospel was written. *Secondarily*, through source analysis, the gospels reveal something about the history of the evangelist's christological views and, indirectly, something about the community's history earlier in the century, especially if the sources the evangelists used had already been part of the community's heritage. *Thirdly*, the gospels offer limited means for reconstructing the ministry and message of the historical Jesus (1977:380).

In principle one can detect aspects of a Christian community beneath the surface of a Gospel. But there are difficulties. In a Gospel the primary interest is the presentation of the words (and actions) of Jesus. But these are only included in the Gospel because the evangelist believes that

---

49. The Jamnia period is the time after the destruction of the temple, 70AD, when the teaching centre of Judaism had moved to Jamnia, (Jabneh). More precisely the Gospel was written after 85AD, the approximate date for the introduction into the synagogues of the reworded Twelfth Benediction, of the *Shemoneh Esreh* or the Twelve Benedictions, called the *Birkat ha-Minim* which pronounced a curse on heretical deviators including those who confessed Jesus to be the Messiah.

these words and actions are important to the community for which he (or she) is writing. We can gain a general knowledge about the community from these writings, but to move to the specifics is difficult. We need to be wary of overly imaginative deductions about ecclesiastical history from what the gospels tell us. Further we need to be reluctant to reconstruct community history from postulated pre-Gospel sources (1979:18-19).

We cannot completely avoid the above problems, but we must be aware of them. Brown proposes to minimize these problems by firstly, basing his conclusions on the existing Gospel, and not on any reconstructed ones; secondly, he proposes to stress those passages in John which are significantly different from the synoptics, this will hopefully present a section where it is the Johannine theological interests that have come to the fore; thirdly, he intends to argue from silence, but only using those matters about which John could scarcely have passed over accidentally (1979:20-21).

### 3.3.1 Sectarianism.

In the process of investigating the Johannine community, it is advisable for us to be made aware, however briefly, of the discussion around sects. It is my contention that the Johannine community can be considered a sect, and I need to explain what is meant by that.

Even if one takes "sect" in a purely religious framework, the whole early Christian movement may have been considered a sect, or at least the Jewish Christian branch of it. In Acts 24:5,14 Jews who do not believe in Jesus describe other Jews who do believe in him as constituting a *hairesis* - the same word used by Josephus (*Life* 10) when he speaks of the three "sects" of the Jews: "Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. But my [Brown's] interest here is the applicability of the religious term "sect" to the Johannine community in its relationship to other Christian communities at the end of the first century. Was this community an accepted church among churches, or alienated and exclusive conventicle? In this dialectic, the Johannine community would *de facto* be a sect, as I understand the term, if explicitly or implicitly it had broken communion (*koinōnia*) with most other Christians, or if because of its theological or ecclesiological tendencies, most other Christians had broken *Koinōnia* with the Johannine community. (Brown 1979:15).



I need to briefly point out a few important elements of sects and sectarian groups. The need for this arises from the opinion of many scholars who view the Johannine community as sectarian in nature (Meeks 1986:141ff, Rensberger 1988)<sup>50</sup>.

According to Wilson (quoted by Draper),

Sects are movements of religious protest. Their members separate themselves from other men in respect of their religious beliefs, practices and institutions, and often in many other departments of their lives. They reject the 'authority of orthodox religious leaders, and often also, of the secular government. Allegiance to a sect is voluntary, but individuals are admitted only on proof of conviction, or by some other test of merit: continuing affiliation rests on sustained evidence of commitment to sect beliefs and practices. Sectarians put their faith first: they order their lives in accordance with it. The orthodox, in contrast, compromise faith with other interests, and their religion accommodates the demands of the secular culture. (Draper 1992:14).

Wilson points out that there are various types of sects which are characterised by having different responses to the rejection of cultural goals and soteriological theories. (Wilson 1973:22).

The two types of sects which concern the Gospel of John more intimately are the "introversionist" and the "manipulationist" sects. For the "introversionist", the world is perceived to be irredeemably evil and salvation can only be achieved by completely withdrawing from it. This leads to the establishment of separated communities which are preoccupied with their own holiness. The "manipulationist" seeks a transformed method of coping with evil. Salvation is only possible by learning some form of esoteric knowledge, which explains how to deal with their problems. (Wilson 1973:24; Draper 1992:16).

Elements of the sectarian nature of the community which produced the Fourth Gospel will become clear in the discussion concerning the development of the community.

---

50. This discussion is closely linked to the discussion in chap. two in which Burridge is mentioned and the formation of a charismatic group in the process of the routinization of charisma. Not all sects are charismatic in nature, but there is a strong link.

### 3.3.2 Various phases.

Brown breaks up the development of the Johannine community into four phases, I have briefly mentioned all of them, but only the first two are of any concern to this thesis. The other two being related to the epistles and later.

Firstly, the pre-Gospel era. This involves the origins of the community and its relation to mid-first century Judaism. By the time the Gospel was written the Johannine Christians had been expelled from the synagogues (Jn 9:22; 16:2), because of their claims about Jesus.<sup>1</sup> This probably took place in the last third of the first century. Brown proposes this date because of the appearance of a reformulation of one of the Eighteen Benedictions. Judaism under the pharisees was no longer as pluralistic after 70AD as it was before. As the Gospel was written during this time it more than likely reflects the debates that took place between the Jews and the Johannine Christians before this time. There is some indication that these controversies took place before the conflict with Rome, and so Brown dates this first phase to between the mid 50's and the late 80's.

Secondly, this involves the life situation of the community at the time the Gospel was written. If one posits more than one author then this stage could have taken place over a period of time. But Brown postulates about 90 AD. The conflict with the synagogues is over, but persecution continues. The development of a still higher christology continues to bring about difference of opinion with the Jews, and this affects the Johannine community's relations with other Christian groups. It is at this stage that problems develop with the "world" possibly through failed attempts to "convert" the world, and they are classified as the darkness.

Thirdly, this involves the life-setting of the now divided Johannine community as reflected in the Johannine epistles. (About 100 AD). The split in the community, as Brown postulates, is due to differences of interpretation by two different people who hold some form of power. The epistles seem to reflect that those who broke away may have had a more numerical success, and the author of the epistles is trying to bolster his followers

Fourthly, dissolution of the two groups. The secessionists move from the conservative Johannine community and quickly progress towards 2nd century gnosticism, Cerinthianism and Montanism. The adherents to the author of the epistles are quickly taken up into the rest of the Christian church, probably sacrificing certain points of their christology.

Much of this recognition shows a community whose evaluation of Jesus was honed by struggle, and whose elevated appreciation of Jesus' divinity led to antagonisms without and schisms within. If the Johannine eagle soared above the earth, it did so with talons bared for the fight; and the last writings that were left us show the eaglets tearing at each other for the possession of the nest. There are moments of tranquil contemplation and inspiring penetration in the Johannine writings, but they also reflect a deep involvement in Christian history. Like Jesus, the word transmitted to the Johannine community lived in the flesh. (Brown 1979:22-24).

Berger and Luckmann's discussion on the process of alternation is of assistance here. This takes place when an individual moves from one social universe to another.

These processes resemble primary socialization, because they have radically to reassign reality accents and, consequently, must replicate to a considerably degree the strongly affective identification with the socializing personnel that was characteristic of childhood. They are different from primary socialization because they do not start *ex nihilo*, and as a result must cope with a problem of dismantling, disintegrating the preceding nomic structure of subjective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966:157).

The effect of this process depends on (a) creating boundaries i.e. separation and (b) on creating an effective plausibility structure i.e. it has to make sense, (c) and strong interaction (encapsulation and strong intra-group interaction). These characteristics will be investigated in the next section.

### **3.3.3 Evidence for the existence of the Johannine Community.**

This will not form a detailed investigation into this evidence, but will rather focus on the evidence as presented by other scholars. It can be regarded as a summary of the evidence. The scholars that I wish to focus on in this section include Brown, Rensberger, Meeks, Draper and Painter.

There have been a number of developments in the study of the Fourth Gospel. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls revealed the existence of a sect whose writings had similarities with the

Gospel. John's so-called 'inward' terminology. (Rensberger 1988:20). A further development was Dodd's work on the independency of John from the other synoptics. This implied that John belonged to a tradition of its own. (1988:20). Martyn made the next development by investigating the theology of the Fourth Gospel. He set out to discover whether the Fourth Gospel was a response to the prevailing events and issues in the life of a Christian community. His results showed John to be a relatively late work and reflecting a process where a community of Judean Christians were being marked off and expelled from a Judean community, likely a synagogue. (1988:22).

Meeks' investigation into the social function of the descent/ascent motif or myth in John's Gospel shows the existence of a community. This myth is significantly different to the use of the ascending/descending redeemer myths of gnostic literature in that the disciples are never defined or called *pneumatikoi* or described in language that describes Jesus<sup>51</sup>. (1986:161).

Thus we have in the Johannine literature a thoroughly dualistic picture: a small group of believers isolated over against "the world" that belongs intrinsically to "the things below", i.e., to darkness and the devil. (1986:161).

This dualism is reflected again in the increasing alienation of Jesus from the Judeans. As this progresses, those who come to believe into Jesus also experience this alienation. This believing of the disciples needs to be expressed by a change in social location. For Meeks, the turning to belief without the accompanying break with the world is futile and a lie.

In telling the story of the Son of Man who came down from heaven and then re-ascended after choosing a few of his own out of the world, the book defines and vindicates the existence of the community that evidently sees itself as unique, alien from its world, under attack, misunderstood, but living in unity with Christ and through him with God. ... It is a book for insiders, for if one already belonged to the Johannine community, then we may presume that the manifold bits of tradition that have taken distinctive form in the Johannine circle would be familiar, the "cross-reference" in the book - so frequently anachronistic within the fictional

---

51. Meeks puts it as follows: "The most significant difference between the Johannine use of the descent/ascent motif and the use in gnostic literature is precisely the fact that the disciples of Jesus, those who do 'hear' his words, are *not* ever identified as those *pneumatikoi* who, like himself, have 'come down from heaven'. They are identified as those who are 'not of this world' (15:19; 17:14ff). As those who are *ek tou theou*, they can be contrasted with the 'false spirits' who are *ek tou kosmou* (1 John 4:1-6)." (1986:161)

sequence of events - would be immediately recognizable, the double entendre which produces mystified and stupid questions from the fictional dialogue partners would be acknowledged by a knowing and superior smile. One of the primary functions of the book, therefore, must have been to provide a reinforcement for the community's social identity, which appears to have been largely negative. It provided a symbolic universe which gave religious legitimacy, a theodicy, to the group's actual isolation from the larger society. (1986:163).

This community is further described by Draper in his article "The Johannine community and its implications for a democratic society."

John sees the human situation as located in a cosmic struggle beyond the control of the individual or even of humankind in general. God creates the world by the utterance of his Word, 'Let there be Light', and through this all things come into being. Yet the light is engulfed in the darkness, which seeks continually to extinguish it, and when the Light himself comes into the world he created, it refuses to receive him because it loves darkness rather than the Light. Light shows up the true work of humankind, so that people prefer the darkness. Because Jesus is the Word or Thought of God himself, he is the Truth which sets people free. Yet the world is in the control of the evil power of darkness, who is the father of lies. So human beings choose rather the safety of lies and remain slaves to the powers of the age. ... Above all, the mark of the community of Jesus engaged in this task of standing for the Truth and for Light against darkness and lies, is love within the community. Love and loyalty within the group; mutual support and remembrance, in prison or out of it, enable the individual to endure against the vast display of force arranged against her/him. A new sense of equality and of accountability to each other become characteristic of such communities. (1991:115-116).

Nicodemus is often seen as a communal figure. This is based on the plural verbs in 3:2,7,11,12. Also Nicodemus is identified as a human being in 3:1 which links him to those human beings mentioned in 2:23-25.

Nicodemus evidently does not stand for himself alone but for some specific group, which is rather negatively portrayed. In the same manner Jesus undoubtedly speaks for the Johannine Christians and stands for them here over against the group represented by Nicodemus. (Rensbergér 1988:38).

Nicodemus is mentioned three times in the Gospel (3:1ff; 7:45-52; 19:38-42) and there does not appear to be any change in his character.

Throughout the Gospel, then, Nicodemus appears as a man of inadequate faith and inadequate courage, and as such he represents a *group* that the author wishes to characterize in this way. Evidently members of this group may hold positions of authority, may even be Pharisees themselves, but their status makes them fearful rather than bold in confessing their faith in Jesus. Moreover, even the faith they have apparently falls short of Johannine standards. Nicodemus sees in Jesus no more than a teacher and even then fails totally to comprehend his teaching. Jesus tells him, "We speak of what we know and testify to what we have seen, and you people do not accept our testimony" (3:11). Shortly after this, there follows the claim that the Son of Man has not only gone up into heaven but has come down from there as well. It was this claim that the Nicodemus Christians were unwilling to admit, this "testimony" that they refused to accept. The christological issue was clearly a major dividing line, for as Marinus de Jonge stresses, their inadequate Christology leaves them, in John's view, outside the true believing community. (1988:40).

John 9 tells the story of the man born blind. This figure is also a communal figure but he is telling the story of the community of the Fourth Gospel. Martyn uses this account to show how the history of the Johannine community is reflected in it. This story pulls together what the writer has to say about the community's relationships with other communities, viz., the Judean rulers and those who hold the faith secretly.

It is a symbolic story in the best sense, not an allegory, for the actions and words of its characters remain for the most part quite natural and unforced, but a representation in memorably vivid narrative form of the events and convictions that moulded the Johannine community and the Fourth Gospel itself. (1988:41).



The absence of Jesus from the story is surprising. These events must have taken on some significance in their own right.

The blind man, it seems clear, symbolizes the Johannine Christians. They have received their sight, as he does, from the one who is the light of the World, and they have suffered, as he does, for their confession of it. His conduct no doubt stands not only for what has been done but for what should be done under such circumstances. His attitude before the Pharisees is daring to the point of insolence, in obvious contrast to the behaviour of his own parents and that of Nicodemus in 7:50-51. Indeed, its nearest parallel is Jesus' demeanor before the high priest in 18:19-23. Perhaps this very parallel explains why Jesus can be absent from the central episodes of the story: his role is taken over by the blind man himself. The blind man, then, represents what is both possible and necessary, for the individual and for the community, when facing the synagogue authorities (1988:42).

The man's parents could also reflect a group of people, Christians who are not willing to make a public confession of their faith (1988:47).

Painter investigates "glimpses:" at the Johannine community in the Farewell Discourse. The function of the Paraclete (13:31-14:31) is given as overcoming the sorrow of the disciples and as making the teaching of Jesus to be remembered by the disciples. This is best suited to a context of a community feeling alienated over against the world. The conflict reflected in chap.9 is picked up in 15:1-16:5. Again the expulsion from the synagogue is mentioned. In chap. 16:12-15 the role of the Paraclete (the Spirit of Truth) is restricted to the community. Only the community has the truth and therefore salvation (1980:21-38).

And so in summary the Gospel seems to fit the outline of an introversionist sect.

...it rejects the world's values and turns inward to higher inner values: ...it withdraws from the world into community and cultivates inner resources and the possession of the Holy Spirit. It claims inner illumination and ethical insight for an enlightened elect. It has little emphasis on eschatology or evangelism, but has a strong in-group morality. Activity in the world is permitted only for conscience sake. It has no professional ministers and is indifferent to other religious movements (Draper 1992:17).



In other words, it presents a counter-culture hostile to, and subversive of the dominant culture in which it finds itself.

### **3.4 Conclusion.**

It is my contention that the Gospel of John reflects the time in which it was written. And that it reflects the attitude of the people of that time and how they responded to the context in which they found themselves. Brown has reminded us that the primary function of the Gospel reflects how the author conceived of and presented Jesus to a Christian community (Brown 1977:380). In this presentation there is a concerted effort to give the community something to cling to in the uncertain times in which they were living. Times of persecution and of conflict both with the world in general, and possibly in particular with the Judeans who surrounded them. In this presentation, I contend that the nature of the Gospel is an attempt to give the community various techniques of preserving the original charisma of Jesus. To try and go back to the original charismatic figure is not possible, but to develop and implement techniques of preserving that charisma is possible. As discussed in chap. 2 above, there are two ways of doing this, the first is to set down various rules and regulations in order to maintain this charisma, the second is to develop some form of contact with the charisma, or maybe as Borg calls it, the Numinous (1987:25ff). It is my contention that the author of the Gospel, upon reflection on the life of Jesus, writes a Gospel that reflects the characteristics of the theory of Weber with regards to mystic virtuosi.

I will now, in the next chapter, concern myself with discussing this in terms of the text of John's Gospel.

## 4. MYSTIC VIRTUOSI AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

### 4.1 Introduction.

We have already looked at the implications of a sociological reading of the New Testament, and have also examined the background to the Fourth Gospel. In this chapter these two elements are brought together. The chapter on sociology and the New Testament focused on Weber's concept of Charisma and then went on to look at how virtuosi fit into his model of the routinization of charisma. We looked at the various characteristics of a mystic virtuoso and now in this chapter we will apply these characteristics to John's Gospel. I hope to show that when one applies these concepts to John's Gospel, the Gospel can be understood in a new and different way. As already mentioned in the introduction, it is my contention that the author of the Fourth Gospel fits Weber's description of a mystic virtuoso and that he presented Jesus in a manner that conforms with his mystical world view. The chapter on the background to the Gospel will be drawn on extensively. Many of the items discussed in that chapter will be taken for granted in this chapter.

This chapter will be structured as follows: I will begin with a general overview of the presentation of Jesus by John in his Gospel. Here I will focus on the proposal that the Gospel does fit the model of a mystic virtuoso. The major characteristics are highlighted and reference is made to chap 2 and the model. An important aspect of this section will be to identify certain sections of the Gospel for closer study. The next section will be a closer study of these identified texts. This study will not follow the strict rules of exegesis, but I will perform a dynamic exegesis<sup>52</sup> of these sections to see what light can be shed on them from the model of the virtuoso. There will be a short conclusion at the end of this chapter summing up the results before I proceed with the conclusion of this thesis.

---

52. By dynamic I simply mean that the elements of a formal exegesis will not be present. I have avoided textual criticism, but have included certain sections of textual criticism in the translation. Other elements, such as, historical context have been discussed in the previous chapter, and I don't repeat this material unless absolutely necessary. This exegesis looks rather at the literary context of the section and then investigates how this section is illuminated using the model of mystic virtuosi.

## 4.2 The presentation of Jesus.

The Jesus of John's Gospel is different to the Jesus in the other Gospels. There are certain similarities, but the overall picture of Jesus is not the same. This section of the thesis will examine these differences and seek to give an explanation for this.

In all four gospels Jesus is described and appears as one who teaches, heals, and as a suffering Messiah. However, the depiction of these activities of Jesus (if suffering can be described as an activity) is different in the Synoptics to that which appears in the Fourth Gospel:

Yet it is not correct to characterize the Jesus of John's Gospel as suffering, nor are his miracles best described as healings. Jesus is certainly designated a teacher in John, yet his teaching is not, and by its nature could not be, understood by his interlocutors. It is a teaching which can, however, be understood by the Christian reader. Although Jesus' suffering is not emphasized in the Synoptic passion narratives, the passion predictions describe his death as suffering, and certainly Mark underscores suffering as characteristic of Jesus' ministry. John, on the other hand, does no more than hint that Jesus' death involves him in the suffering which the Synoptics strongly suggest. The difference between the Johannine and the Synoptics portrayals of Jesus's miracles, teachings, and death are in large measure the difference between John and the Synoptics, and the distinctive feature of the former becomes all the clearer when set in contrast with the latter. (Moody Smith 1977:368).

Moody Smith goes on to talk about the "miracles" in John's Gospel. They are called "Signs", which reveal that Jesus is the one sent from God. These signs are acknowledged outside of the immediate circle of disciples (3:2), and they raise the questions as to who Jesus is and they suggest an answer. Some are impressed by these signs, and for that reason they know who Jesus is and they have made a decision which could lead to faith in The Anointed One (3:2ff). The miracles or signs are credited as historical and as such they perform a valuable function within the Gospel. They are an important part of the process leading to faith, faith being the recognition of the identity of Jesus. The concept of faith plays an important function in the Gospel. The signs are supposed to lead to a true confession of faith in Jesus. The verb πιστεῦειν indicates that a

person or a group of people has/have made a correct confession of who Jesus is. In the account of the wedding in Cana (2:11) the disciples believe into him after the miracle or the sign has taken place. The form of the verb used is the aorist. Again this is highlighted in 2:22-23, where again the aorist form of the verb is used, and indicates a belief in Jesus which is correct.

John presents Jesus in a very different way to the other writers of the gospels. This difference is in opposition to Brodie's verisimilitude<sup>53</sup>. It is this difference which lends credence to the idea or theory that John and his Gospel are examples of mystic writings. In a new book by Countryman<sup>54</sup>, he investigates the "Mystical way in the Fourth Gospel." He presents "a reading that sees the Gospel as focused on progress toward mystical union in the person of Jesus." (1994:1). And he takes the word mystical to

describe an experience of things or persons outside myself as direct and unmediated as my experience of myself is. At one level, this may be an experience of the order of the universe and of my part in it, in which case it is called "mystical enlightenment." at another level it may be an experience of full knowledge of another specific being, in which case it is called "mystical union." ... In practise, it may not always be possible to distinguish enlightenment sharply from union, but I believe that John treats the former as a prelude to the latter (1994:1).

The work by Countryman shall be incorporated more completely into the individual sections in my thesis which deal with related matters.

One of the characteristics of a mystic virtuoso as opposed to an ascetic virtuoso, as mentioned above, is the content of their activity. I am suggesting that John fits the description of a mystic virtuoso and that he presents Jesus in a similar light, in order to fulfill his specific purpose. The

---

53. Brodie discusses John as being based very closely on the Synoptics. He discusses the similarities between John and the Synoptics as "verisimilitude." The discussion with Brodie has been dealt with earlier in this thesis, but suffice it to say that the story in the Synoptics and John is basically the same. But the extent of this similarity needs closer examination. John was working within certain confines. He couldn't change the story that much. Jesus still had to be identifiable. I would argue for a similarity but only on a very broad and undefined plane (1993b:63-65).

54. The work by Countryman proved to be very useful for my thesis, however, he did not provide an adequate sociological background in which to situate his work. While working through his book, I was never quite sure if we were approaching the same topic, or whether we were working towards different goals. I feel that if he had provided a more concrete sociological background in which to situate his work then it would have been more useful.

mystic virtuoso does not teach as such, rather mechanisms of 'illumination' are given, which are not based on teaching but rather on a close personal encounter with the numinous.

The richness, colour, specificity, concreteness, and variety which characterize the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels are by and large absent from John, as is his apparent willingness and intention to teach anyone who would listen [to] the demands and will of God in view of the near advent of his kingdom. We have no parables, no pronouncement stories in John; therefore, we have none of the brief epigrammatic sayings which are so characteristic of the Synoptic Jesus. Neither can much of Q or of the didactic elements of Mark, M, or L be found. Instead, the Johannine Jesus expounds Christology and argues with his theological opponents, the Jews. (Moody Smith 1977:370).

Instead we have in the Fourth Gospel a great deal of dialogue between Jesus and either his opponents or his supporters. The teaching is combined with more practical elements. For example, the teaching on the Bread of Life in chap. 6, is presented in the context of a dialogue with his opponents, the Judeans. But it is also presented in the context of helpful hints as to how to implement it. There is an absence of any material similar to the "Sermon on the Mount" of Matthew or the "Sermon on the Plain" of Luke. There is no straight forward teaching, all teaching is wrapped in examples from history, or in examples from everyday life. The practical techniques of maintaining salvation are presented rather than teaching.

There is a need to consider the distinctive Johannine view of Jesus. We need to examine the sort of community that would produce such a view of Jesus. I have examined this community above in chap. 3. Much of what Moody Smith draws on has already been mentioned. Moody Smith relies on the theory of the traumatic expulsion from a synagogue as a partial reason behind the unique depiction of Jesus.

The miracles are signs, if not proofs, of Jesus' messianic dignity; and the discourses and dialogues of the first half of the Gospel concentrate upon the question of Jesus' identity and role. Just such a fixation upon the christological question fits the proposed church-synagogue milieu. That milieu in turn helps

explain the eristic [*sic*]<sup>55</sup> character of the first half of the Gospel especially, as well as its intense concentration on Christology. Jesus himself is portrayed as the origin of the dispute between Christians (Christ-confessors) and the synagogue, and his affirmations about himself become the warrant and justification for the Christian community's claims for him. (Moody Smith 1977:372).

Jesus is identified by the community on the basis of his 'signs' as the Son of God. This will form part of a further study later in this chapter.

These claims are cast in the form of a confession by the community of their faith. But the community would insist that they are christological claims rooted in the words of Jesus himself. The question as to whether Jesus actually made these claims, is inappropriate. The real question is whether John's presentation of Jesus in such a light is legitimate.

Certainly it is not if one is seeking an 'objective historical account,' whatever that may be. It is understandable and legitimate only from a distinctively Christian perspective, that is only on the confessional position that Jesus is the Christ. On that basis John's presentation is legitimate and becomes enlightening and suggestive. From any other perspective it is offensive, just as in the Gospel Jesus' claims for himself are offensive to those who do not share the belief of his followers... That belief, its implicated hopes and uncertainties, becomes transparent in the so-called farewell discourses and final prayer (chapters 13-17). There the presupposition of a community of his followers surviving more than a generation after his departure, with all the problems attendant upon their perilous situation in the unfriendly world, is plainly evident. It is such a community with its peculiar traditions and history, which through one of its gifted members has produced the presentation of Jesus found in the Fourth Gospel. (Moody Smith 1977:373).

This claim I will examine in more detail at a later stage, where I will investigate the farewell discourses. It is this "gifted member" who puts into writing the teachings of Jesus in such a way that suggests evidence for this claim of him fitting the model of a mystic virtuoso. The existence

---

55. I was unable to find this word in a regular English Dictionary, but it seems to be constructed from the Greek word meaning, strife or quarrel.

of the Paraclete as a continuous source of the presence of Jesus is described in the farewell discourse. And so, at least in Moody Smith's interpretation,

the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is also the Jesus of the church's present and future. He is the source of the Spirit-Paraclete who abides with the church in its witness and especially in its adversity. Even as Jesus is depicted as present in the conflict with the synagogue which produced the Johannine community, so he is portrayed as the source of unity, stability, and purpose in the community's continued existence on the world. This presence of Jesus is not only given in the contemporary Johannine community, that is contemporary with the author, it is given as an abiding assurance to the community about its own future: Jesus will continue to come to, and dwell among, his disciples. (Moody Smith 1977:375).

Moody Smith switches from talking about the community to talking about the church. This switch is not presented in the clearest of manners, but there are strong similarities to Brodie's "encyclopaedic" Gospel (Brodie 1993b:30), where the Gospel very quickly moves from the particular Johannine community, in Brodie's case this is not even discussed, to the universal church. Although this move may be justified, I wish not to focus on it. The Spirit-Paraclete is the mode of Jesus' abiding presence. It is given rather than imagined. The exact mode of the functioning of the Spirit-Paraclete is never given, but his function is clear.

Especially the emphasis on the Spirit's bringing to recollection and expanding upon Jesus' own teaching suggests that the Spirit-Paraclete worked through the leadership or ministry of the Johannine community. This does not necessarily mean that an ordained ministry of the Johannine church administered or dispensed the Spirit. Quite possibly the gift of the Spirit, especially in the functions described, authenticated the leadership of the church. The leadership of the Johannine church mediates the presence of Jesus to the congregation through the Spirit. But does the choice of leadership determine who shall possess the Spirit? In all likelihood the other way around; the intervention and work of the Spirit determined the leadership of the church. Yet it is clear that the Spirit alone cannot authenticate itself. If the Spirit is nothing other than the continuing presence and revelation of Jesus to his followers, any continuation of that presence or revelation must bear a positive relation to the historical figure. John's Jesus is intended to do just that, despite his Christian theological dress. (Moody Smith 1977:375-6).



I think that Moody Smith is being a little naive here. To claim that possession of the Spirit authenticates leadership is not the end of the matter<sup>56</sup>. Any claim to possessing the Spirit is a claim to authority and unmediated “inspiration” from God. Any claim like this cannot be tested. The Spirit becomes the continuing presence of Jesus and so helps the community to bring to mind the words/teachings of Jesus. Draper discusses this in an article on the sociological function of the Paraclete. In John 15:26-27, it is clear that the Paraclete is sent from the Father.

Indeed, as Spirit of Truth, he (ἐκεῖνος) proceeds from the Father... His function is to bear witness concerning Jesus. This might, at first glance, be a reference to parenesis within the community, except that the witness concerning Jesus is paralleled by the witness of the community to the world, made emphatic by the καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε (v27). The witness of the Paraclete is required because the community is in danger of falling away in the face of excommunication and persecution. In that hour, the community remembers the promise of Jesus that he would send the Paraclete (16:4). (1992:23).

These points are picked and further developed in the section on John 13.

### 4.3 Virtuoso: major characteristics.

The function and task of a virtuoso is to go back towards the historical charismatic figure in terms of the ideals and vision of that individual. In our case to return to the ideals and vision of the charismatic figure of Jesus. This can be done in either of two ways, ascetically, or mystically. These terms and how they function in Weber's model have been discussed in the second chapter. An ascetic virtuoso world view is a model which relies on the facts, which goes by the mind and the discourse of the individual. A mystic model presents the charismatic figure again in terms of someone special and different to the rest. In chap. 2, I discussed the characteristics of the mystic

---

56. This is precisely Weber's point about charisma. I believe that Moody Smith is drawing on Weber when he makes this claim. Charisma is a certain quality of an individual personality by which that person is considered extraordinary and treated as if that individual had certain supernatural or superhuman, or at the least, certain specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These qualities are as such not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as commendable, and on the basis of them the individual is treated as a leader. Charismatic authority has a particular sociological nature. Whereas patriarchy and bureaucracy cater for everyday 'normal' needs, and all extraordinary needs which transcend routine everyday economics are satisfied in an entirely heterogeneous manner. They are satisfied on a charismatic basis. (Weber 1978:1111).

virtuoso model. There I dealt in depth with Weber's model. Here I intend to highlight those major characteristics and explain the model.

For Weber the first, and seemingly most important, characteristic of a mystic virtuoso is characterized by "absolute flight from the world." This is as a result of a subjective awareness of salvation which is aided by the extrusion of all daily routines (Weber 1978:544). This being the first and foremost characteristic it is supported by two other characteristics. These are a striving to achieve rest in the god or a mystical union with the divine and the possession of mystical knowledge. The possession of this knowledge leads to energetic concentration upon certain truths which result in an illumination of these truths.

The illumination consists essentially in a unique quality of feeling or, more concretely, in the felt emotional unity of knowledge and volitional mood which provides the mystic with decisive assurance of his religious state of grace. (1978:546).

We have in John a display of the mystic virtuosi model. Jesus even though he spends much of his time in discourse is always different, he is the exalted Son of God, even while he is a person. Is this not a characteristic of a mystic virtuosi world view? I will investigate. Jesus is different, he knows about his death, he has insights into the nature of the world, he speaks about other worldly things and events. The irony present in some of the discourses would enhance this. This type of careful interweaving of a theme with two or more parts, or levels of understanding<sup>57</sup>, reflects the work of someone who thinks and displays himself as a different person depending on the context. The inner circle would understand and appreciate the hidden level of the discourse, but the world in general does not see the two levels and understands Jesus on a merely physical plain. I develop the understanding of irony as an element in the model of the mystic virtuosi a little later. But the use of irony demonstrates a comprehension of certain knowledge which is unknown, or unknowable to others outside of the community.

In John we see that Jesus expounds certain truths, that may seem simple to the world, but always have a different meaning for those who have depth of insight. For example the emphasis that Jesus

---

57. See my later use of Gail O'Day.

places on love throughout the Gospel, but particularly in the farewell discourse. This must have assumed a very central position within the community, and exerted an influence of the world, as can be seen through the reaction of the world to the community. Does this have an integrating function within the group?

In terms of the model it is important to understand that we are working with a model and not with an individual person. This model explains the attempts of certain people to attain salvation, or in our case maintain the charisma. It is not a matter of identifying people as mystics, but rather using the model to explain these individuals' behaviour. What follows now are characteristics of John's Gospel that fit or match the characteristics of the model. I've done this in two sections. The first section is looking at the whole Gospel and then later at individual sections within the Gospel.

### **4.3.1 A general overview of the Gospel.**

I wish to investigate particular examples from the Gospel relating to the model of mystic virtuosi in order to support my thesis. I will be looking for characteristics, described in chap.2 about virtuosi, in order to do this<sup>58</sup>. The Gospel of John is structured in such away that the experience of the believer, or the member of the community, depends upon and emerges out of the union of the Father and the Son. It is the goal of the community to achieve union with the Son and indeed with the Father. Jesus becomes the only connection between the Father and humanity (the community), and vice versa, the only connection between the community and the Father (Countryman 1994:1). Countryman understands the Gospel to move in a direction that leads to mystical enlightenment, from conversion through baptism and reception of the Eucharist to mystical enlightenment and union. This union is only complete in "the life to come." (1994:2). This structure provides a useful starting point for the examination of the Gospel.

#### **4.3.1.0.1 Focus on the word "abide" (μῑνω).**

I have translated this word as 'abide', and it appears reasonably frequently through out the Gospel. I will look at a few accounts. It appears that the word μῑνω picks up the Old Testament

---

58. Please refer to my translation of the Gospel attached as an Appendix.

image of the abiding of God and the things and persons relating to God. This has some religious and theological significance. The presence of God is characterized by his endurance, and this is denoted by μένω. Within the New Testament the word abide seems to describe the immutability of God and the things of God. (TDNT vol. 4. 1964:574).

By the use of μένειν John seeks to express the immutability and inviolability of the relation of immanence. In doing he elevates the Christian religion above what is attained in hellenistic rapture or even in the prophecy of Israel. Thus God abides in Christ (14:10). Believers abide in Christ (6:56; 15:47) and Christ in them (15:4-7). God abides in believers and believers in God. (TDNT vol. 4. 1964:575).

The first use of the word μένω (1:32-33) is used to describe the Spirit's continual presence in/on Jesus. This description sets Jesus apart from the rest of the people around him, and John the Baptist recognises this as a sign of Jesus contact with God. Jesus is designated as the Son of God. It is interesting that of the eight occurrences of the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (the others being 1:34,49; 5:25; 10:36; 11:4,27;19:7; 20:31) the first should be in connection with the verb 'to abide.' This gives the impression that in order to be the Son of God there has to be an element of abiding with/in God.

Continuing this discussion on the word μένω Brodie makes a link with the days of creation. He looks carefully at the numbering of the days in the opening chapter of the Gospel and finds that the best way to view these numbering of days is to look at the creation story of Genesis. The basic structure of Genesis 1:1-2:4a is one of six days followed by a seventh day which breaks the pattern (1993a:130). The text is clear, it begins, "In the beginning" after which six days are described and the seventh day is different, where God rested.

The relationship between the two pattern-breaking days appears to be quite complex. In Genesis it is the day when *God rested* (*kata-pauō*, "pause/rest"). In John it is the day when *the disciples rested with Jesus* (*menō*, "remain/ stayed/ rest/abide"). The two are quite different, yet the differences are like the two sides of the same coin. There is in both a sense of standing outside the flow of things, of resting in a time-surpassing dimension. (1993a:130).

This image of resting picks up very clearly the Old Testament image of resting. But John places it in the centre and not at the end of the sequence of days as Genesis does, and in this manner, the idea of rest becomes a central focus for the Gospel.

The continuing use of μένω (1:38-39) evokes continuity with above. The disciples abide with Jesus, they withdraw from the world and abide with Jesus, who is the designated Son of God. There are hints of contact with the Spirit. Jesus is demonstrated as having contact with God, and through this the Spirit sets Jesus apart. "The richness of the word 'abide' has passed from the Spirit (1:32-33), to Jesus (1:38-39), to the disciples (1:39): 'they abode.'" (Brodie 1993a:160). It is not so much the movement that is the focus of this scene of the disciples abiding with Jesus, but rather Jesus himself as the one who embodies the Spirit of God. And so the disciples abide with Jesus, and it is the tenth hour, which for Brodie becomes a symbol of perfection reflecting that the time spent abiding with Jesus is the equivalent to time spent abiding with God. (1993a:161). This picks up very clearly one of the characteristics mentioned above the idea of union with the divine. In this opening scene, and the focus on the word μένω reflects this characteristic very well.

A simple identification with this would imply that one of the mechanisms of maintaining charisma would be to abide with/in Jesus. The disciples maintain this close personal contact. μένω - creates a sense of mystical union (*unio mystica*) (Weber 1978:545), with the disciples, as they are at this stage, 'abiding' with Jesus, the designated Son of God, a sense of resting in God is created.

In contrast to asceticism, contemplation is primarily the quest to achieve rest in god and in him alone. It entails inactivity, and in its most consistent form it entails the cessation of thought, of everything that in any way reminds one of the world, and of course the absolute minimization of all outer and inner activity. By these paths the mystic achieves that subjective condition which may be enjoyed as the possession of, or mystical union (*unio mystica*) with, the divine. (Weber 1978:545).

Again the word μένω appears frequently in the farewell discourse. Particularly in chap. 14 and 15. Here Jesus becomes the one who sends the Spirit (παράκλητος), the disciples therefore

need to 'abide' in the *παράκλητος*, as they 'abode' in Jesus, who was designated as the Son of God. And also in chap. 15, when Jesus talks about the vine, the idea of abiding is very prevalent. The idea of 'abiding' in the vine grows in intensity. The image is created of a union with Jesus, with the divine. This is again picked up in chap. 17, where, although the word *μένω* is not used, the idea is simulated by the concept of union. Being one. Where the theory of Weber is, in a manner of speaking, put into words, and the divine mystical union is a desire on the lips of Jesus as a wish for those who should 'abide' in him, and in the Father who sent him.

As an aside I wish briefly to discuss the concept of 'brotherly love' as expressed by Weber<sup>59</sup>.

The core of the mystical concept of the oriental Christian church was a firm conviction that Christian brotherly love, when sufficiently strong and pure, must necessarily lead to unity in all things, even in dogmatic beliefs. In other words, men who sufficiently love one another in the Johannine sense of mystical love, will also think alike and, because of the very irrationality of their common feeling, act in a solidary fashion which is pleasing to God. Because of this concept, the Eastern church could dispense with an infallibly rational authority in matters of doctrine. (Weber 1978: 551).

This is reflected by the non-occurrence of any dogmatic teaching such as a list of 'do's' and 'don'ts'.

The Farewell Discourse is filled with commands to love one another, and this command is given by Jesus. αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἣ ἐμή, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς· μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ. ὑμεῖς φίλοι μου ἐστε εἰὰν ποιῇτε ἃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν (15:12-14)

---

59. Weber makes a concrete link in his discussion of mystic virtuosi with John's Gospel. This raises the question as to how much did Weber develop his model using John's Gospel? Through Weber's many references to Buddhism (1978:551ff) I'm sure that he had other sources on which he drew to develop his model. In which case there is no possibility of a circular argument developing in this thesis.

This love which the disciples are commanded to have for one another represents the love that Jesus has for them. They are called friends of Jesus. φίλος means a loved one or a dear one, and is translated as friend. This continual reiterating of the command to love one another enforces the nearness of the disciples to one another, and to Jesus, the designated Son of God. This highlights their difference from the world, and is related to the discussion above on unity with the divine. As a symbol of their unity with the divine, they are called to love one another.

#### 4.3.1.0.2 Focus on γιγνώσκω and οἶδα as keys to mystical illumination.

First I must investigate the difference between these two words. Most often they are both translated as 'know'. οἶδα is the perfect form of the verb εἶδω (to see), this verb retains its proper sense except in the perfect, where the direct translation, 'I have seen,' is normally translated 'I know.' Whereas γιγνώσκω, in a very real sense means to learn or to know or to perceive. From this the noun γνῶσις which means 'a knowing', or 'knowledge.' This subtle but distinct difference in the meaning of the two words may lead to a new insight into the way they are used by John in his Gospel. John uses these words in different ways depending on the situation. In chap. 9, the healing of the blind man, only the word οἶδα is used. This is used to heighten the drama of the story, where there is a definite play on words. When the characters say, 'I know' (as we translate it) there is always the underlying meaning of 'I have seen'<sup>60</sup>. This may not be deliberate, but an understanding of it heightens the story and makes for a deeper appreciation of the text.

The word γιγνώσκω denotes in ordinary Greek the intelligent comprehension of an object, whether this comes for the first time, or comes afresh, into the consideration of the one who grasps it, or whether it is already present. In other words, it has a purely technical meaning. However within Gnostic thought, as will be further explained below, it often refers to knowledge about or concerning God. It can and does also refer to ecstatic or mystical vision, and to this extent knowing is still understood as a kind of seeing, though in the sense of mystic vision rather than the older Greek sense. (TDNT vol.1. 1964:686)

---

60. See my later discussion of Gale O'Day.



Hans Jonas (1963) has given us a useful breakdown of the gnostic understanding of γνῶσις and I will refer briefly to him. It appears that the term “knowledge” is in itself a purely technical term and is unspecific. However, in the gnostic context, “knowledge” has a definite religious or supernatural meaning. (Jonas: 1963:34).

*Gnosis* means pre-eminently knowledge of God, and from what we have said about the radical transcendence of the deity it follows that “knowledge of God” is the knowledge of something naturally un-knowable and therefore itself not a natural condition. Its objects include everything that belongs to the divine realm of being, namely, the order and history of the upper worlds, and what is to issue from it, namely, the salvation of *man* [sic]. With objects of this kind, knowledge as a mental act is vastly different from the rational cognition of philosophy (1963:34).

And so knowledge becomes closely bound up with revelatory experience, and the receiving of truth is either through sacred and secret traditions or through inner illumination:

the transcendent God is unknown in the world and cannot be discovered from it; therefore revelation is needed. ... Its bearer is a messenger from the world of light who penetrates the barriers of the spheres, outwits the Archons, awakens the spirit from its earthly slumber, and imparts to it the saving knowledge “from without.” ... The knowledge, thus revealed, ... comprises the whole content of the gnostic myth, with everything it has to teach about God, man [sic], and the world; ... On the practical side, however, it is more particularly “knowledge of the way,” namely, of the soul’s way out of the world, comprising the sacramental and magical preparations for its future ascent and the secret names and formulas that force the passage through each sphere. Equipped with this *gnosis*, the soul after death travels upwards, leaving behind at each sphere the physical “vestment” contributed by it: thus the spirit stripped of all foreign accretions reaches the God beyond the world and becomes reunited with the divine substance. (1963:35,45).

And so a mystical union is achieved between the individual and the divine.

Union with the divine is as a result of the possession or understanding of certain knowledge. Mystical knowledge is not something new, it is a perception of an overall meaning of the world.

Such gnosis is basically a 'possession' of something from which there may be derived a new practical orientation to the world, and under certain circumstances even new and communicable items of knowledge.

Again in chap. 10, the account of the shepherd of the sheep, we have an example of multiple uses of the word γιγνώσκω. When John talks about the sheep knowing the voice of Jesus, then the word οἶδα is used, whereas when John talks about Jesus knowing the sheep, then the word γιγνώσκω is used. Why this difference? Is it not possible that John was purposefully using the different words to indicate something? Jesus, being the designated Son of God, has a knowledge, a mystical illumination, but the sheep don't, they have to rely on what they have seen, and do not have this mystical illumination. Jesus has spent time abiding with God, indeed the Spirit abides in/with him. This closeness, union, with God gives Jesus the ability to know the sheep (γιγνώσκειν). The sheep don't abide with God, or with Jesus (at least, not yet) and therefore have to rely on what they see (οἶδα). The disciples abide with Jesus, but because they don't feature in this section, we are not sure how much they understand who Jesus is<sup>61</sup>. In verse six again a different play is made using the words we are discussing. Ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς (10:6). In other words, the words that Jesus spoke to them, they were unable to understand. The people did not have access to this mystical illumination, and thus were unable to understand the words of Jesus.

#### 4.3.1.0.3. Irony as a key to the model of mystic virtuosi.

John's use of irony may contribute to the discussion on mystic illumination<sup>62</sup>. A simple definition of irony may be the following: an expression of meaning, often humorous or sarcastic, by the use

---

61. I will pick up this understanding or lack of it on the part of the disciples towards Jesus at a later stage of this thesis.

62. Gale O'Day gives a good break down of Irony and how to identify it. It is her contention that the Gospel of John is full of irony, working from MacRae, she claims that it is irony that expresses John's insight into the meaning of Christ for the world. (O'Day 1986:6). As an example she performs an 'exegesis' of chap. 4, and shows clearly the two levels of meaning that are evident in that chapter as well as in the Gospel as a whole (1986:49ff).

of language of a different or opposite tendency, or the use of language with one meaning for a privileged audience and another for those addressed or concerned. And for irony to succeed the author must establish a relationship with the audience, in which the audience shares some knowledge which will enable them to understand the irony, and therefore the intended meaning (O'Day 1986:29). O'Day focuses on irony as a revelatory mode. The various incongruities and tensions draw the reader into the text and are there to help the reader to really see what is happening.

Despite its apparent attempts to conceal meaning, *irony is a mode of revelatory language*. It reveals by asking the reader to make judgments and decisions about the relative values of stated and intended meanings, drawing the reader into its vision of truth, so that when the reader finally understands, he or she becomes a member of the community that shares that vision, constituted by those who have also followed the author's lead. (O'Day 1986:31).

The discussion between Jesus and Nicodemus in chap. 3 may lend credence to this. Nicodemus comes to Jesus based on what he sees, and the word οἶδα is used: οὗτος ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ῥαββί, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ἡ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ (3:2). There then follows a lengthy discussion about being born ἄνωθεν. This discussion seems to confuse Nicodemus endlessly, then Jesus in verse ten says: ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις; (3:10). Implying that knowledge of Jesus and of the Spirit or wind is mystical. And Nicodemus can't appreciate this or understand this because he does not know what Jesus does. A relationship with Jesus based on what Nicodemus has seen (οἶδα) is not sufficient. It does not lead one into union with Jesus. What one sees needs to develop into what one knows (γινώσκω), this does lead into a mystical union with Jesus. Nicodemus, as a teacher of Israel, should understand this, but doesn't. To believe is to come to a complete understanding of Jesus.

A discussion on the word ἄνωθεν will shed light on the idea of a knowledge that is only available to a few. The two translations of this word are equally valid, 'from above' and/or

‘again’. In the Nicodemus story, Jesus states that one must be born from above, and Nicodemus understands this to mean be born again. The author is speaking of two different spheres of existence, there is the earthly sphere and the heavenly sphere. The heavenly sphere is not of this world and is the sphere of the mystic. The earthly sphere is the sphere of the ascetic, a sphere characterized by activity and ethical concern, whereas the heavenly sphere is a sphere characterized by inactivity and union with God. This is a characteristic mentioned above for the model of a mystic virtuosi. Irony is the method that the author uses to initiate the readers into this sphere and it is a sphere different from the one that Nicodemus inhabits.

This can also be discussed in the incident with the woman from Samaria which starts off with Jesus knowing that the Pharisees had heard about Jesus and his baptising, and the woman who only relies on what she has seen. There is no mystical illumination here, but the irony would suggest that Jesus is always at least one step ahead of the woman.

I wish to end this section with a short discussion on the word ‘light.’ There is a great use of the word φῶς and it is possible that the author intends to use this word to indicate something about the gaining of a mystical union with the divine. Although the simple meaning of φῶς is ‘light’ or in some cases ‘daylight’, in John’s Gospel the juxta-positioning of this word with ‘darkness’ gives it a significantly different meaning. I have spoken much about ‘illumination’, and in the light of this, the word ‘light’ becomes important. In chap. 9 the blind man comes to the light and sees, and he gains illumination and so worships Jesus and offers a true confession of faith. Jesus’ statement ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾶ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου (9:5). Jesus is the one who brings light to the world, and this light enables one to receive true illumination of that mystical knowledge described above. This careful use of φῶς is maintained in the Gospel. In the prologue, the word coming down from God is the light for humanity. Despite all the negative influences in the world, the light still remains. If we take φῶς to be referring in some sense to the illumination gained by abiding with Jesus, then passages such as 3:19-21 can also be understood in terms of the model. For John the darkness of the world is due to the unwillingness of some, especially those who remain in the darkness to achieve rest in God.

#### **4.3.1.1 A short summary.**

In this general overview of the Gospel, I have mentioned a few key words which seem to unlock the door to view this Gospel as the work of a mystic. This will now continue with in-depth investigations of certain texts. It can be seen that by focusing on the words μένω and γιγνώσκω and φῶς, we can view the Gospel as referring to mystical enlightenment. The use of irony, as expanded by O'Day helps us. Meaning which is hidden in more than one level becomes a tool for the community. They begin to see Jesus as the Son of God, and their belief grows and is fully rewarded at the end of the Gospel when they experience a union with Jesus. It is this investigation which now continues.

#### **4.3.2 Exegesis of certain sections.**

This section will not follow the format of strict exegesis, but will be developed along the lines of a close reading and examination of the passage in question. I will bring in the work of other scholars to support the proposals made in this thesis, and will argue along the lines that these passages support the proposal that John is a mystic virtuoso, and his writing reflects this. The following sections will be investigated: John 1:29-51; 3:1-21; 6:1-71; 10:1-21; 13-17 (which will be divided into shorter sections); 20.

I have not entered into any textual criticism in this section. Those areas of the text where textual criticism would assist the thesis have been discussed in the translation. The translation appears as an appendix at the end of this thesis.

##### **4.3.2.1 John 1:29-51.**

###### **4.3.2.1.1 The Context:**

The context of this passage is the opening section of the Gospel. We have read in the 'Prologue' about the Word becoming flesh and dwelling among us. The Prologue tries to define the relationship between God and the Word. The author stresses both that the Word is and is not

God (v1-3). John the Baptist has already testified to the priests and Levites and those sent from Jerusalem, that he is not The Anointed One, but that he has come to prepare the way for The Anointed One of God.

This short section in John's Gospel has already been mentioned above in my discussion on the word μένω ('I abide', as I have translated it). In this section there are abundant repetitions of the word μένω. John the Baptist testifies to the Spirit abiding on Jesus, and Jesus is designated as the Son of God: *καὶ γὰρ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (v34). And then from the words of the testimony of John the Baptist we move to the encounter of two of his disciples with Jesus. Here there is an inquiry into where Jesus abides, and the disciples are encouraged to come and see. From this there are three accounts of other people joining the band of disciples. Andrew calls Peter, his brother; Jesus calls Philip, who in turn calls Nathanael. And we again have mention of the fact that Jesus is the Son of God. *ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ· ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ* (v49).

This brings us to the end of the opening scenes of John's Gospel. From here on the Gospel enters into the first of the miracles, and the scene changes dramatically from the opening scene of Jesus and the first disciples. There are close links between this section of the Gospel and chap. 14 and 15. The dialogue about where Jesus abides is continued.

#### 4.3.2.1.2 How does the model of mystic virtuoso help us with this section?

In this section, as in others, we see a Jesus, presented as such by John, who has been designated as the Son of God. The presence of the Spirit sets Jesus apart, and the fact that the Spirit abides on or with him is a further indication of this difference of Jesus. Right in the beginning of his Gospel John indicates that Jesus is 'qualified' to help humanity find their salvation. The intensely personal relationship between Jesus and God is highlighted (v32-34). Because of this intensely personal relationship between Jesus and God, Jesus can be described as someone who has mystic illumination of the divine, in the sense understood by Weber. The next point follows on from here. The disciples are encouraged to come and see where Jesus abides. And they then abide with him for the rest of the day. The mystical world view of Jesus firstly encourages the disciples to spend

time with him, and then by spending time with Jesus they are exposed to his mystical world view. This becomes expressed in the Gospel by the word μένω, and will continue to inform the discussion in this thesis. What follows is that the disciples, the first two, of which one was Andrew, are so impressed by this person whom they have spent time with that they are 'encouraged' to tell others about him. There is no sense in which the mystical illumination is passed on as such, rather it is a sense of coming to someone who has this mystical illumination. It is not knowledge that is passed on, but a gaining of knowledge, in the words of Weber, "it denotes a practical form of knowledge. Such *gnosis* is basically a "possession" of something from which there may be derived a new practical orientation to the world..." (1978:545). At one level John is plainly communicating a relationship of Jesus based on closeness to him, but on another level in order to experience salvation, here referred to what Jesus does as the Lamb who takes away the sin of the world (v29), one needs to realize that he is the person who has a close personal relationship with the numinous, and that the disciples need to realise this. This is what forms the content of the knowledge that is gained, and effects their relationship to the world.

The 'conversion' of the first disciples and in particular that of Nathanael reveal something of the link between Jesus and the Father. Nathanael's initial position, under the fig tree also can help us in our investigation of the Gospel. The reference to Nathanael sitting under the fig tree brings to mind the study of the Torah, which is often represented by one studying it under a fig tree. This meditation on the Torah can also be seen as a prelude to a mystical experience which Nathanael has when he encounters Jesus. Nathanael's initial scepticism (v46), is completely reversed on the account of the 'miracle' of Jesus, i.e., Jesus telling him what he was doing (v 48). The confession of Nathanael is counterweighted by the statement of Jesus that he will see angels ascending and descending on the Son of the Human Being. In recalling the account of Jacob in Gen 28, Jesus makes the link between himself and God that much more clear. Jesus is the link between heaven and earth (Countryman 1994:27). The quote from Gen 28:12 in which Jesus promises to Nathanael that he will see greater things, even the angels of God ascending and descending onto the Son of the Human Being. Wayne Meeks takes this ascent/descent motif and examines it.

For example, the descent from heaven is not described in John, but everywhere presupposed as a *fait accompli*. The prologue offers no real exception, for it is not really a "prologue in heaven" though the standpoint of the poem's narrator is, in



a sense, *sub specie aeternitatis*<sup>63</sup>. The story of Jesus in the Gospel is all played out on earth, despite the frequent indicators that he really belongs elsewhere. (Meeks 1986:145).

This motif identifies Jesus as the stranger from heaven (Meeks 1986:146), who is completely different. The motif occurs through out the text of the Gospel primarily at the point of a story where the inability of the world, or the Judeans to accept and understand Jesus is expressed (1986:152). The model mystic virtuoso helps us to grasp this inability of the Judeans to understand Jesus. He is only understandable to those who are prepared to abide with him, who are prepared to engage in the mystical contemplative lifestyle that Jesus promulgates. The increasing emphasis on the motif in the development of the Gospel leads Meeks to conclude that

In telling the story of the Son of Man who came down from heaven and then re-ascended after choosing a few of his own out of the world, the book defines and vindicates the existence of the community that evidently sees itself as unique, alien from its world, under attack, misunderstood, but living in unity with Christ and through him with God. (1986:163)

The motif of ascent/descent can be understood using the model of a mystic virtuoso. The motif gives expression to the mystical relationship between Jesus and God. This motif is introduced to the reader here in the opening scenes of the Gospel. Linked with the word μένω it provides a helpful insight to what John was trying to say. John's Jesus is a figure completely unlike any other, he is the designated Son of God, he is the Son of the Human Being, he has descended from heaven and will ascend back to where he was before. Because of the presence of the Spirit, he has a close intimate relationship with the numinous, and as such is qualified to hand on to his followers the techniques for developing such a relationship with God. By understanding this text in this way, and using Weber's concept of virtuosi, we are given a better insight into the way in which Jesus demonstrated his relationship with God. The contemplative lifestyle, the mystic teachings and mannerism, all point the way for the community to live, and to live in such a way in relation to a world of oppression, and misunderstanding.

---

63. Translated as "under the gaze of eternity."

#### 4.3.2.2 John 3:1-21 (The account of Nicodemus).

##### 4.3.2.2.1 The Context.

John 3:1-21 tells the story of Nicodemus. Prior to this account the wedding at Cana has been described and Jesus has revealed his glory so that his disciples could believe in him. Jesus has entered into Jerusalem and gone into the temple, here he has driven out those who were selling doves and oxen and sheep, and had overturned the tables of the money changers. In this Jesus has also demonstrated to his disciples and to the Judeans as a whole that he does have the authority. John has introduced the readers and the community to the idea that Jesus would have to die and then rise again. The short dialogue concerning the destruction and rebuilding of the temple is very clearly linked to his death by verse 21 & 22: ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The link is made, not by Jesus, but by the author writing after the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Then we have a short rather confusing insert by the author. This section becomes more understandable if it is closely associated with what follows, rather than with what preceded it. It is my contention that 2:23-25 actually belong with 3:1. A close reading will reveal that there is a similarity in vocabulary, and if one understands Nicodemus to be an example of one of those to whom Jesus did not testify, because he knew what was in humanity, then the section on Nicodemus follows very fluently. “And there was a human being of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus...” Nicodemus is one of those about whom Jesus knew (2:25). The account of Nicodemus follows, in which there is a large play on the word ἄνωθεν, and being born. There is an oddity about the text in that Nicodemus is a single person but he quiet clearly represents a group of people as the plural is often used in the mouth of Jesus to address Nicodemus (See translation). After 3:21 John goes back to John the Baptist. Here John the Baptist once again reinforces the fact that he has to decrease while Jesus has to increase. This gives further weight to the authority of Jesus already demonstrated in chap. 2, and leads into the discussion in chap. 4 where Jesus is depicted as baptising people prior to his excursion into Samaria.

#### 4.3.2.2.2. How does the model of mystic virtuoso help us with this section?

If we are looking at techniques of maintaining charisma, what about the story of Nicodemus? I have already discussed this in connection with Nicodemus' misunderstanding and the irony in the passage. But as a technique for maintaining the charisma or assuring one's self of salvation, then the story of Nicodemus is useful. Nicodemus approaches Jesus and speaks to him, but does not ask a question of him. Jesus then starts off on this dialogue about being born again (from above). ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (v3). Jesus then qualifies what he says about being born again (from above), by saying that one has to be born out of water and Spirit (or wind). ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (v5). What we are dealing with here is a mechanism for maintaining the charisma. In order for the disciples, or in this case, Nicodemus, to remain under the influence of the charisma that Jesus possessed, he has to be born again (from above) or in other words, he has to be born of water and Spirit (wind). The model helps us to see that Jesus is speaking of a different sphere of existence (see ἄνωθεν above). Nicodemus is unable to understand Jesus because he is not able to perceive this 'other' sphere of existence. In this mystical sphere one needs to be born of water and the Spirit not just water.

If we talk about the Johannine community, then what does this imply for the members of that community. David Rensberger (1988) is of assistance here.

Nicodemus appears in the role of a "secret Christian," one of those who wish to keep their faith in Jesus, such as it is, from becoming publicly known in order to maintain what J. Louis Martyn calls a "dual allegiance" to the Christian faith and to the synagogue. In particular, Nicodemus represents those secret Christians who are themselves among the Pharisaic teaching authorities and feared that a public confession of Jesus would endanger their position in the synagogue community (cf. John 3:1; 12:42). They were prepared to acknowledge Jesus, in private, as a divinely sent miracle worker and teacher, but their Christology fell short of the belief demanded by the Fourth Evangelist. For this reason, but especially for their unwillingness to let even the faith that they had be known at large, he criticized

them severely. Yet even so, he evidently continued to hold some hope that they might yet come to fuller belief and to a public confession of it. (1988:55).

John 3:3,7 are more than just a call to be born again (from above) *μὴ θαυμάσης ὅτι εἶπόν σοι· δεῖ ὑμῶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν* (v7). It is a call for the Nicodemus group to join the Johannine group. And this joining would entail an acceptance of the Christological confession of the Johannine group. It is a call to move from the one sphere of existence to another. This 'higher' or mystical sphere is characterized by the Johannine community and their high christology. This is important in its link to being born of water and Spirit (wind) with very definite links to baptism.

Given the authenticity of both water and Spirit in 3:5, and their significance in the overall unity of the chapter, we must go on to ask about their meaning for the [two] figure[s] we have discussed. For Nicodemus, it is significant that to be born from above is not only a heavenly birth of the Spirit but also a birth of water, that is, of baptism. For baptism, it must be remembered, is not only a sacrament but an initiation rite. If to be born from above requires a decision to believe in the one sent from God, it also requires, we have suggested, adherence to the *community* of such believers. Baptismal initiation was the open declaration of this adherence, and we have seen that it was just this open confession that the group represented by Nicodemus was reluctant to make. Jesus tells them, "you people must be born from above," and that this means birth from water as well as from Spirit. They cannot avoid either the christological decision or the public acknowledgment of it in baptism, that is, in initiation into the Johannine group. (Rensberger 1988:58).

If baptism is an initiation rite, and in this case becomes an initiation rite into the Johannine community, what other associations are there with baptism? Initiation is a powerful ritual that brings the child into a fuller standing with the rest of the community. Those who are initiated undergo a series of teachings in isolation from the rest of the community. These are surrounded by strict controls and discipline. When the initiation is complete they are welcomed as full members of the society<sup>64</sup>. They have learnt the secrets and they know the knowledge, therefore

---

64. For a more detailed investigation into the function of rituals, see works by Victor Turner (1969). Mary Douglas (1966 and 1970) also investigates the function of rituals and relates them to certain sections of the Bible. William Domeris (1991) has also used the work by Douglas, in particular her 'grid/group' model and  
(continued...)

they are welcome within the society. Similarly within the Johannine community, we can extrapolate, that the process of baptism (water and Spirit/wind) is a process of learning the secrets and the knowledge in order to become members of the community. But it is the learning of these secrets that is more important than the ritual, as nowhere is the ritual actually described (*cf* *Didache*<sup>65</sup>). Baptism is the normal sequel to conversion, and as such fits in after the conversions that took place in chap. 1. The confusion that reigns between Nicodemus and Jesus, and the non-sequiturs of some of Jesus' replies to Nicodemus' questions emphasizes that it is not the act of baptism which affects the individual, but rather the "inner, spiritual alteration held to be the accompaniment of the rite." (Countryman 1994:34). The inability of Nicodemus to grasp the 'earthly' things, and Jesus ability to tell even more about the 'heavenly' things (v12), reflect Jesus' unique relationship with God. For the person who believes, and knows Jesus and his relationship with God, this discussion with Nicodemus is relatively simple to understand. But for the person who does not know or understand Jesus' relationships with God, in this case, Nicodemus, the discussion is very difficult to grasp.

The discussion on baptism can be lengthened to include discussion up to the end of chap. 5, but that is beyond the scope of this thesis. Suffice it to state that baptism involves a change on the part of the individual, a recognition that Jesus is the Son of God. So baptism for John then is a changing of affiliations. Change from belonging to the world to belonging to the Johannine community, a change of one sphere of existence (the world) to another sphere (the sphere of *ἄνωθεν*). Along with this, it forms a boundary between the community and the rest of the world.

It is a method of recognising those who belong and those who don't:

Clearly this conception of baptism corresponds well to a number of aspects of baptismal function described for the Pauline communities by Wayne Meeks. There too baptism forms a threshold between the world and the community where Jesus is Lord, and there too baptism is associated with the perception of the Spirit and becoming a child of God. In both cases, baptism accomplishes the transition from

---

64. (...continued)  
applied it to the Gospel of John.

65. In this document from approximately the same era as John, the *Didache* gives very clear instructions on how to perform the various rituals. These instructions are accompanied by teachings, but the ritual itself is given great importance. This does not occur in the Gospel of John. (*Didache* vii:1-4).

the world to an exclusive community and thus serves as a permanent boundary between the two. (Rensberger 1988:69).

And so by becoming part of the community, the members become part of those who 'abide' with Jesus. Those who withdraw from the world into the seclusion of their community. And the discussion above on 'abide', μένω, affirms every aspect of their being.

#### **4.3.2.3 John 6:1-71 (The Bread of Life).**

##### **4.3.2.3.1 The context.**

Ideally one should talk about the whole of John 6, but that would be a long complicated exercise, the focus of this thesis will be on the last few verses. The context of this section is given by a healing at the beginning of chap. 5, and then a complicated dialogue between Jesus and the Judeans, over John the Baptist's position. Jesus initiates a discussion about Moses being the accuser of the Judeans which will later come up again in chap. 6. There has been much debate as to whether chap. 6 belongs after chap. 5.

It is well known that chapter 6 appears to interrupt the logical order of events recorded in chapters 5 and 7. Bultmann's reconstruction of the original order (1971:209) makes good sense, but like all attempts to change the order it suffers from the disadvantage that there is no textual evidence to support any such dislocation. (Suggit 1992:65)

Chap. 6 begins with the familiar account of the feeding of the large crowd of people with a few loaves and fish. This single event is recorded in all the gospels. After the feeding, the disciples embark across the sea, and Jesus comes to them walking on the water. The reason for the crowds insistence on finding Jesus is given by their desire for bread, and this initiates a lengthily discussion on the bread of life. This discussion concludes with the Judeans being highly dissatisfied with Jesus, and the teaching is so difficult that even some of his disciples desert him. The passage is concluded by a form of confession of faith by Peter, and a reminder that Judas will be the one to betray him. In so doing the passage keeps alive the revelation of Jesus to the woman at the well, and the knowledge of the coming betrayal and death of Jesus.

Chap. 7 follows in which a further discussion is initiated about Jesus being the Living Water. Here it is the brothers of Jesus who fail to understand who he is, and his purpose. In this the confusion of the Judeans is picked up and carried through to the next encounter with them during the feast of Tabernacles.

#### 4.3.2.3.2. How does the model of mystic virtuoso help us with this section?

The Fourth Gospel omits any direct reference to the ‘last Supper’ on a par with those accounts found in the Synoptics. The blatant eucharistic symbolism and references in chap. 6 seem to meet the need for any discussion regarding this subject. Again, as with baptism, there is no explicit reference as to how to go about the meal, the rite is not the important element, but rather the content of the ritual. The eucharist follows on after conversion and baptism in Countryman’s plan of the Gospel (1994:50). This omission of any concrete mentioning of the Eucharist can also be seen as a characteristic which fits the model of a mystic virtuoso. The focus of the illumination is in the inner meaning of the ritual and not so much on the actual performance of the ritual. The model shows us that contemplation of certain truths leads to illumination of those truths. It appears that the lack of a references to the last supper directs one’s focus onto the truths regarding the bread and the wine which leads one to acknowledge that Jesus is the bread of life. A mystical insight into the sacraments.

The claim by Jesus, “I am the bread of life.” (v35), in response to the question by the crowds for him to give them bread, and again in verse 48, places Jesus in a position superior to Moses. Jesus reveals himself as the provider of bread, bread that leads to life. Just as those who ate the manna in the desert and died, so those who eat him (Jesus) will not die. In this Jesus puts aside the crowd’s concern for physical food, and takes them to a second level of understanding. The person who has a complete understanding of who Jesus is, and believes that Jesus is the Son of God, has no need of physical bread. This has strong connections with the discussion between Jesus and the woman at the well (4:14). (Countryman 1994:54).

Another closely linked section is the section in John 6 about the bread of life. 6:51. ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγη ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσκει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σὰρξ μου



ἔστιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. And 6:56 ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἶμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ. Within the whole context of the discussion of the bread of life, we are reminded again and again that in order to ‘abide’ in Jesus one has to eat and drink him.

This must be understood in relation to the Johannine communal setting, in which the solidarity of individuals with Jesus, their “abiding” in him, was of hard necessity closely bound up with their solidarity with one another, their “love.” To abide in Jesus, that is, to maintain the Johannine christological confession (with which, as we have seen, the Eucharistic passage is closely connected), meant to be distanced and isolated from the social world of the synagogue. The risk that this involved we have already found portrayed in the figures of Nicodemus, the blind man, and the blind man’s parents. John 16:2 suggests that the risk could have extended in some circumstances to life itself. In these conditions, the need for mutual support would have been strongly felt, and it seems clear that the members of the Johannine community were in fact tightly drawn together. “Love” would mean not only affection and a general kindness but standing with others in the community against betrayal by outsiders and participating actively in creating the new communal bonds that must take the place of the lost synagogue fellowship. The Eucharist symbolizes not only the gift of eternal life in Jesus but also the world’s rejection of that gift and of the community that had accepted it. If sharing in the Eucharist meal meant affirming the Johannine faith, it would also have meant affirming the community’s solidarity in the face of the dangers brought upon them by their faith. (Rensberger 1988:80).

In a similar way as to the discussion on ‘abiding’ in Jesus, the Eucharist is a practical method of abiding in Jesus and in the community. By eating and gnawing the flesh and blood of Jesus one remains in contact with him and so in contact with the charisma and the salvation which he promised. The conclusion of chap. 6 shows that some of the disciples found this teaching impossibly hard to accept and left Jesus. This point serves to highlight what was mentioned earlier about the internal and the external impact of the rituals involved. Participation in the ritual does not guarantee a perfectly reliable disciple, or member of the community. Judas is a prime example,

and he is mentioned here, one who participated in all the rituals but was still found wanting, and in the end betrayed Jesus. The 'sacraments' here discussed as baptism and the eucharist, become steps in one's growing relation with Jesus, they are not ends in themselves. (Countryman 1994:58). There is a required understanding of who Jesus is, a belief in him as the Son of God.

#### **4.3.2.4 John 10:1-21 (The shepherd and the sheep).**

##### **4.3.2.4.1 The Context.**

In chap. 8, the discourse goes beyond the external rituals, mentioned above, and begins to deal with the internal enlightenment. The series of images on light and dark evoke the prologue (1:4-5), and serve to explain the fundamental unpredictability of enlightenment. (Countryman 1994:66). In chap. 9 then Jesus demonstrates to the Judeans the power he has to heal the man born blind. And as described above there is a play on the word 'know.' At the end of chap. 9 Jesus makes a comment about those being blind who can see, and this invites a response from the Pharisees. After this response Jesus embarks on his discussion about the sheep and the shepherd. These two passages are linked, and should be read as such. Further evidence of this linkage is that in 9:21, a comment is made about Jesus being possessed and a response is that a man with a demon is unable to heal a man be blind. ἄλλοι ἔλεγον· ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἔστιν δαιμονιζομένου· μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοῖξαι; (v21). The healing of the blind man serves as a metaphor for his spiritual (mystical) enlightenment (35-38), and the difference between him and the Pharisees is highlighted by their inability to see (39-41).

True sight is to see things as they really are. That will not be easy, for we are caught in that desperate alienation from the creator that John described in the prologue as "the dark." We cannot see truly what we are afraid to see. The essence of the blind man's enlightenment was to recognize in Jesus the touchstone of reality. He does not express it in a fully-fledged Johannine doctrine of the Christ, but in ways appropriate to the narrative. The drift, however, is the same. As long as one is orientated towards the Son, one sees; turn toward some other standard of reality, and one is blind. (Countryman 1994:76).

After 10:21, the scene appears to change, we have a brief description of time and place, which has not occurred since chap. 7, where Jesus is described as being in the temple during the time of the feast. Now he is still in Jerusalem but it is the feast of renovation. There is no reason to think that this needs to be separated from what precedes it, as Jesus again picks up the theme of sheep, albeit briefly. His claim about being one with the Father, again leads the Judeans into anger and an attempt to stone him. At the end of this scene Jesus departs across the Jordan, and we are left with the idea that many people are going to see him, because of the miracles. Chap. 11 proceeds with the raising of Lazarus, and seems to flow, both chronologically, and geographically, from the point that Jesus is out of Judea when he hears of Lazarus' illness.

#### 4.3.2.4.2. How does the model of mystic virtuoso help us with this section?

One may be tempted to comment that the discussion on virtuosi is of little use in this chapter, and the idea of a mystic union with the divine is completely absent from this passage. This may be true, and indeed it is more evident in chap. 15 as we shall see later, but in chap. 10, we can find help using the tools of the model of mystic virtuoso. Firstly there is the discussion of Jesus as the door to the sheepfold. We have already stated that Jesus is the Son of God, and as such he knows the true shepherd from the false shepherds. In this capacity he is able to protect the sheep. The sheep recognise this because they know his voice, they have a connection with the shepherd, almost equivalent to a mystical union, and this helps them in not being led astray. Jesus is the gate to the sheep, and as such he is the only point of access that is legitimate. The way the sheep respond to his voice, because they know him, is the same way that Jesus responds to the Father. For those who are enlightened, and who believe that Jesus is the Son of God, will follow Jesus. They know that Jesus is the only connection between God and his creation, indeed Jesus is an agent of that creation (see prologue).

In this chapter Jesus is presented as both the door and the shepherd (v7,11). This suggests a mystical understanding of Jesus. And only one who has spent time meditating on who Jesus is could understand his dual functioning in this chapter. One can only enter into the sheepfold, the community, through Jesus, and this would imply that one needs to know Jesus. But Jesus is also the shepherd of the sheep, and continues to lead the sheep, once one has entered the sheepfold. Again the two levels, mentioned by O'Day earlier, can be seen here. It is easy enough to see Jesus as one or the other, but true illumination sees Jesus as both.

There is a bold statement of Jesus' unity with the Father expressed in verse 30, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμεν. The sheep know this, but those who do not have a complete grasp of who Jesus is, take him to be speaking blasphemy.

#### 4.3.2.5 John 13-17 (The Farewell discourse).

I plan to discuss chap. 13-14, 15 and 17. I am leaving out chap. 16 for the sake of length.

##### 4.3.2.5.1 The Context.

In this section I will discuss the context for the whole of the "Farewell Discourse" and I will discuss each of the four sections I have chose in relation to mystic virtuosi. This will be easier to handle and make for a better grasp of what is going on.

These five chapters bring to and end many of the themes discussed throughout the Gospel. They summarise, and then give a platform for the conclusion of the Gospel in the last four chapters. Chap. 11 recounts the raising of Lazarus from the dead, and at the end of that chapter we are given an insight into the high-priest's desire to put an end to Jesus. This leads into chap. 12 where Jesus is again visiting Lazarus and Mary and Martha, and we are told that the high-priests wish to put Lazarus to death as well because of the crowds attraction to him. This short scene links chap. 11 to chap. 12 which focuses on the so-called "triumphal entry." Part of the triumphal entry is a discussion about the Son of the Human Being, and the dialogue with the crowds. In 12:23, Jesus says that "the hour has come", which gives rise to the approaching death of Jesus. Now is the time when Jesus shall be revealed in his glory, now is the time when Jesus brings glory to the Father, and the Father glorifies the Son. This change in pace requires the reader to understand that a change is to take place. A revealing has to occur, and this takes place, to a certain extent, in the Farewell Discourse. At the end of this Jesus hides himself from them, and the Gospel goes on to give an interlude which links up various Old Testament passages<sup>66</sup>. Just prior to the end of the chapter Jesus interrupts the scene again and gives a short sharp discourse on those who believe in him. This brings us to chap. 13 and the beginning of the Farewell Discourse proper.

---

66. These various quotes from the Old Testament are more than just an explanation for what is happening. The intention of the author (as much as we are able to know this) is for the whole passage to be brought to mind, not just the verse quoted. So when he quotes from Isaiah 53:1, it is not only verse 1 that is important but the whole context of it. In this case a description of the "suffering servant."

There appears to be a definite break between chap. 12 and 13. Indeed there is a break, implied in time and possibly in geographical setting. Chap. 12 is situated six days before the Passover, while chap. 13 is situated “before the feast of the Passover” (13:1), and the exact time is deliberately left vague. Now Jesus is seated with his disciples and the discourses and activities of the Farewell Discourse are embarked on. At the end of chap. 17, there again appears to be a sharp break with Jesus going out from the room, and entering the garden. Here he is betrayed and handed over to the high-priests and the Romans. Then follows the “trial” and the crucifixion of Jesus, his death and his resurrection. Then in chap. 20, the important handing on of the charisma, which I shall discuss later.

The two breaks on either side of these five chapters serve to highlight their content. Although the various themes on either side of the Farewell Discourse are picked up in the Discourse, the break is emphasised. In these five chapters something different happens. It is here that Jesus reveals himself to his disciples as he has not revealed himself elsewhere.

I will discuss each of the chosen sections individually highlighting those aspects which are most useful in the direction of this thesis.

#### 4.3.2.5.2 John 13.

The setting of the Farewell Discourse can be discussed in terms of mystic virtuosi. The setting reflects a situation of absolute flight from the world. The disciples are gathered with Jesus away from the world, and it is only in this setting that Jesus can wash their feet and give them his Farewell Discourse. It is only in this setting of absolute flight from the world that Jesus can mention to his disciples that one of them will betray him, and the shock and horror of this can only be appreciated in this setting. It is in this setting that Jesus become more and more ‘transparent’ to his disciples (to the community). He prepares them for their new relationship with one-another and with the paraclete.

The “new commandment” that Jesus gives to his disciples in verse 34 again reflects the intensive interaction between the disciples that is needed to maintain this community that Jesus has established. The model expresses the complete break with the world as “absolute flight from the world.” For a community which exercises this “flight from the world” there will need to be

intensive reconstruction of their social universe or world view in terms of their mystical world view. This is what appears to be happening in the Farewell Discourse and the model is of assistance for us to appreciate it more. Intensively active in this section, and indeed the entire farewell discourse, is the application of various mechanisms for a successful formation of a community. There is world view reconstruction:

The extraordinary nature of the Johannine narration has long been observed, the kind of repetition and interwoven fabric, the oblique, ironic manner of establishing theological insights, the limited number of events which lead to extended discourses... What this method amounts to in sociological terms, is *world view reconstruction*. People are brought to see reality in a new kind of way, to see themselves in a new light. They come to re-interpret their old religious traditions in terms of a newly constructed reality, which has the figure of Jesus at the centre. All the old undertakings and rituals of the Jewish religion and national life are now re-interpreted on the basis of Jesus. (Draper 1992:21).

This 're-interpreting' is what is happening in this Gospel. John is re-interpreting the Old Testament traditions as well as the traditions about Jesus in line with the model of mysticism. Part of the process of a construction of this community is to foster intensive interaction. The newly constructed world view can only be maintained through a process of intensive interaction. The prominence of the 'love' theme (ἀγάπη) reflects this. In this theme the unity of the Father and the Son and the love that is this unity, and the love of the Son for his own, is extended now to include a love between members of that community:

The Discourses begin with the juxtaposition of the theme of Jesus' Departure (13:31-33) and the theme of mutual love within the community which mirrors Jesus love for them... This love is to be the hall-mark by which the true disciples of Jesus are to be recognised (13:35). The theme recurs in 14:20-24, where the unity between Father and Son is extended to the community (v20). Love for Jesus is demonstrated in keeping his commandments, which are none other than the command to love each other, and this becomes the pre-condition for the presence of Jesus (and the Father) in the community (v21-24). Once again in 15:9-17 the commandment to love within the community is extended to the idea of self-

sacrificial love, just as Jesus' own love meant laying down his life. (Draper 1992:22).

A third and equally important process is the process of boundary maintenance. This function is taken over by the Paraclete, and does not form such an important section of this thesis<sup>67</sup>.

#### 4.3.2.5.3 John 14.

John 14 follows on closely from chap. 13. After Jesus' statement that he will be denied by Peter, it is quite obvious that his, and possibly, their, hearts will be troubled, in this manner Jesus starts chap. 14 with the sentence: Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε (v1). This single phrase refers us to a very close relationship with God. A similar phrase is repeated in verse 27, and echoes this. The discourse continues with Jesus telling the disciples that they do know the way to where it is that Jesus is going. The discussion on ἄνωθεν helps us here. One of the characteristics of the model is the two spheres of existence. Because the disciples have been born from above they do know the way. However, Thomas' question reveals a flaw or an imperfection in their faith, in that they still don't understand who Jesus is after all this time. Jesus then tells them quite plainly who he is, and that he is the way to the Father. The short dialogue between Jesus and Thomas reveals this. Λέγει αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς· κύριε, οὐκ οἶδμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι;

---

67. Draper develops this line of investigation in his article. "Working purely at the surface level, at present, it is noteworthy that on each occasion on which the Paraclete is mentioned, the ΚΟΣΜΟΣ is also mentioned. Possession of the Paraclete differentiates the community from the world, which cannot receive him (14:17). The gift of the paraclete brings the peace of Jesus, which is 'not as the world gives' (15:27), so that the community should not be troubled or be cowards. This fear is provoked by the imminent coming of the Ruler of the world (15:30). The gift of the Paraclete is mentioned again in 15:26-27, sandwiched between two passages on the hatred of the world, which will lead to the persecution of the community (15:18-25; 16:1-4). The excommunication from the synagogue and threat to life itself may lead community members to apostacize (σκανδαλισθῆτε), but Jesus' promise of the Paraclete will strengthen and maintain the community against the world. Finally, the task of the Paraclete is seen as confrontation with the world. The Paraclete will convict the world concerning sin, righteousness and judgement (16:7-11). The second obvious factor in the way the evangelists uses the Paraclete theme, is that he is equated with the Spirit of Truth. Truth is the indicator of the community's claim to exclusive possession of salvation. This is summarized in the famous saying of Jesus: 'I am the way and the truth and the life; no-one comes to the Father except through me'. There is no salvation outside the sect. This is the characteristic mark of the introversionist sect. The exclusive claim to salvation is a technique of boundary maintenance. The Paraclete is specifically linked to this claim in 14:17; 17:26; indirectly in 16:7 and directly in 17:13. To be 'led into all truth' (16:13) by the Paraclete is to see reality the way the community sees it and to see any other perspective as falsehood inspired by the Ruler of this world. In other words, the sociological function of the Paraclete is boundary maintenance over against a hostile world." (Draper 1992:22-3).



λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ (v5-6). In this dialogue, Jesus once again re-affirms his relationship with the Father, and at the same times confirms for the disciples that he has a special relationship with God. Indeed, possibly the disciples thought he was God. According to Weber, for the activity of contemplation to succeed in achieving its goal of mystical illumination, the thrusting out of every mundane, daily interest is required (1978:544). This dialogue enforces this. There is no activity here, just an acceptance that Jesus is the way to the Father. Contemplating this is all that is required.

This is developed in the next section of dialogue. Jesus emphasizes the fact that if they have known (ἐγνώκατε) him then they would also know (γνώσεσθε) the Father (v7). Jesus enforces the idea that by knowing him, they have come to know the Father. This knowledge is different from the knowledge of the Pharisees and the rest of the Judeans<sup>68</sup>. This knowledge is based on a special relationship with Jesus, and not on any obedience to a set of rules.

In contrast to asceticism, contemplation is primarily the quest to achieve rest in god and in him alone. It entails inactivity, and in its most consistent form it entails the cessation of thought, of everything that in any way reminds one of the world, and of course the absolute minimization of all outer and inner activity. (Weber 1978:545)

There is no set of regulations for the disciples to follow in order to achieve a victory over the world. Here, the way to the Father is through Jesus, and that implies absolute faith in him. This is a flight from the world. The promise of salvation is through Jesus, not through regulations, again this links up closely with what Weber is saying. The command to love cannot be seen as a rule that needs obeying. In a vague sense it might be. But the command to love is so inextricably tied up with the relationship between Jesus and the Father, and Jesus and the community that it is not considered a command but a necessity of life. In Jesus the way of humanity to God, and the way of God to humanity are met together (14:10). Only those who are truly enlightened can grasp this, and even at this stage the disciples are struggling. (Countryman 1994:102).

---

68. See the above discussion on the difference between γινώσκω and οἶδα.

Linked up with this flight from the world, and the ensuing absolute faith in Jesus, is the presence and activity of the Paraclete. The Paraclete becomes for the community the presence of Jesus after his death.

The presence of the Paraclete is a necessary re-assurance that the believers will not be left defenceless before a hostile world (Οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς v18). The exclusivity of the community over against the world is maintained by the claim that the Spirit which indwells the community has the sole guardianship of the Truth. (Draper 1992:25).

The Paraclete meets the community's need for peace and re-assurance and courage in the face of persecution. The Paraclete becomes the numinous, and the "abiding" which was needed in Jesus in chap. 1, now becomes necessary in the Paraclete. ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται (v17).

Verses 23-26 may give the impression that we are dealing with asceticism rather than mysticism, where Jesus gives his disciples commands requiring obedience. However, this is not the case, Weber stresses this as follows:

Contemplation does not necessarily become a passive abandonment to dreams or a simple self-hypnosis, though it may approach these states in practise. On the contrary, the distinctive road to contemplation is a very energetic concentration upon certain truths. The decisive aspect of this process is not the content of these truths, which frequently seem very simple to non-mystics, but rather the type of emphasis placed upon the truths. The mystical truths come to assume a central position within, and to exert an integrating influence upon, the total view of the world.... The illumination consists essentially in a unique quality of feeling or, more concretely, in the felt emotional unity of knowledge and volitional mood which provides the mystic with decisive assurance of his religious state of grace. (1978:546).

ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με

πατρός. Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν μένων· ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ] (v23-26). This dialogue gives the content of the contemplation for the disciples. This becomes the mechanism for contemplation and as such gives the disciples the assurance of their state of grace, or their salvation.

The enigmatic "Rise, let us go from here." at the end of chap. 14 has baffled scholars for many years. Does this signify the end of the original discourse, and that chap. 15-17 were added by a later redactor, or is it just an editorial slip made by a scribe very early on in the transmission of the text? These questions will have to remain unanswered for now<sup>69</sup>.

#### 4.3.2.5.4 John 15.

Chap. 15 brings us to the very famous discourse on the vine. Here the 'parable' followed by the brief explanation is a prime example of an attempt to achieve a union with the divine. Here again, with the resurgence of the word (μείνω), the author brings the community to realise the implications of this divine union.

The truth of all existence lies in its intimate relationship with the Father through the Son. Everything that is has existence only insofar as it is in love with its creator. (Countryman 1994:107).

It is this that is emphasized by the story of the vine, and it relates closely to image of the sheep in chap. 10. If we refer back to the discussion of chap. 13, this relates to the reconstruction of a world view. The intensive interaction is emphasised by a union with the divine, and in the same process a union with each other. The so-called "brotherly love" of the Johannine community. Together with the presence of the Paraclete, the community needs to abide in Christ, as the branches of a vine remain together. In this way the community is able to continue to know the presence of God, and they continue to remain within the community. The strength of the

---

69. Brodie gives a comprehensive study of this point in a general study on the unity of the Farewell Discourse as a whole. Brodie approaches this issue from his own investigation, which is a literary analysis of the Gospel. He argues, persuasively, that the text is a literary unit. And that the phrase at the end of chap. 14 is put there for a purpose, and that it links closely with the beginning of chap. 17, in which there are also indications of movement. (Brodie 1993a 428ff).

community over against the world, as recorded later in this chapter (v18ff), is maintained by their unity with the divine and each other.

The rejection by the world of the community is seen again in verse 19. This dis-association with the world is another characteristic of a mystic community. They now live in and from God's love, and because of this, they live in opposition to the world (Countryman 1994:107). Because of the mystical subjective appropriation of salvation, the community may no longer find themselves bound by the rules of the world.

For the ascetic, the certainty of salvation always demonstrates itself in rational action, integrated as to meaning, end, and means, and governed by principles and rules. Conversely, for the mystic who actually possesses a subjectively appropriated state of salvation the result of this subjective condition may be anomism. His salvation manifests itself not in any sort of activity but in a subjective condition and its idiosyncratic quality. He feels himself no longer bound by any rule of conduct; regardless of his behaviour, he is certain of salvation. (Weber 1978:549).

The dualism which is emphasised between the world and the community is a reflection of this. εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος (v19). It is because of the community's mysticism that they no longer consider themselves part of the world, and it is because of this that the world hates them.

#### 4.3.2.5.5 John 17.

Chap. 17 brings us to the end of the Farewell Discourse, and is commonly known as the High Priestly prayer of Jesus. The setting does not seem to have changed, but there is the further action of Jesus lifting up his eyes to the heaven. The intimacy that Jesus shares with the Father is reflected in the terminology that is used. Brodie makes a point about the ascending of Jesus during the course of this prayer. He understands the prayer to be ambiguous in its setting, 'is Jesus on earth or in Heaven at this point?' But what Brodie does is highlight the essence of the unity of the Father and the Son, and the increasing unity of the Son and the disciples (Brodie 1993a:505-508). This increasing unity between God and Jesus and between Jesus and the disciples fits in very well with the model of achieving union with the divine. At the end of the mystical illumination through

the Farewell Discourse Jesus achieves a union with God as do the disciples through Jesus. This is further emphasized by the easiness with which Jesus addresses the Father is evident. Here, vv1-8, Jesus makes a summary of his activity. This summary reveals how Jesus tried to reveal the Father to those around him. There may even be a hint that he was successful: Ἐφάνέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς ἔδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. σοὶ ἦσαν καὶ μοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρηκαν. νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν· (v6-7). The author seems to imply that Jesus was successful in his task of introducing the disciples to the Father.

Again the separation of the community from the world is given a strong emphasis. This break from the world is accompanied by an increasing desire on the part of Jesus for unity. It starts with a keeping in the name of the Father (v11). This develops into keeping them separate from the world, but Jesus is leaving the world, so they now need to keep together (v13-14). They don't need to be removed from the world, but only kept together in the world, because they are not of the world in any case. They have achieved some form of enlightenment and hence unity with the divine (v15-16). Before complete union is achieved Jesus asks that they be made holy<sup>70</sup> and this includes being aware of the need to go out into the world to continue the work that Jesus started (v 17-19). Then a concern is expressed for those who later come to true faith in Jesus. This may or may not reflect an increase in the community of members who were not part of the original community. These "new" people also have to achieve a unity with the divine (v20-21). Then (v22-24), the climax of this passage, Jesus prays for a complete unity with the divine. The concept of union with the divine is now carried to its completion. There is no longer a 'abiding' with the divine, (μένω) is no longer used. There is now a ONENESS with the divine. Unity and no distinction. This is the ultimate goal of the mystic, this was Jesus' ultimate goal, and John has portrayed this in his Gospel. Then the brief qualification (v24-26), for the community it is quiet obvious that complete unity has not been achieved since they are on earth and they are beset with problems around them. So the wish of the community, placed into the mouth of Jesus, that they may be where he is, is mentioned to give an explanation of their present situation. In a sense this

---

70. In my translation "Holify them."

also expresses a wish for even greater unity, a unity that cannot be achieved in their present context, but can only be achieved later.

With a unique ring of authority (*thelō*, "I will") Jesus speaks to the Father of a togetherness in which the believers see a new degree of glory, glory as it reflects the Father's eternal love. The implication is of the believers entering fully into the divine exchange of love, entering the eternity of God. (Brodie 1993a:517).

Countryman elucidates a few themes from this chapter as well as from others that relate to the concept of union. The unity within the community is not any lesser than the unity between the Father and the Son, which is expressed in the words of the prologue.

Such a unity does not submerge the separate reality of the beings that enter into it;... Yet this union overcomes all possibility of estrangement, so that, as our Gospel has repeatedly emphasized, Jesus and the Father are really one. The unity into which the believers are now called is that of the primordial glory,... (1994:116).

This unity is brought about through the ministry of Jesus, and also through the subsequent ministry of the community. And this unity is more than just organizational unity, this is a divine unity which Jesus prays for. (1994:116-117).

And so in this chapter John expresses both the success of Jesus' mission of bringing enlightenment to the disciples, and he also hints at the fact that there may even be success in his attempts to bring enlightenment to the community in which he belongs. Salvation is to be found in a union with the divine, a ONENESS with God through Jesus. This is what Jesus came to do, and this is what John does in his Gospel for his community. As in the beginning where the Logos is God so at the end this union has been demonstrated to the disciples and so they participate in this union.

#### **4.3.2.6 John 20.**

##### **4.3.2.6.1 The Context.**

At the end of the Farewell Discourse, Jesus and the disciples leave the place where they were, and cross over into a garden. Here he is betrayed and arrested by the Romans and the chief-priests. He is taken and experiences a 'trial' of sorts. Peter denies that he knows him, he is brought before



Pilate where he is humiliated and mocked by Pilate and he is eventually handed over to be crucified. His death and the denial by Peter, must have come as a shock to the disciples. John now has to in some manner bring the narrative of the life of Jesus to some conclusion and he has to hold two items together. Firstly, he has to be true to the events, it was not possible for him to leave out the crucifixion altogether. Secondly, he also has to be true to the direction of his Gospel, namely that of Jesus existing in the context of a mystic world view, and how this now relates to the community after his cruel death. This he does in chap. 20. In a manner of speaking, chap. 20 can be seen as the logical end to the Gospel. It brings all the various strands together, and it ends. There is no need to include the final chapter (21)<sup>71</sup>.

#### 4.3.2.6.2. How does the model of mystic virtuoso help us with this section?

Why must I examine chap. 20? Chap. 20 contains an important element for this study, that is the passing on of the charisma from Jesus to the community. In a sense this has already taken place in the Farewell Discourse in the discussions regarding the Paraclete. But something more happens in this chapter. The chapter begins with the apparent disbelief of Mary, and to a certain extent Peter: Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρῶτ' σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἡρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου. τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν (v1-2). Mary does not realise or understand that Jesus had to die and then would rise from the dead. This points to the fact that even though she may have spent a considerable amount of time with him, her faith was not yet complete. Peter also shows this in his response when he reaches the tomb after the beloved disciple. ἔρχεται οὖν καὶ Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα, καὶ τὸ σουδάριον, ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐ μετὰ τῶν ὀθονίων κείμενον ἀλλὰ χωρὶς ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἓνα τόπον (v6-7). The point is made that there is incomplete faith and that further

---

71. I am not going to investigate the merits of keeping or rejecting chap. 21 as part of the original Gospel. Suffice it to say that the chapter is present in the oldest of the manuscripts, and does carry some important theological content.



experience is needed. For John this means that he has to some how make a connection between the death of Jesus and the continuing presence of Christ with them. He does this by having Jesus appear to Mary, and then later to the rest of the disciples.

The words that Jesus speaks to Mary, once Mary has recognised him indicate a continuance and a development of the unity of the believer with the divine. Verse 17 gives us the clue: λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· μή μου ἄπτου, οὕτω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς· ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεὸν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν (v17). The unity of the disciples with Jesus is now described in Jesus' words that his Father is their Father, and that his God is their God. The unity is emphasised, and the disciples now have an added extra to their faith. Mary's recognition of Jesus shows that she has finally reached enlightenment, and she now goes off to tell the disciples. Jesus then appears to the disciples, and is revealed to them. Jesus' crossing over from earth to heaven, to a complete union once again with the Father is complete. He now requires the disciples to do likewise.

Jesus breathes onto his disciples, those gathered together, and says to them, receive the Holy Spirit (20:22) καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον. The association of receiving the Spirit with breathing takes us back to Nicodemus, where there is a play on the word πνεῦμα either 'wind' or 'Spirit'. By being breathed on by Jesus, who is now the risen Son of God, they partake of his essence, and are brought into a closer union with him and through him, with the Father.

Again the unity is demonstrated in Jesus' discussion with Thomas. Thomas needs proof that Jesus is alive, that this is the same Jesus who was around before. He wants to experience that unity which was talked about in the Farewell Discourse by physical contact. Physical contact, a putting of his hand into the side of Jesus would be for him, and probably for most of the disciples the needed evidence that they still were one with God. Jesus' willingness for Thomas to do so, draws Thomas to the ultimate Christological confession, that Jesus is his Lord and God. That in Jesus he has access to the Father, that in Jesus the ultimate unity has been achieved. They are ONE.

Jesus has now crossed fully over to the Father. With the believers he has left peace, Spirit, and a mission to the cosmos. Jesus' path has brought him out from the Father and into the cosmos - and now out of the cosmos and back to the Father. The believer's path, in a sense, coincides, for the believer, too, is "of God." Still, the way back to the creator is difficult for the inhabitants of this cosmos - perhaps impossible without the road that Jesus' return opens up. The believer sets foot on it by steps that may be trivial and foolish, as in conversion, or grossly material and external, as in baptism and eucharist. But these are part of the same road that leads on to enlightenment, to new life, and ultimately to union both with God and with other believers. (Countryman 1994:136).

#### 4.4. Conclusion.

The question that needs to be asked at the end of this chapter, and will be fully discussed in the next, is, 'So what?' We have seen that it is possible that John presented Jesus in a manner completely different to other Gospels, but remained true to the generally accepted narrative on his life. The salvation that Jesus brought to the disciples, and the community, is dependant on coming to a true and complete understanding of who Jesus is. The discussion on πιστεύω emphasised this. We also saw in the investigation of certain words, that they can be understood to lend assistance to one who is trying to attain salvation. The disciple needs to abide in Jesus, and know who he is. This we saw was reflected throughout the Gospel. On closer investigation, certain texts shone clearly with implications for those hoping to attain salvation. The account of the sheep and the shepherd (chap. 10). The Farewell Discourse brings in the concept of union with Jesus, who is the way to the Father, and is also God. These, and the other sections investigated, show that for John, and the community in which he was working, there was a great need to maintain their salvation, they needed to return to the original ideals and vision of Jesus. The way to do this was to come into a union with him through an understanding of who he was.

Applying the model to the text reveals that the nature of John's Gospel reflects the world view of the mystic virtuoso as described by Max Weber. The different spheres of existence are highlighted and brought to life as the disciples move from the sphere of this world to the mystical

sphere inhabited by Jesus. We also see the inability of Nicodemus and others like him to do so or to understand the need for this move. The model also highlights the use of the word 'abide' and how the author uses it. The model highlights the absence of the rituals of baptism and the eucharist by showing that mystical insight is gained by paying attention or contemplating the truths associated with these sacraments.

The world view reconstruction that takes place, particularly in the Farewell Discourse is given a new insight by the application of the model. The model emphasizes the intensive interaction of members of the community as they embark on recreating their world view (social universe). The prayer in chap 17 is given new life as the model helps us to appreciate the intensity of the union with the divine expressed in those words.

## 5. CONCLUSION.

### 5.1. Summing up the discussion.

This thesis has investigated the applicability of Weber's concept of mystic virtuoso in the third phase of the Routinization of Charisma to the Gospel of John. In order to do this I have examined three main areas: firstly, I looked at "Sociology in the New Testament"; secondly, I looked at the "Background to the Fourth Gospel"; and thirdly, I looked at the evidence for "Mystic Virtuosi in the Fourth Gospel."

In chap. 2 I looked at the value of using recent sociological tools in our investigation of the Bible as a whole and in particular the New Testament. I looked at various definitions of sociology and showed that sociology stretches our own personal and scientific horizons (Elliott 1986:2). These new horizons give us a different insight into the New Testament. From these sociological tools, I looked at models, and the value of models for our investigation. Models in themselves are tools that allow us to clarify our terminology. They help us to present our findings against a background that can be transferred to other societies and cultures.

I then moved onto an in-depth discussion on Weber. I started by looking at his views on authority and contrasted them with those of Holmberg. For Weber authority expresses the possibility of being obeyed by the person to whom the request or command is given. Weber classifies three different types of authority according to their respective claims for legitimacy. Holmberg argues that there is a difference between leadership and authority. Leadership is voluntary while authority is not. From this discussion I went on to look at charismatic authority. Here a leader is perceived to have some extraordinary or supernatural power or quality, and he or she is treated as such. At this point I also looked at the use that Gager made of Weber's concept and also investigated Burridge. From the investigation into charismatic authority I went to the next stage of the process outlined by Weber viz., "the routinization of charisma." This phase describes the process whereby charismatic authority, which is completely different to any other type of authority, becomes "ordinary." Its complete otherness is changed and normalization sets in. A charismatic community

arises from this process. From here I went on to look at an important section for my thesis viz., that of religious virtuosi. There are basically two different types of virtuosi, ascetic and mystic. The focus of my discussion after giving a brief breakdown of ascetic virtuosi, was mystic virtuosi. Some of the characteristics of the model of mystic virtuoso are a striving to achieve rest in the god and striving to achieve a union with the divine. These two points describe mechanisms of attaining salvation and are not in themselves regarded as salvation.

As a development I also included at this point a brief examination of Berger and Luckmann and their sociology of knowledge. Berger and Luckmann have shown that reality is a social construction and this was very important for the discussion on the community in John's Gospel because this community would have reconstructed its own reality after having been put out from the synagogue. Some critiques were mentioned in general about the application of sociology to the New Testament but they all seemed to revolve around the lack of a broader appreciation of history. I have tried to remedy that by including in my discussion on the background to the Gospel a short general view of the history of the community.

A model was then developed for the rest of this paper. This model presented a breakdown of the routinization of charisma. And this was discussed at relative length in chap. 2. The primary focus of the model was on the characteristics of mystic virtuosi. And the model listed these characteristics for us to investigate.

The third chapter of this thesis focused on the background to the Fourth Gospel. Here I investigated the various influences which may have had a bearing on the Gospel. These influences included gnosticism, the Hellenistic influences of Plato and Philo, various Old Testament influences, influences from Rabbinic Judaism and Qumran. These were discussed and it was argued that it is not always necessary to look far afield for these influences. But one can find much of what influenced John in the Old Testament. This does not deny the impact of these other mentioned influences. A short note was also made about the authorship and dating of the Gospel, but no lengthy discussion was entered into.

A detailed discussion regarding the unity and composition of the Gospel was mentioned. I looked at the flow of the Gospel and whether the Gospel is a literary unity. I investigated the various

explanations given for those dislocations that occur in the Gospel, and how these explanations tried to “correct” the Gospel. I also briefly investigated the relationship between the Gospel and the synoptics, and in this section included a discussion Brodie’s hypothesis that the Gospel reflects a careful reworking of the synoptics by a single author. This presented a problem for me and I investigated an alternative. I accept a single author for the Gospel who wrote the Gospel over a lengthy period of time, but not by using the synoptics as his sources, but rather a careful appreciation of the life of the community to which he (or she) belonged. This may have, and I think would have, included a careful “theological” reflection on the life of Jesus in terms of what the community was experiencing at the time of writing.

A section was then presented on the community of the Fourth Gospel. This was not an attempt to prove that such a community existed, but rather a recounting and summary of the evidence that such a community did exist. Brodie again is not in favour of defining this community as narrowly as other scholars have (Meeks and Rensberger), and he insists on arguing that the community of the Fourth Gospel is a universal community. I find this very difficult to accept and I strongly favour a community with a specific context and social situation as set out by Meeks, Rensberger and others. Brown also argues for the existence of a community but focuses more on the development of this community and basis his argument on the development of their christology.

Chap. 4 then focused on the application of the discussion of mystic virtuosi to the Gospel and to the community described in chap. 3. I started the discussion by a close look at John’s presentation of Jesus and argued that John’s Jesus is very different, although there is a vague similarity. It was this difference in the presentation of Jesus which started off the investigation into the applicability of Weber’s concept of mystic virtuosi to the Fourth Gospel. A general overview of the Gospel revealed that various terms and phrases could be picked up and show close similarities to the application of the concept of mystic virtuosi. These terms included μένω, οἶδα, γινώσκω ἄνωθεν and φῶς. These words invoked the sense of a mystical union with the divine as well as a mystical knowledge imparted through this contact. From the appreciation of these few words, I then went on to look at various section of the Gospel in relative detail. These sections included 1:31-51; 3:1-21; 6:1-71; 10:1-21; 13-14; 15; 17; 20. From the investigation into these sections it



became clear that John's Gospel is a careful presentation of the life of Jesus by a mystic virtuoso who conceived of Jesus as a mystic as well.

## 5.2. The proposal and result.

The title of this thesis is, "To test the applicability of Weber's concept of mystic virtuosi in the third phase of the routinization of Charisma to the Gospel of John." The proposal was that the author's writing reflects a world view which can be characterised by Weber's model of mystic virtuosi.

In order to achieve this I set about discussing the characteristics of a mystic virtuosi, and they can, first and foremost, be described as 'absolute flight from the world.' This is displayed in two ways, firstly by a striving to achieve rest in God or a mystical union, and secondly by the possession of a mystical knowledge upon which they meditate and achieve illumination of these truths. These being the major characteristics, I then showed, through the close inspection of certain words and themes, how these characteristics were to be found in the Gospel. The word μένω for example showed something of the desire to achieve a mystical union with the divine, and this was brought to a culmination in chap 17 of the Gospel, where Jesus prays that they may all be one. The word γινώσκω showed us something of the mystical knowledge that is characteristic of this model. In this regard I also looked at the word ἄνωθεν which can be seen to reflect two spheres of existence, depending on what one's understanding of Jesus is. For Jesus and the community they belong to a heavenly, or mystical sphere of existence, while Nicodemus belongs to a earthly sphere of existence. This can be seen to demonstrate the characteristic of 'flight from the world.'

From this discussion on the various characteristics, I then entered a discussion on various sections of the Gospel, to see if this model could help us to understand more of what was going on. It was shown that the model can help us to read John's Gospel. It brings to light these two spheres of existence and demonstrates very helpfully the flight from the world represented by the intensive interaction of the community. The model can help to understand how the Johannine community related to other communities within the same area, whether Judean or Christian.



And so I conclude that the model of mystic virtuosi, as set out by Weber, can be applied to the Fourth Gospel, and produce results that are beneficial and helpful to the study of that Gospel.

## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

### 6.1 Books:

- Ashton, J. 1991. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Barrett, C.K. 1972. "The dialectical theology of St. John." In: *New Testament essays*. C.K. Barrett (ed). London: SPCK.
- Barrett, C.K. 1975. *The Gospel of John and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Barrett, C.K. 1978 (1955). *The Gospel according to St John: an introduction with commentary and notes on the Greek text*. 2nd edition. London: SPCK.
- Bendix, Reinhard. 1971. "Charismatic Leadership" In *Scholarship and Partisanship: essays on Max Weber*. R. Bendix and G. Roth (eds) Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berger, P. 1969. *The sacred canopy*. New York: Anchor.
- Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. 1966. *The social construction of reality*. London: Anchor.
- Borg, Marcus. 1987. *Jesus. A new vision: spirit, culture and the life of discipleship*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Bouma, G.D. "By what authority?: an analysis of the locus of ultimate authority in ecclesiastical organisations." In Black. A.W. (ed) 1991. *Religion in Australia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Brodie, Thomas L. 1993a. *The Gospel according to John: a literary and theological commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brodie, Thomas L. 1993b. *The quest for the origins of John's Gospel: a source-oriented approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Raymond E. 1966. *The Gospel of John*. Volume 1 (I-xii) London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Brown, Raymond E. 1979. *The community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. 1955. *Theology of the New Testament. Volume 2*. New York: Scribner's Sons.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. 1971 (1964). *The Gospel of John: a commentary*. Translated by Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burridge, Kenhelm. 1969. *New Heaven, New Earth: a study of millenarian activities*. New York: Schocken.

- Carney, Thomas F. 1975. *The shape of the past: models and antiquities*. Lawrence: Coronado Press.
- Charlesworth, James H. 1972. "A critical comparison of the dualism in 1QS 3:13-4:26 and the dualism contained in the Gospel of John." In *John and Qumran*. James Charlesworth (ed) 1972. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Countryman, L. William. 1994 (Revised edition:1941). *The mystical way in the Fourth Gospel: crossing over into God*. Pennsylvania: Trinity Press.
- Cullmann, O. 1976. *The Johannine circle*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Dodd, Charles H. 1953. *The interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dodd, Charles H. 1963. *Historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Draper, Jonathan. *Weber and the wandering charismatic*. A prototype document. Unpublished.
- Draper, Jonathan. 1991. "The Johannine community and its implications for a democratic society." In: *A democratic vision for South Africa*. Klaus Nürnberger (ed). Pietermaritzburg: Encounter.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel Noah 1965. "The study of processes of institutionalization, institutional change, and comparative institutions." In: *Essays on comparative institutions*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel Noah. 1973. "Tradition and social structure" In: *Tradition, change and modernity*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Eldridge, J.E.T. (Ed) 1971. *Max Weber: the interpretation of social reality*. London: Nelson.
- Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Balz, Horst & Schneider, Gerhard (eds). 1981 Vol 2. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids.
- Fiorenza, F.S. "Religion and society: legitimation, rationalism, or cultural heritage." In Metz, J.B. (ed) 1979. *Christianity and the bourgeoisie*. New York: Seabury.
- Fortna, Robert T. 1970. *The Gospel of signs: a reconstruction of the narrative source underlying the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament studies monograph series 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fortna, Robert T. 1988. *The fourth Gospel and its predecessor*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Gager, John, G. 1975. *Kingdom and community: the social world of early Christianity*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C.W. (Eds) 1948. *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hahn, F. 1973. *The worship of the early Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Hengel, Martin. 1981. *The charismatic leader and his followers*. Translated by James Greig, edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Hengel, Martin. 1989. *The Johannine question*. London: SCM.
- Herzog, Frederick. 1972. *Liberation theology: liberation in the light of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Holmberg, B. 1978 *Paul and power*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Horsley, Richard, A. 1985. *Bandits, prophets and messiahs*. Minneapolis: Winston.
- Horsley, Richard, A. 1987. *Jesus and the spiral of violence*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Johnston, G. 1970. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jonas, Hans. 1963 (2nd edition: 1958). *The Gnostic religion*. Boston: Beacon.
- Judge, E.A. 1960. *The social pattern of Christian groups in the first century*. London: SCM.
- Käsemann Ernst. 1968. *Jesus' last will and testament: a study of the Gospel of John in the light of chapter 17*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Kee, Howard Clark. 1989. *Knowing the truth: a sociological approach to New Testament interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Kysar, Robert. 1975. *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Kysar, Robert 1976. *John the Maverick Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Lasswell, H.D. and Kaplan, A. 1950 *Power and society*. London: Yale UP.
- Leaney, A.R.C. 1966. *The rule of Qumran and its meaning*. London: SCM.
- Leaney A.R.C. 1984. *The Jewish and Christian world 200BC to AD 200*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lohfink, G. 1985. *Jesus and community: the social dimension of Christian faith*. London: SPCK.
- Long, T.E. "Prophecy, Charisma, and politics: reinterpreting the Weberian thesis." In Hadden, J.K. and Shupe, A. (eds) 1986. *Prophetic religions and politics*. New York: New Era.
- MacDonald, M. 1988 *The Pauline churches*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Malherbe, Abraham, J. 1983 (1977) Second edition. *Social aspects of early Christianity*. London: Louisiana State University.
- Malina, Bruce J. 1983. "The social sciences and biblical interpretation." In: *The Bible and liberation: political and social hermeneutics*. Norman K. Gottwald (ed). Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Malina, Bruce, J. 1986. *Christian origins and cultural anthropology*. Atlanta: John Knox press.
- Martin, D. and Mullen, P (eds) 1984. *Strange gifts?* New York: Blackwell.
- Martyn, J.L. 1979 (1968). *History and theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd edition. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Meeks, Wayne A. 1967. *The prophet-king: Moses traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Vol xiv of Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Meeks, Wayne A. 1986. "The man from heaven in Johannine sectarianism." In: *The interpretation of John*. J. Ashton (ed). Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Moloney, Francis J. 1993. *Belief in the Word: reading John 1-4*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Neyrey, J. 1988. *An ideological revolt: John's Christology in social science perspective*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Nielsen, Donald. A. 1990. "Max Weber and the sociology of early Christianity." In: *Time, place, and circumstance*. W.H. Swatos (ed). New York: Greenwood Press.
- O'Day, Gail. 1986. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Osiek, Carolyn. 1992 (Revised edition). *What are they saying about the social setting of the New Testament*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Pollard, T.E. 1969. *Johannine Christology and the early church*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph series. No 13. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rensberger, David. 1988. *Johannine faith and liberating community*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Robinson, J.A.T. 1962. "The new look on the Fourth Gospel" and "The destination and purpose of St. John's Gospel." In: *Twelve New testament essays: Studies in Biblical theology*. No. 13 London: SCM.
- Sanders, J.N. 1969. *The Gospel according to St. John*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Schnackenburg, R. 1968. *The Gospel according to St. John*. (3 volumes) New York: Herder and Herder.

- Schweizer, E. 1961. *Church order in the New Testament*. London: SCM.
- Scroggs, Robin. 1983. "The sociological interpretation of the New Testament: the present state of research." In: *The Bible and liberation: political and social hermeneutics*. Norman K. Gottwald (ed). Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Sergovia, Fernando. 1991. *The Farewell of the Word*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Stambaugh, J and Balch, D. 1986 *The social world of the first Christians*. London: SPCK.
- Stegner, Werner. 1993. *Introduction to New Testament Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Streeter, B.H. 1929 *The primitive Church*. London: MacMillan.
- Suggit, John 1992. *The sign of life: studies in the fourth Gospel and the liturgy of the church*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster.
- Theissen, G. 1992. *Social reality and the early Christians*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Theological Dictionary of the New testament*. Kittel, J. (Ed) 1964. Vol 1 & 4. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids.
- Tidball, Derek. 1983. *An introduction to the sociology of the New Testament*. Exeter: Paternoster.
- Vermees, Geza 1987 (1962). *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. (Third edition). London: Penguin
- von Campenhausen, Hans. 1969. *Ecclesiastical authority and spiritual power in the church of the first three centuries*. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Waetjen, Herman. 1994. *The dynamics of group formation and the beginnings of the Christian movement*. Rough document
- Weber, M. *Economy and society*. Roth, G and Wittich, C. (eds) 1978 London: University of California press.
- Wilson, B.R. 1973. *Magic and the millennium*. London: Macmillan.



## 6.2 Journals:

- Alegre, Xavier. 1981. "My kingdom is not of this world." In: *Theology digest*. vol 29(3) pp 231-235.
- Bartlett, David L. 1978. "John G. Gager's 'Kingdom and Community': a summary and response." In: *Zygon* vol 13(2) pp 109-122.
- Bassler, Jouette M. 1981. "The Galileans: a neglected factor in Johannine community research." In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. vol 43(2) pp 243-257.
- Bensman, Joseph and Givant, Michael. 1975. "Charisma and modernity: the use and abuse of a concept." In *Social Research* vol 42 pp 570-613.
- Bishop, Leigh C. 1985. "Healing in the koinonia: therapeutic dynamics of church community." In: *Journal of psychology and theology* vol 13(1) pp 12-20.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. 1990. "A Jewish sect of the Persian Period." In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. vol 52(1) pp 5-20.
- Bourke, Myles, M. 1968. "Reflection on church order in the New Testament." In *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* vol 30 pp 493-511.
- Brennan, Brian. 1985. "Athanasius' vita antonii: a sociological interpretation." In: *Vigiliae Christianae* vol 39(3) pp 209-227.
- ✓ Brown, Raymond E. 1967 "Review of James L. Martyn's 'History and theology in the Fourth Gospel'" In *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*. Vol 23 pp 392-394.
- Brown, Raymond E. 1977. "Johannine Ecclesiology - the community's origins." In *Interpretation*. Vol 31(4) pp 379-393.
- Cohen, D.L. 1972. "The concept of charisma and the analysis of leadership." In *Politische Studien* vol 20. pp 299-305.
- ✓ Collins, Adela Yarbo. 1980. "Crisis and community in the Gospel of John." In: *Currents in theology and mission* vol 7(4) pp 196-204.
- ✓ Cook, James I. 1967. "John 20:19-23: an exegesis." In: *Reformed review*. vol 21(2) pp 2-10.
- Culpepper, R.A. and Charlesworth, J.H. 1973. "The odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John." In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* vol 35(3) pp 298-322.
- ✓ De Jonge, M. 1973. "Jewish expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel." In: *New Testament Studies*. vol 19(3) pp 246-270.



- Domeris, W.R. 1991. "The farewell discourse: an anthropological perspective." In: *Neotestamentica*. Vol 25(2) pp 232-250.
- Draper, Jonathan. 1992. "The sociological function of the Spirit/Paraclete in the farewell discourses in the Fourth Gospel." In: *Neotestamentica*. vol 26(1) pp 13-29.
- Edwards, O.C. 1977. "Sociology as a tool for interpreting the New testament." In: *Anglican Theological Review*. Vol 65 pp 431-438.
- Elliott, John H. 1977. "Social-scientific criticism of the New Testament and its social world: more on method and models." In *Semina* 35. pp 1-33.
- Friedland, William H. 1964. "For a sociological concept of charisma." In: *Social Forces* vol 43. pp 18-26.
- Haley, Peter. 1980. "Rudolph Sohm on Charisma." In: *Journal of Religion*. vol 60(2) pp 185-197.
- Hawkin, David J. 1975. "Orthodoxy and heresy in John 10:1-21 and 15:1-17." In: *Evangelical Quarterly*. vol 47(4) pp 208-213.
- Hill, Michael. 1973. "Max Weber (1864-1920)." In: *Expository Times*. vol 84. pp 260-265.
- Kysar, R. 1985. "The Fourth Gospel: a report on recent research." In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen welt*. vol 2(25.3) pp 2391-2480.
- Johnson, Benton. 1963. "On church and sect." In: *American Sociological Review*. vol 28. pp 539-549.
- Maier, Harry O. 1990. "The charismatic authority of Ignatius of Antioch: a sociological analysis." In: *Theology Digest*. vol 37(3) pp 235-240.
- Malina, Bruce. J. 1984. "Jesus as charismatic leader." In: *Biblical Theological Bulletin*. Vol 14 pp 55-62.
- Malina, Bruce, J. 1989. "Christ and time: Swiss or Mediterranean?" In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. Vol 51 pp 1-31.
- Martin, James P. 1978. "John 10:1-10." In: *Interpretation*. vol 32(2) pp 171-175.
- Mattill, A. S. 1977. "Johannine community behind the Fourth Gospel: George Richter's analysis." In: *Theological Studies*. vol. 38. pp 294-315.
- Macintosh, Donald. 1970. "Weber and Freud: on the nature and sources of authority." In: *American Sociological Review*. vol 35. pp 901-911.

- Maier, Harry O. 1990. "The charismatic authority of Ignatius of Antioch: a sociological analysis." In *Theology Digest*. Vol 37(3) pp 235-240.
- Meeks, W. 1972. "The man from heaven in Johannine sectarianism." In: *Journal for Biblical literature*. vol 91. pp 44-72.
- Miyahara, Kojiro. 1983. "Charisma from Weber to contemporary sociology." In: *Sociological Inquiry*. Vol 53 pp 368-388.
- Moody Smith, D. 1977. "The presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." In: *Interpretation*. vol 31(4) pp 367-378.
- Moody Smith, D. 1979. "John 16:1-15." In: *Interpretation*. vol 33(1) pp 58-62.
- Murphy, John L. 1959. "The use of 'Ekklesia' in the New Testament (part 1 and 2)." In: *American ecclesiastical review* vol 140 pp 250-259 and pp 325-332.
- Neiryck, F. 1975. "The other disciple in Jn 18:15-16." In: *Ephemerides theologicae lovaniensis*. vol. 51. pp 113-141.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. 1979. "Jacob traditions and the interpretation of John 4:10-26." In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. vol 41(3) pp 419-437.
- O'Grady, J.F. 1979. "The role of the beloved disciple." In: *Biblical theology bulletin* vol 9(2) pp 58-65.
- Painter, John. 1980. "Glimpses of the Johannine community in the farewell discourses." In: *Australian biblical review* vol 28 pp 21-38.
- Painter, John. 1981. "The farewell discourse and the history of Johannine Christianity." In: *New Testament Studies*. vol 27(4) pp 525-543.
- Rodd, Cyril S. 1981. "On applying a sociological theory to biblical studies." In: *Journal for the study of the Old Testament* vol 19 pp 95-106.
- Schneiders, Sandra M. 1982. "Women in the Fourth Gospel and the role of women in the contemporary church." In: *Biblical Theology Bulletin*. vol 12 pp 35-45.
- Schütz, John Howard. 1974. "Charisma and social reality in primitive Christianity." In: *Journal of Religion*. vol 54. pp 51-70.
- Schwartz, Barry. 1983. "George Washington and the Whig conception of heroic leadership." In: *American Sociological Review*. vol 48 (February) pp 18-33.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. 1978. "Too much Kingdom, too little Community." In: *Zygon*. vol 13(2) pp 123-130.

- Spencer, Martin E. 1973. "What is charisma." In: *British Journal of Sociology*. vol 24. pp 341-354.
- Stevenson, Eileen. 1979. "Some insights from the sociology of religion into the origin and development of the early Christian church." In: *Expository Times*. vol 90(10) pp 300-305.
- Stott, John R.W. 1979. "The kingdom and community: can the kingdom of God satisfy man's search for love?" In: *Crux*. vol 15(3) pp 14-24.
- Via, Dan O. Jr. 1961. "Darkness, Christ, and the church in the Fourth Gospel." In: *Scottish Journal of Theology*. vol 14 pp 178-193.
- Villa-Vicencio, C. 1991. "Religion as repression and revolution: a sociological comment." In *Journal for the Study of Religion*. Vol 4.1 pp 51-65.
- Weiss, H. 1979. "Foot washing in the Johannine community." In: *Novum Testamentum*. vol 21(4) pp 298-325.

## 7. APPENDIX

### 7.1. Translation of John's Gospel.

A short note:

The purpose of this translation is to provide an alternative to the regularly used translation for my thesis. In all cases I have tried as much as the English language allows me to remain as close to the Greek language as possible. I have not tried to produce an English translation that abides by all the rules of the English language. In cases where the syntax and grammar do not flow it is either the problem of the English language or my own poor grasp of the English language that prevented me from finding a better way of expressing the Greek. I have tried to aim for formal equivalence, which is orientated towards the linguistic form of the original and seeks to imitate that form in word order, syntax, and, if possible, in phonology (Stegner 1993:8). Again, where possible, I have translated a single Greek word with a single English word, unless otherwise indicated. I have made extensive use of the 'hyphen' in this regard. Without further ado, here is the translation.

<sup>1</sup>In the beginning was the word, and the word was towards God, and God was the word. <sup>2</sup>This one<sup>1</sup> was in the beginning towards God. <sup>3</sup>All things came into being through him, and apart from him nothing has come into being that has come into being. <sup>4</sup>In him<sup>2</sup> was life, and the life was the light of humanity<sup>3</sup>; <sup>5</sup>and the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not grasped it. <sup>6</sup>There was a human being, sent from God, his name was John. <sup>7</sup>This one came into testimony so that he may testify concerning the light, so that all may believe through him. <sup>8</sup>That one was not the light, but that he may testify concerning the light. <sup>9</sup>The true light, which enlightens every human being, is coming into the world. <sup>10</sup>He was in the world, and the world came into being through him, and the world did not know him. <sup>11</sup>He came to his own things, and his own people did not receive him. <sup>12</sup>Whosoever received him, he gave to them the authority to become children of God, those believing into his name, <sup>13</sup>who were not born out of blood, not out of the will of flesh, not out of the will of a man, but of God. <sup>14</sup>And the word became flesh and dwelt<sup>4</sup> among us and we perceived his glory, the glory as the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth. <sup>15</sup>John testifies concerning him and he has cried out saying, "This one was the one of whom

---

1. I have as much as possible translated emphatic pronouns in this way. For example this is a translation of οὗτος.

2. An alternate translation of these two verses may read as follows: All things came into being through him, and apart from him nothing has come into being, that which has come into being was life in him, and the life was the light of humanity;...

3. ἄνθρωπος has been translated as human being. The plural has been translated as humanity.

4. ἐσκήνωσεν - lived among as in a tent. This brings up the images of the feast of Tabernacles in which the Judeans all made shelters of some form and lived in them. The Ark of the covenant also was kept in a tent, and the Ark symbolized the presence of God or the glory of God.

I spoke, 'The one coming behind me was before me because he was first of me.' <sup>16</sup>From out of his fullness we all received grace as good as grace; <sup>17</sup>because the law was given through Moses, grace and truth came into being through Jesus the Anointed One'. <sup>18</sup>No one has ever seen God, the only begotten God who exists in the bosom of the Father that one has made him known. <sup>19</sup>And this is the testimony of John, when the Judeans<sup>v</sup> sent to him out of Jerusalem priests and Levites in order that they may ask him, "Who are you?" <sup>20</sup>And he confessed and did not deny, and he confessed, "I am not the Anointed One." <sup>21</sup>And they asked him, "What then? Are you Elijah?" And he said, "I m not." "Are you the Prophet?" And he answers, "No." <sup>22</sup> Then they said to him, "Who are you? Give us an answer for those who sent us, What do you say concerning yourself?" <sup>23</sup>He said, *"I am a voice shouting in the desert, 'Make straight the path of the Lord.'"* Even as the prophet Isaiah said." <sup>24</sup>And those having sent were from the Pharisees. <sup>25</sup>And they asked him and said to him, "Why then do you baptize if you are not the Anointed One, nor Elijah nor the Prophet?" <sup>26</sup>John answered them saying, "I baptize in water, in the middle of you stands one you whom you do not know, <sup>27</sup>the one coming behind me, of whom I am not worthy to loosen the strap of his sandal." <sup>28</sup>These things came to pass in Bethany across the Jordan, where John was baptizing. <sup>29</sup>The next day he saw Jesus coming towards him and said, "See the lamb of God, the one taking up the sin of the world. <sup>30</sup>This is the one concerning whom I said, 'Behind me comes a man who was before me, because he was first of me.' <sup>31</sup>And I did not know him, but so that he may be revealed to Israel because of this I came baptizing in water." <sup>32</sup>And John testified saying, "I have seen the spirit descending as a dove out of the heaven and it abode on him. <sup>33</sup>And I did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize in water that one said to me, 'On whom you see the spirit descending and abiding on him, this one is the one baptizing in the holy spirit.' <sup>34</sup>And I have seen and have testified that this is the Son of God<sup>vm</sup>." <sup>35</sup>The next day John stood again and two of his disciples, <sup>36</sup>and when he saw Jesus walking he said, "See the lamb of God." <sup>37</sup>And two of his disciples heard him speaking and they followed Jesus. <sup>38</sup>And Jesus turns and seeing them following said to them, "What do you seek?" And they said to him, "Rabbi," - which when

5. The question arises as to where John the Baptist stops speaking. The next couple of phrases could also belong to the previous speaker, or there could be a new speaker at this point, I have left it indicating a new speaker.

6. I have maintained a translation of Χριστός as "The Anointed One" through out this translation.

7. The word translated as "Judeans" is the Greek word 'Ιουδαῖοι. I have made mention of this in the section on the community in John's Gospel.

8. The Nestle Aland text of this verse reads: *κἀγὼ ἐώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. The reading of ὁ υἱὸς is attested by <sup>66,75</sup> A B C L N W Θ Ψ 063 <sup>f</sup>33. 892 *al*. As such this reading has very good attestation on external grounds. There are two alternative readings given. Ο *εκλεκτός* which is attested to by <sup>5vid</sup> N\* b e ff<sup>2\*</sup> sy<sup>c</sup>, and a Latin rendering (electus filius) which is attested to by a ff<sup>2c</sup> sa. The two alternatives do not have much in the way of strong external attestation, but the original reading of Sinaiticus does lend its weight. On purely external grounds the text is to be chosen. But on internal grounds: the reading of the text (the Son of God) or the reading of the first alternative (the chosen of God) or the second alternative (the chosen Son of God) does not make much difference. Ο *εκλεκτός* would be a more difficult reading, and ὁ υἱὸς could be considered as a harmonization with verse 49 in which there is no textual evidence for a contrary reading of ὁ υἱὸς. Brodie seems to prefer Ο *εκλεκτός* (1993a:157, where Brown seems to prefer ὁ υἱὸς, based on external evidence I will maintain the reading of ὁ υἱὸς.



translated said 'Teacher.' - "Where do you abide?"<sup>39</sup> He said to them, "Come and see." Then they came and saw where he abodes and they abode with him that day; it was about the tenth hour.

<sup>40</sup>Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter was one of the two hearing from John and following him.

<sup>41</sup>This one finds first his own brother, Simon and said to him, "We have found the Messiah, which is translated 'The Anointed One.'"<sup>42</sup> He led him towards Jesus. Seeing him Jesus said, "You are Simon, the son of John, you will be called Cephas which is translated Peter."<sup>43</sup>

The next day he wished to go to Galilee and he finds Philip. And Jesus said to him, "Follow me."<sup>44</sup> And Philip was from Bethsaida, out of the city of Andrew and Peter.

<sup>45</sup>Philip finds Nathanael and said to him, "The one whom Moses wrote in the law and the prophets, we have found, Jesus the son of Joseph from Nazareth."<sup>46</sup>

And Nathanael said to him, "Out of Nazareth is it possible for anything good to be?" Philip said to him, "Come and see."<sup>47</sup> Jesus saw Nathanael coming towards him and said concerning him, "See a true Israelite in whom there is no treachery."<sup>48</sup>

Nathanael said to him, "From where do you know me?" Jesus answered and said to him, "Before Philip called you being under the fig tree, I saw you."<sup>49</sup>

Nathanael answered him, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are the ruler<sup>x</sup> of Israel."<sup>50</sup> Jesus answered and said to him, "Because I said to you that I saw you under the fig tree (do) you believe (?)<sup>x</sup> You will see greater things than these."<sup>51</sup>

And he said to him, "Truly, truly I say to you (plural)<sup>x</sup>, you will see *the heaven being opened and the angels of God ascending and descending* onto the Son of the Human Being."

2 And on the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there,

<sup>2</sup>Jesus also was called and his disciples to the wedding. <sup>3</sup>And when the wine failed the mother of Jesus said towards him, "They have no wine."<sup>4</sup> And Jesus said to her, "What do you have to do with me, woman? My hour has not yet come."<sup>5</sup>

His mother said to the servants, "Whatever he says to you, do."<sup>6</sup> And having been placed there were six stone water jars according to the purification of the Judeans, holding two or three measures.

<sup>7</sup>Jesus said to them, "Fill the jars with water." And they filled them until the top. <sup>8</sup>And he said to them, "Now draw out and carry to the host<sup>x</sup>." And they carried (it). <sup>9</sup>And when the one presiding over the feast tasted the water having become wine and he did not know from where it was, but the servants knew, those who had drawn up the water, the one presiding over the feast calls the bridegroom<sup>10</sup> and he said to him,

"Every human being places first the good wine and whenever they have drunk (then) the lesser, you have kept the good wine until now."<sup>11</sup>

This, the beginning of the signs, Jesus did in Cana of Galilee and he revealed his glory, and his disciples believed into him. <sup>12</sup>After this he descended into Capernaum and his mother and (his) brothers and his disciples and there they abode not many days.

<sup>13</sup>And the Passover of the Judeans was near and Jesus ascended into Jerusalem. <sup>14</sup>And he found in the temple those selling oxen and sheep and doves and those money-changers sitting,

<sup>15</sup>and when he made a whip out of cords he threw all out of the temple and the sheep and the oxen, and he threw down the small coins of the small money changers and turned over the tables,

---

9. βασιλεὺς has been translated as ruler and not king.

10. Through out the translation I have refrained from making a decision as to whether a particular phrase is a question or not where any ambiguity exists. I have preferred to maintain the ambiguity, and to indicate it by placing the question mark in brackets.

11. In cases where there is an odd change of number in the person/people being addressed, I have indicated this as follows (plural).

12. ἀρχιτρικίνω - the one presiding over the feast. I have used the word 'host.'

<sup>16</sup>and to those selling doves he said, "Take these things out from here, do not make the house of my Father a house of merchants." <sup>17</sup>His disciples remembered that it is written, "*Zeal for your house eats me up*." <sup>18</sup>Then the Judeans answered and said to him, "What sign do you show to us because you do these things?" <sup>19</sup>Jesus answered and said to them, "Destroy this inner sanctuary<sup>xiii</sup> and in three days I will raise it<sup>xv</sup>." <sup>20</sup>The Judeans then said, "This inner sanctuary was built in forty six years and you will raise it in three days?" <sup>21</sup>But that one spoke concerning the inner sanctuary of his body. <sup>22</sup>Then when he was raised out of the dead, his disciples remembered that he had spoken this, and they believed the writing and the word which Jesus had spoken. <sup>23</sup>And when he was in Jerusalem in the Passover feast many believed into his name seeing his signs which he did, <sup>24</sup>but Jesus did not believe himself to them because he (was able) to know all <sup>25</sup>and because he had no need that anyone testify concerning the human being; for he himself knew what was in the human being.

3 And there was a human being of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, ruler of the Judeans; <sup>2</sup>this one came to him at night and said to him, "Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher having come from God, for no one is able to do these signs which you do, unless God is with him." <sup>3</sup>Jesus answered and said to him, "Truly, truly, I say to you unless one be born from above (again), it is not possible to see the reign<sup>xv</sup> of God." <sup>4</sup>Nicodemus said to him, "How is it possible for a human being while being old to be born? If is not possible to enter into the belly of his mother a second time and to be born (?)" <sup>5</sup>Jesus answered, "Truly, truly I say to you unless one be born out of water and spirit, one is not able to enter the reign of God. <sup>6</sup>That having been born of the flesh is flesh, and that having been born of the spirit (wind) is spirit (wind). <sup>7</sup>Do not be astonished that I said to you, 'It is necessary for you (plural) to be born again (from above).' <sup>8</sup>The spirit (wind) blows wherever it wishes and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know from where it comes and where it goes, all having been born of the<sup>xvi</sup> spirit (wind) it is so." <sup>9</sup>Nicodemus answered and said to him, "How is it possible for this to be?" <sup>10</sup>Jesus answered and said to him, "You are the teacher of Israel and these things you do not know (?)" <sup>11</sup>Truly, truly I say to you that which we know we have spoken and that which we have seen we testify and our testimony you (plural) do not receive. <sup>12</sup>If I spoke to you earthly things and you (plural) do not believe, how if I speak to you (plural) the heavenly things will you believe?" <sup>13</sup>And no one has ascended to the heaven

13. ναός. There is no single English word which is an equivalent. I have left it as 'inner sanctuary.'

14. ἐγείρω - is literally translated 'to arouse', but can also mean to raise, and in the New Testament can be used to mean rise from the dead. I have needed to distinguish between this and αἵρω which means to lift up or take up and is often used in connection with lifting Jesus up on the cross, the glorification of Jesus. Another word used in a similar way to αἵρω is ὑψόω which also has this ambiguous meaning oscillating between lifting up in order to crucify and lifting up in order to glorify.

15. βασιλείαν as opposed to ἄρχων. I have translated both words, as well as βασιλεὺς, using the inclusive ruler or reign. Though, strictly speaking, βασιλεὺς, should be translated as king.

16. The reading of the text is widely supported by the constant witnesses to John's Gospel. However, the alternate reading (του υδατος και) is supported by B; it; sy<sup>ac</sup>. The external witnesses greatly favours the reading of the text, and the internal evidence also favours this, as the insertion is a harmonization with 3:5.



except the one who descended out of the heaven, the Son of the Human Being<sup>xvii</sup>. <sup>14</sup>And even as Moses lifted up the snake in the desert, so it is necessary for the Son of the Human Being to be lifted up <sup>15</sup>so that all believing in him may have life eternal. <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave the only Son, so that all believing into him may not perish but may have life eternal. <sup>17</sup>For God did not send the Son into the world so that he may judge the world, but that the world may be saved through him. <sup>18</sup>The one believing into him is not judged, but the one not believing is already judged, because that one did not believe into the name of the only born Son of God. <sup>19</sup>And this is the judgement that the light has come into the world and humanity loved the darkness rather than the light, for their works were grievous. <sup>20</sup>For all accomplishing trivial things hate the light and do not come towards the light, so that their works may not be picked out. <sup>21</sup>But whoever does the truth comes towards the light, so that their works may be revealed because it is worked in God.” <sup>22</sup>After these things Jesus and his disciple came into the Judean land and there he passed time with them and he baptized. <sup>23</sup>And John was also baptizing at Aenon near Salim because there was much water there, and they came and they were baptized; <sup>24</sup>For John had not yet been thrown into prison. <sup>25</sup>Then there came about a seeking out of the disciples of John with a Judean concerning purification. <sup>26</sup>And they came towards John and said to him, “Rabbi, the one who was with you across the Jordan, about whom you have testified, see this one baptizes and all are going to him.” <sup>27</sup>John answered and said, “No human being is able to receive anything except that which is given to him out of the heaven.” <sup>28</sup>You yourselves testify for me that I said, ‘I am not the Anointed One.’ But that I was sent before of that one. <sup>29</sup>The one having the bride is the bridegroom, and the friend of the bridegroom the one standing and hearing he rejoices with joy because of the sound of the bridegroom, therefore this my joy is full. <sup>30</sup>It is necessary for that one to increase, but me to become less. <sup>31</sup>The one coming from above is above all; the one being out of the earth is of the earth and speaks of the earth. The one coming out of the heaven is above all. <sup>32</sup>The one having seen and heard this testifies, and his testimony no one receives. <sup>33</sup>The one receiving his testimony sealed that God is true. <sup>34</sup>For who ever God has sent, speaks the words of God, for he does not give the spirit (wind) out of measure. <sup>35</sup>The Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hand. <sup>36</sup>The one believing into the Son has life eternal; and the one refusing the Son will not see life, but the anger of God abides on him.”

---

17. There is an insertion in certain manuscripts at the end of this verse. The text as it stands is supported by: *P*<sup>66,75</sup>; *ℵ*; *B*; *L*; *W*<sup>a</sup>; 083; 0113; 33; 1010; 1241; *pc*; *co*. This is very good external evidence, given the value of the two papyri and Sinaiticus. But the first variant reads as follows: Ο ΩΝ (Ος ην ε) εν τω ουρανω. The portion in brackets is supported by the original reading of Alexandrinus, and as such is not well attested, but the rest is very well attested: *A*; *Θ*; *Ψ*; 050; 063; *ℓ*<sup>1,13</sup>; *M*; *lat*; *sy*<sup>(c)p.h.</sup>; *bo*<sup>pt</sup>; *Or*<sup>lat</sup>; *Epiph*<sup>pt</sup>. This reading has great support from the Western and Syrian traditions, but the Alexandrian tradition is not well accounted for. The translation of this: (the Son of the Human Being the one being in the heaven) emphasizes the continual presence of Jesus in heaven. This reading could well represent a more difficult reading, because how can the Son be in two places at once, which is what this variant would seem to suggest. The second variant reads as follows: Ο ΩΝ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥ-ΝΟΥ, and is translated as: the one out of the heaven. This reading is supported by: 0141; *pc*; *sy*<sup>e</sup>, and the external evidence is not very strong. It is easy to see a scribe correcting the first variant and changing it to the second, which would fit better with the scene in the text. On external evidence I am inclined to accept the text, but on internal evidence the first variant is a far more difficult reading, and I am inclined to accept it. For the sake of this translation I will follow the text.

4 Therefore when Jesus<sup>xviii</sup> knew that the Pharisees heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John, <sup>2</sup>and yet Jesus himself did not baptize but his disciples, <sup>3</sup>he left Judea and came again to Galilee. <sup>4</sup>It was necessary for him to go through Samaria. <sup>5</sup>Therefore he came into a city of Samaria being called Sychar close to the place which Jacob gave to Joseph his son. <sup>6</sup>There was the spring of Jacob. Then Jesus, having become tired from the journey sat down closer to the spring; it was about the sixth hour. <sup>7</sup>A woman out of Samaria came to draw water. Jesus said to her, "Give me a drink." <sup>8</sup>For his disciples having gone away into the city so that they may buy food. <sup>9</sup>Then the Samaritan woman said to him, "How, you being a Judean, you ask from me a drink being a woman of Samaria? For the Judeans have no dealings with Samaritans." <sup>10</sup>Jesus answered and said to her, "If you knew the gift of God and who is the one speaking to you, 'Give me a drink.' You would ask him and he would give to you living water." <sup>11</sup>The woman said to him, "Sir<sup>xx</sup>, you have nothing to draw with and the well is deep, from where then do you have the living water? <sup>12</sup>You are not greater than our father Jacob, who gave to us the well and he himself drank out of it and his children<sup>xx</sup> and his cattle(?)" <sup>13</sup>Jesus answered and said to her, "Everyone who drinks out of this water will again thirst, <sup>14</sup>but whoever drinks out of the water which I will give will never thirst into the ages, but the water which I will give will become in them a spring of water springing up into life eternal." <sup>15</sup>The woman said to him, "Sir, give me this water, so that I may not thirst, nor come here to draw." <sup>16</sup>He said to her, "Go call your man/husband<sup>xxi</sup> and come here." <sup>17</sup>The woman answered and said to him, "I do not have a husband." Jesus said to her, "Well you said, 'I have no man/husband, <sup>18</sup>for you had five husbands and now the one whom you have is not your husband, this you have spoken truly." <sup>19</sup>The woman said to him, "Sir, I perceive that you are a prophet. <sup>20</sup>Our ancestors<sup>xxii</sup> worshipped on this mountain; and you say that in Jerusalem is the place where it is necessary to worship." <sup>21</sup>Jesus said to her, "Believe me, woman, that the hour comes when not on this mountain nor in Jerusalem you (plural) will worship the Father. <sup>22</sup>You (plural) worship that which you do not know; we worship that which we know, because salvation is out of the Judeans. <sup>23</sup>But the hour comes and now is when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father also seeks such worshippers for him. <sup>24</sup>God is spirit and it is necessary for those worshipping to worship in spirit and truth." <sup>25</sup>The woman said to him, "I know that the Messiah comes, the one called 'The Anointed One' when that one comes, he will announce to us all things." <sup>26</sup>Jesus said to her, "I am (he) the one speaking to you." <sup>27</sup>And

---

18. Here is a textual problem that I have to investigate. The whole of verse 1 is left out by some commentators. But the problem surrounds 'Ιησοῦς. The previous edition used the word Κυριός. The textual evidence for both is very good, and no decision can be made just referring to the textual evidence. The harder reading however is the use of the word 'Ιησοῦς. In this instance I feel it is more likely that 'Ιησοῦς is the better reading.

19. The translation of κύριε or κύριος is difficult. Does one translate it Lord or Sir or Master. All these have different meanings and all could have been intentioned by the speakers in the Gospel. In most cases in the mouth of the disciples or a follower of Jesus I have used "Lord" otherwise I have used either "Sir" or "Master". Often the ambiguity should remain.

20. I suspect that υἱοὶ is here used in its generic sense.

21. Again I have deliberately left the ambiguity.

22. Here I have deliberately used the English word "Ancestors" and will do so through out the translation, except where there are particular references to Abraham.

at that moment his disciples came and they were astonished that he was speaking with a woman, however no one said, "What do you seek?" or, "Why do you speak with her?"<sup>28</sup> Then the woman left her water jar and went into the city and said to humanity,<sup>29</sup> "Come, see a human being who told me everything whatever I did, could this one be the Anointed One?"<sup>30</sup> They came out of the city and were coming towards him.<sup>31</sup> In the mean time the disciples were asking him saying, "Rabbi, eat."<sup>32</sup> But he said to them, "I have food to eat about which you know nothing."<sup>33</sup> Then the disciples said towards one another, "Surely someone has brought to him to eat?"<sup>34</sup> Jesus said to them, "My food is that I will do the will of the one who sent me and I will complete his work."<sup>35</sup> Do you not say that there are still four months and the harvest comes? See I say to you, lift up your eyes and perceive the fields that they are white with the harvest already.<sup>36</sup> The one reaping receives their wage and gathers the fruit towards life eternal, so that the one sowing and the one harvesting may rejoice in the same way.<sup>37</sup> For in this the word is true that there is one sowing and one harvesting.<sup>38</sup> I sent you to harvest that which you did not tire for; others have tired and you have come into their labour."<sup>39</sup> And out of that city many of the Samaritans believed into him through the word of the woman's testimony, "He told me everything that I did."<sup>40</sup> Then when the Samaritans came towards him, asking him to abide with them; and he abode there two days.<sup>41</sup> And many more believed through his word,<sup>42</sup> they said to the woman, "It is no longer through your speaking we believe for we have heard and know this one is truly the saviour of the world."<sup>43</sup> And after two days he went out from there into Galilee.<sup>44</sup> For Jesus himself testified that a prophet in his own land does not have honour.<sup>45</sup> When then he came to Galilee, the Galileans received him having seen all whatever he did in Jerusalem in the feast, for they also had gone to the feast.<sup>46</sup> Then he came again to Cana of Galilee where he made water wine. And there was a certain royal officer whose son was sick in Capernaum.<sup>47</sup> This one when he heard that Jesus had come out of Judea into Galilee, departed towards him, and asked that he may descend and heal his son, for he was at the point of death.<sup>48</sup> Then Jesus said towards him, "Unless you see signs and marvels you will not believe."<sup>49</sup> The royal official said to him, "Sir descend before my child dies."<sup>50</sup> Jesus said to him, "Go, your son lives." The human being believed the word which Jesus said to him and went.<sup>51</sup> And when he descended, his slaves met him saying that his child lives.<sup>52</sup> Then he learnt by inquiry<sup>xiii</sup> the hour from them in which he had become better in health; they said to him, "Yesterday the burning-fever departed at the seventh hour."<sup>53</sup> The father knew then that it was in that hour that Jesus said to him, "Your son lives." and he himself believed and his whole household.<sup>54</sup> This second sign Jesus again did coming out of Judea into Galilee.

5 After these things there was a feast of the Judeans and Jesus ascended into Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> And in Jerusalem there is by the Sheepgate a pool which is called in Hebrew 'Bethzatha' having five roofed colonnades.<sup>3</sup> In these there lay many of those who are sick, blind, lame, withered.<sup>5</sup> And there was a certain human being there having in himself sickness for thirty-eight years;<sup>6</sup> Jesus seeing this one having been placed there, and knowing that he has been there for a long time already, he said to him, "You wish to become healthy(?)"<sup>7</sup> The one who is ill answered him, "Sir, I have no human being that when the water is stirred who may put me into the pool."<sup>8</sup> Jesus said to him, "Rise, lift up your bed and walk."<sup>9</sup> And at once the human being became healthy and he lifted up his bed and he walked. But that day was the Sabbath.<sup>10</sup> Then the Judeans said to the one who had been healed, "It is the Sabbath, and it is not lawful for you to lift up your bed."<sup>11</sup> But he

---

23. πυνθάνομαι - I have left the translation as is, because to use the phrase, 'he inquired' loses the idea that he actually learnt from his inquiry.



answered them, "The one when he made me healthy, that one said to me, 'Lift up your bed and walk.'" <sup>12</sup>They asked him, "Who is the human being who said to you, 'Lift up and walk?'" <sup>13</sup>And the one having been cured did not know who it was, for Jesus entered the crowd that was in that place. <sup>14</sup>After these things Jesus found him in the temple and said to him, "See having become healthy, sin no longer, so that nothing worse happen to you." <sup>15</sup>The human being departed and announced to the Judeans that Jesus was the one who made him healthy. <sup>16</sup>And because of this the Judeans pursued Jesus because he did these things on the Sabbath. <sup>17</sup>But Jesus answered them, My Father is working still and I am working." <sup>18</sup>Because of this the Judeans sought more intensely to kill him because not only did he break the Sabbath, but he also said that God was his own Father, making himself equal to God. <sup>19</sup>Then Jesus answered and said to them, "Truly, truly I say to you, the Son is unable to do anything of himself only that which he sees the Father doing; for that which that one does, these things also the Son does in the same way. <sup>20</sup>For the Father loves the Son and displays all things to him which he himself does, and he will display greater works than these to him, so that you may be astonished. <sup>21</sup>For just as the Father raises the dead and makes them live, so also the Son makes live those he wishes. <sup>22</sup>For the Father judges no one, but he has given all judgement to the Son, <sup>23</sup>so that all may honour the Son even as they honour the Father. The one not honouring the Son does not honour the Father who sent him. <sup>24</sup>Truly, truly I say to you that the one hearing my word and believing in the one who sent me, has life eternal and does not come into judgement, but has passed out of death into life. <sup>25</sup>Truly, truly I say to you that the hour comes and now is when the dead will hear the sound of the Son of God and those hearing will live. <sup>26</sup>For just as the Father has life in himself so also he gave the Son to have life in himself. <sup>27</sup>And he gave to him authority to make judgement because he is the Son of the Human Being. <sup>28</sup>Do not be astonished at this, because the hour comes in which all those in the tombs will hear his sound <sup>29</sup>and coming out those doing good into the resurrection of life, and those accomplishing trivial things in the resurrection of judgement. <sup>30</sup>I am unable to do anything of myself, even as I hear, I judge, and my judgement is righteous because I do not seek my will but the will of the one who sent me. <sup>31</sup>If I testify concerning myself my testimony is not true; <sup>32</sup>there is another testifying concerning me and I know that the testimony which that one testifies concerning me is true. <sup>33</sup>You have sent towards John, and he has testified to the truth. <sup>34</sup>But I do not receive the testimony of a human being, but these things I say so that you may be saved. <sup>35</sup>That one was a burning lamp and shining, but you wished to rejoice greatly for an hour in his light. <sup>36</sup>But I have a greater testimony than John; for the works which my Father gave me that I will complete these things, these works which I (will) do testify concerning me that the Father sent me. <sup>37</sup>And the Father who sent me, that one has testified concerning me. You have never heard his sound nor have you ever seen his image, <sup>38</sup>and his word you do not have abiding in you, because that one whom he has sent to you, you do not believe <sup>39</sup>Enquire from the writings because you think to have in them life eternal; and it is they which testify concerning me; <sup>40</sup>and you do not wish to come towards me so that you may have life. <sup>41</sup>I do not receive glory from humanity, <sup>42</sup>but I know you that you do not have the love of God in you. <sup>43</sup>I have come in the name of my Father, and you do not receive me; if another came in their own name, that one you will receive. <sup>44</sup>How is it possible for you to believe the one receiving glory from another one, and you do not seek the glory concerning the only God? <sup>45</sup>Do not think that I will denounce you before the Father. Moses is the one denouncing you into whom you have hoped. <sup>46</sup>For if you believed Moses, you would believe me; for that one wrote concerning me. <sup>47</sup>But if you do not believe the writings of that one, how will you believe my words?"

6 After these things Jesus went across the sea of Galilee of Tiberias.<sup>2</sup> And a large crowd followed him because they saw the signs which he did on those who were sick.<sup>3</sup> Jesus went up to the mountain and sat there with his disciples.<sup>4</sup> And the Passover was near, the feast of the Judeans.<sup>5</sup> Then Jesus lifting up his eyes and seeing that a large crowd was coming towards him said to Philip, "How will we buy bread so that these may eat?"<sup>6</sup> This he said testing him, for he already knew what he intended to do.<sup>7</sup> Philip answered him, "Two hundred denarii will not supply bread for these so that each person may receive a little."<sup>8</sup> One of his disciples said to him, Andrew the brother of Simon Peter,<sup>9</sup> "There is a young child here who has five barley loaves and two fish<sup>xxiv</sup>, but what are these to so many?"<sup>10</sup> Jesus said, "Sit humanity down." And there was much grass in that place. Then the men sat down, the number about five thousand.<sup>11</sup> Then Jesus took the loaves and having given thanks he gave to those lying down, likewise also with the dried fish, howsoever much they wished.<sup>12</sup> And when they had their full, he said to his disciples, "Gather together the left over pieces, so that nothing may perish."<sup>13</sup> Then they gathered and they filled twelve baskets with the pieces from the five loaves of barley which those who had eaten left over.<sup>14</sup> Then humanity seeing the sign which he did said that this one truly is the prophet who is coming into the world.<sup>15</sup> Then Jesus knowing that they intended to come and to seize him so that they may make him ruler, went away again to the mountain by himself.<sup>16</sup> And when it became evening his disciples descended to the sea<sup>17</sup> and embarking in a boat they started across the sea to Capernaum. And it was already dark and Jesus had not yet come towards them,<sup>18</sup> and the sea rose because a great wind was blowing.<sup>19</sup> Having driven then about twenty five or thirty stadia, they saw Jesus walking on the sea and becoming near the boat, and they were frightened.<sup>20</sup> And he said to them, "I am (it is I); do not fear."<sup>21</sup> Then they wished to receive him into the boat, and at once the boat was at the land to which they were going.<sup>22</sup> On the next day the crowd, the one standing across the sea, saw that there was one boat there, but no others and that Jesus did not enter with his disciples into the boat but only his disciples went.<sup>23</sup> But boats from Tiberias came near the place where they ate the bread, the Lord having given thanks.<sup>24</sup> Then when the crowd saw that Jesus was not there nor his disciples, they themselves embarked in boats and came to Capernaum seeking Jesus.<sup>25</sup> And finding him across the sea they said to him, "Rabbi, when did you come here?"<sup>26</sup> Jesus answered them and said, "Truly, truly I say to you, you seek me not because of the signs you saw, but because you ate of the loaves and were full."<sup>27</sup> Do not work for the food which perishes but the food abiding into life eternal, which the Son of the Human Being will give you; for God the Father has sealed this one."<sup>28</sup> Then they said towards him, "What must we do so that we may do the works of God?"<sup>29</sup> Jesus answered and said to them, "This is the work of God, that you believe in the one whom that one sent."<sup>30</sup> Then they said to him, "Then what sign (will) you do, so that we may see and believe in you? What do you work?"<sup>31</sup> Our ancestors ate mana in the wilderness, just as it is written, '*He gave them bread from the heave to eat.*'"<sup>32</sup> Then Jesus said to them, "Truly, truly I say to you, Moses did not give you the bread from the heaven, but my Father gives you the true bread of the heaven;<sup>33</sup> For the bread of God is the one descending from the heaven and gives life to the world."<sup>34</sup> Then they said towards him, "Lord, give us this bread always."<sup>35</sup> Jesus said to them, "I am the bread of life; the one coming towards me shall not hunger, and the one believing in me shall not thirst ever."<sup>36</sup> But I say to you that you have seen me yet you do not believe.<sup>37</sup> All that my Father gives towards me will come, and the one coming towards me I will not throw out,<sup>38</sup> because I have descended from the heaven not that I may do my will but the will

---

24. ὄψαρια is only used in John's Gospel and refers to whatever food is to be eaten with bread. According to the Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament, in each case of its appearance in John's Gospel it refers to fish which is seen as accompanying bread.

of the one who sent me. <sup>39</sup>And this is the will of the one who sent me, that I will perish utterly none of those he has given me from him, but I will raise it up on (in) the last day. <sup>40</sup>For this is the will of my Father, that all those who see the Son and believe in him may have life eternal, and I will raise them on the last day.” <sup>41</sup>Then the Judeans muttered against him because he said, “I am the bread which descended from the heaven.” <sup>42</sup>And they said to him, “Is this not Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How can he no say that, ‘I have descended from the heaven?’” <sup>43</sup>Jesus answered and said to them, “Do not mutter with one another. <sup>44</sup>No one is able to come towards me unless the Father, the one who sent me, draws them, and I will raise them on the last day. <sup>45</sup>It is written in the prophets, ‘*And they will all be taught by God.*’ All who heard from the Father and learned come towards me. <sup>46</sup>Not that anyone has seen the Father except the one being from God, this one has seen the Father. <sup>47</sup>Truly, truly I say to you, the one believing has life eternal. <sup>48</sup>I am the bread of life. <sup>49</sup>Your ancestors ate the manna in the desert and died; <sup>50</sup>this one is the bread which descended from the heaven, so that those who eat of it/him may not die. <sup>51</sup>I am the living bread who/which has descended from the heaven; whoever eats of this bread will live into eternity, and the bread which I will give is my flesh on behalf of the life of the world.” <sup>52</sup>Then the Judeans fought with one another saying, “How is it possible that this one give to us his flesh to eat?” <sup>53</sup>Then Jesus said to them, “Truly, truly I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of the Human Being and drink his blood, you do not have life in yourselves. <sup>54</sup>The one gnawing my flesh and drinking my blood has life eternal, and I will raise that one up on the last day. <sup>55</sup>For my flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink. <sup>56</sup>The one gnawing my flesh and drinking my blood abides in me and I in them. <sup>57</sup>Just as the living Father sent me and I live through the Father, and the one gnawing me that one will live through me. <sup>58</sup>This is the bread which/who has descended from the heaven, not that which the ancestors ate and died; the one gnawing this bread will live into eternity.” <sup>59</sup>These things he said in the synagogue teaching in Capernaum. <sup>60</sup>Then many of his disciples hearing said, “This word is hard; who is able to listen to it/him?” <sup>61</sup>But Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples muttered against this said to them, “This causes you to stumble(?)” <sup>62</sup>Then what if you saw the Son of the Human Being ascending where he was before? <sup>63</sup>It is the Spirit that makes life, the flesh does not help anyone; the words which I have spoken to you are spirit and are life. <sup>64</sup>But there are among you some who do not believe.” For Jesus knew from the beginning who of those were not believing and who of those would hand him over. <sup>65</sup>And he said, “Because of this I have told you that no one is able to come towards me unless it is given to them by the Father.” <sup>66</sup>Out of this many of his disciples went behind and no longer walked with him. <sup>67</sup>Then Jesus said to the twelve, “Do you wish to go also?” <sup>68</sup>Simon Peter answered him, “Lord towards whom shall we go? You have the words of life eternal, <sup>69</sup>and we have believed and we know that you are the holy one of God.” <sup>70</sup>Jesus answered them, “Have I not chosen you, the twelve? And one out of you is a devil.” <sup>71</sup>He spoke of Judas son of Simon Iscariot; for this one intended to hand him over, one of the twelve.

7 And after these things Jesus walked about in Galilee; for he did not wish to walk about in Judea because the Judeans sought to kill him. <sup>2</sup>But the feast of Tents of the Judeans was near. <sup>3</sup>Then his brothers said towards him, “Change over from here and go into Judea so that your disciples may also perceive your works which you do, <sup>4</sup>for no one works in secret and seeks to be known openly. If you work these things, reveal yourself to the world.” <sup>5</sup>For his brothers did not believe



into him. <sup>6</sup>Then Jesus said to them, "My time<sup>xxv</sup> is not yet, but your time is always at hand. <sup>7</sup>The world is not able to hate you, but me it hates because I testify concerning it that its works are grievous. <sup>8</sup>You ascend into the feast, I do not ascend into this feast because my time is not yet full." <sup>9</sup>When he said these things he abode in Galilee. <sup>10</sup>But when his brothers ascended into the feast then he also ascended not revealingly but in secret. <sup>11</sup>Then the Judeans sought him in the feast and they said, "Where is that one?" <sup>12</sup>And concerning him there was much murmuring in the crowd, some said that he is good, others said, "No, but he leads the crowds astray<sup>xxvi</sup>." <sup>13</sup>Yet no one spoke concerning him openly through of the fear of the Judeans. <sup>14</sup>It was already the middle of the feast when Jesus ascended into the temple and he taught. <sup>15</sup>Then the Judeans were astonished saying, "How does this one know the writings not having been a disciple?" <sup>16</sup>Then Jesus answered them and said, "My teaching is not mine, but of the one who sent me; <sup>17</sup>if anyone wishes to work their will that one will know concerning the teaching whether it is out of God or whether I speak from myself. <sup>18</sup>The one who speaks from themselves seeks their own glory; the one seeking the glory of the one who sent them is true and in them is no unrighteousness. <sup>19</sup>Did not Moses give you the law? And none out of you do the law. Why do you seek to kill me?" <sup>20</sup>The crowd answered, "You have a demon, who seeks to kill you?" <sup>21</sup>Jesus answered and said to them, "I did one work and you all were astonished <sup>22</sup>because of it; Moses has given you circumcision - not that it is out of Moses but out of the ancestors - and you circumcise a human being on the Sabbath. <sup>23</sup>If a human being receives circumcision on the Sabbath so that the law of Moses may not be loosed, you are angry with me because I made the whole human being healthy on the Sabbath (?) <sup>24</sup>Do not judge according to that which can be seen, but judge with righteous judgement." <sup>25</sup>Some of those from Jerusalem said, "Is not this one the one whom they seek to kill?" <sup>26</sup>And see he speaks openly and they say nothing to him. Could it be that the rulers truly know that this one is the Anointed One? <sup>27</sup>But we know from where this one is; and the Anointed One when he comes no one will know from where he is." <sup>28</sup>Then Jesus cried out, teaching in the temple, and saying, "You know me and you know from where I am; but I have not come from myself, but the one who sent me is true, whom you do not know. <sup>29</sup>I know him because from him I am and that one sent me." <sup>30</sup>Then they sought to lay hold of him, but no one laid hands on him because his hour had not yet come. <sup>31</sup>But out of the crowd many believed into him and they said, "Whenever the Anointed One comes he will not work more signs than this one has done (?) <sup>32</sup>The Pharisees heard the murmuring of the crowd concerning him, and the high-priests and the Pharisees sent attendants that they may lay hold of him. <sup>33</sup>Then Jesus said, "I am with you still a short time<sup>xxvii</sup> and I go towards the one who sent me. <sup>34</sup>You will seek me and you will not find me, and where I am you are not able to come." <sup>35</sup>Then the Judeans said amongst themselves, "Where does this one intend to go that we will not find him? Surely he does not intend to go into the diaspora of the Greeks and to teach the Greeks? <sup>36</sup>What is this word which he said, 'You will seek me and you will not find me.' and, 'Where I am you are not able to go.'?" <sup>37</sup>And on the last day, the greatest of the feast, Jesus stood and cried out saying, "If any thirsts, come towards me and drink. <sup>38</sup>The one believing into me, even as the writing said, '*Rivers of living water will flow out of his heart.*'" <sup>39</sup>But he said this concerning the spirit which those believing into him intended to receive; for the

---

25. καιρός as opposed to ὥρα.

26. πλανᾶ literally means 'to wonder', i.e. to wonder around. I have translated it as to 'lead astray.' Also in verse 47.

27. χρόνος instead of any other reference until now.



spirit was not yet, because Jesus had not yet been glorified. <sup>40</sup>Then some of the crowd, hearing these words said, "This is truly the prophet." <sup>41</sup>Others said, "This is the Anointed One." But some said, "Shall the Anointed One come out of Galilee? <sup>42</sup>Has not the writing said that the Anointed One comes out of the seed of David and from Bethlehem the village where David was?" <sup>43</sup>Then there was division in the crowd because of him; <sup>44</sup>some of them wished to lay hold of him, but no one laid hands on him. <sup>45</sup>Then the attendants came towards the high priests and Pharisees, and they said to them<sup>xxviii</sup>, "Why did you not lead him?" <sup>46</sup>The attendants answered, "No one has spoken like this human being." <sup>47</sup>Then the Pharisees answered them, "Surely you have not also been led astray? <sup>48</sup>None of the rulers believed into him or of the Pharisees. <sup>49</sup>But this crowd who do not know the law are under a curse." <sup>50</sup>Nicodemus said to them, the one going towards him before, being one of them, <sup>51</sup>"Does our law judge the human being if not first hearing concerning him and knowing what he does?" <sup>52</sup>They answered and said to him, "Surely you are not from Galilee? Enquire and see that out of Galilee no prophet rises."<sup>xxix</sup>

**8**<sup>12</sup>Then again Jesus spoke to them saying, "I am the light of the world; the one following me will not walk in the darkness but will have the light of life." <sup>13</sup>Then the Pharisees said to him, "You testify concerning yourself, your testimony is not true." <sup>14</sup>Jesus answered and said to them, "Even if I testify concerning myself, my testimony is true because I know from where I came and where I go, but you do not know from where I come or where I go. <sup>15</sup>You judge according to the flesh, I judge no one. <sup>16</sup>Even if I judge, my judgement is true because I am not alone but I and the one who sent me my Father. <sup>17</sup>And in your law it is written that the testimony of two of humanity is true. <sup>18</sup>I am the one testifying concerning myself and the one who sent me testifies concerning me, my Father." <sup>19</sup>They said to him, "Where is your father?" Jesus answered, "You do not know me nor my Father; if you knew me, my Father you would also have know" <sup>20</sup>These words he spoke in the treasury, teaching in the temple and no one laid hold of him because his hour had not yet come. <sup>21</sup>Again he said to them, "I go away and you will seek me and in your sin you will die; where I go you are not able to come." <sup>22</sup>Then the Judeans said, "Surely he will not kill himself because he said, 'Where I go you are not able to come?'" <sup>23</sup>And he said to them, "You are of below, I am of above; you are of this world, I am not of this world. <sup>24</sup>Therefore I told you that you will die in your sins for if you do not believe that I am, you will die in your sins." <sup>25</sup>They said to him, "Who are you?" Jesus said to them, "From the beginning, that which I have spoken to you(?) <sup>26</sup>I have many things to say concerning you and to judge, but the one who sent me is true, and I, that which I heard from him these things I speak into the world." <sup>27</sup>They did not know that he spoke to them concerning the Father. <sup>28</sup>Then Jesus said to them, "Whenever you have lifted up the Son of the Human Being then you will know that I am (he), and that I do nothing of myself, but even as my Father has taught me, these things I speak. <sup>29</sup>And the one who sent me is with me; he has not left me alone, because I always work the things that are good to him." <sup>30</sup>Speaking these things many believed into him. <sup>31</sup>Then Jesus said towards those Judeans who had believed into him, "If you abide in my word you are truly my disciples <sup>32</sup>and you will know the truth, and the truth will free you." <sup>33</sup>They answered him, "We are the seed of Abraham and we have never been enslaved to anyone, how can you say, 'You will be free?'" <sup>34</sup>Jesus answered them, "Truly, truly I say to you that everyone doing a sin is a slave of sin. <sup>35</sup>The slave does not

---

28. It is not possible to tell merely from the language who is speaking to who. But the context would indicate that the Pharisees are speaking to the attendants.

29. For the text of 7:53-8:11 see after chap 21.

abide in the house into the ages, the Son abides into the ages. <sup>36</sup>If then the Son frees you, you will be free. <sup>37</sup>I know that you are the seed of Abraham; but you seek to kill me because my word (has) no place in you. <sup>38</sup>That which I have seen from the Father I speak, and you then do that which you heard from (your) father.” <sup>39</sup>They answered and said to him, “Our father is Abraham.” Jesus said to them, “If you are children of Abraham, you would work the works of Abraham; <sup>40</sup>but now you seek to kill me, a human being who has spoken the truth to you which I heard from God; this Abraham did not do. <sup>41</sup>You do the works of your father.” Then they said to him, “We have not been born out of fornication, we have one Father, God.” <sup>42</sup>Jesus said to them, “If God was your Father you would love me, for I came out of God and I have come; I have not come from myself, but that one sent me. <sup>43</sup>Why do you not know that which I have spoken? Because you are unable to hear my word. <sup>44</sup>You are of the father, the devil, and the desire of your father you wish to do. That one was a murderer from the beginning and he does not stand on the truth, because the truth is not in him. Whenever he speaks a lie he speaks out of himself because he is a liar and the father of them <sup>45</sup>But I, because I speak the truth, you do not believe me. <sup>46</sup>Who among you picks me out with sin? If I speak the truth, why do you not believe me? <sup>47</sup>The one being of God hears the words of God the reason you do not hear because you are not of God.” <sup>48</sup>The Judeans answered and said to him, “Surely we are right saying that you are a Samaritan and you have a demon?” <sup>49</sup>Jesus answered, “I do not have a demon, but I honour my Father and you dishonour me. <sup>50</sup>I do not seek my glory; there is one seeking and judging. <sup>51</sup>Truly, truly I say to you whoever keeps my word, will not see death into the ages.” <sup>52</sup>The Judeans said to him, “Now we know that you have a demon, Abraham died and the prophets, and you say, ‘Whoever keeps my word will not taste death into the ages.’ <sup>53</sup>Surely you are not greater than our ancestor Abraham who died? And the prophets died. Who do you make yourself?” <sup>54</sup>Jesus answered, “If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing; the Father is the one glorifying me, whom you said, ‘He is our God.’” <sup>55</sup>And you have not known him but I know him. And if I said that I did not know him, I will be like you, a liar; but I know him and I keep his word. <sup>56</sup>Your ancestor Abraham rejoiced greatly that he may see my day, and he saw and he rejoiced.” <sup>57</sup>The Judeans said towards him, “You are not (yet) fifty years and you have seen Abraham (?)” <sup>58</sup>Jesus said to them, “Truly, truly I say to you, before Abraham came to be I am.” <sup>59</sup>Then they lifted up stones to throw at him. But Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple.

9 And going he saw a human being blind out of birth. <sup>2</sup>And his disciples asked him saying, “Rabbi, who sinned, this one or this one’s parents, in order that he was born blind?” <sup>3</sup>Jesus answered, “Neither this one sinned nor his parents but that the works of God may be revealed in him. <sup>4</sup>It is necessary for us to work the works of the one who sent me while it is day night comes when no one is able to work. <sup>5</sup>While being in the world, I am the light of the world.” <sup>6</sup>Saying these things he spat to the ground and made clay out of that which had been spat and he anointed him with the clay onto the eyes <sup>7</sup>and he said to him, “Go wash in the pool of Siloam” - which is interpreted ‘sent’ - then he went and washed and he came seeing. <sup>8</sup>Then the neighbours and those seeing him before that he was a beggar said, “Is this not the one sitting and begging?” <sup>9</sup>Some said, “It is this one.” others said, “No, but it is one like him.” That one said, “I am (he).” <sup>10</sup>Then they said to him, “How then have your eyes been opened?” <sup>11</sup>That one answered, “The human being, the one called Jesus made clay and anointed my eyes and said to me, ‘Go into Siloam and wash - going then and washing I saw.’” <sup>12</sup>And they said to him, “Where is that one?” He said, “I don’t know.” <sup>13</sup>They led him towards the Pharisees the one who was blind. <sup>14</sup>And it was the Sabbath on the day Jesus made clay and opened his eyes. <sup>15</sup>Then again even the Pharisees asking him how he saw. And he said to them, “He placed clay onto my eyes and I washed and I see.” <sup>16</sup>Then some out of the Pharisees

said, "This human being is not from God, because he does not keep the Sabbath." But others said, "How is it possible for a human being who is a sinner to do such signs?" And there was a division among them. <sup>17</sup>Then they again say to the blind person, "What do you say concerning him, because he opened your eyes?" And he said, "He is a prophet." <sup>18</sup>Then the Judeans did not believe concerning him that he was blind and received his sight until they called the parents of the one who received his sight. <sup>19</sup>And they asked them saying, "This one is your son, whom you say was born blind. How then does he now see?" <sup>20</sup>Then his parents answered and said, "We know that this one is our son and that he was born blind, <sup>21</sup>but how now he sees we do not know, nor do we know who opened his eyes; ask him, he is of age, he will speak concerning himself." <sup>22</sup>His parents said these things because they feared the Judeans; for already the Judeans had come together in order that if anyone should confess him (as) The Anointed One, he was to be separated from the synagogue. <sup>23</sup>Because of this his parents said, "He is of age, ask him." <sup>24</sup>Then they called the human being a second time who was blind and said to him, "Give glory to God, we know that this human being is a sinner." <sup>25</sup>That one then answered, "If he is a sinner, I don't know; I know one thing that being blind I now see." <sup>26</sup>Then they said to him, "What did he do to you? How then did he open your eyes?" <sup>27</sup>He answered them, "I said to you already and you did not hear; why do you wish to hear again? Surely you also do not wish to become his disciples?" <sup>28</sup>And they abused him and said, "You are that one's disciple, but we are disciples of Moses; <sup>29</sup>we know that God has spoken to Moses but this one we don't know from where he is." <sup>30</sup>The human being answered and said to them, "In this is an astonishment, that you don't know from where he is, and he opened my eyes. <sup>31</sup>We know that God does not hear sinners but whoever may be a God fearer and may do his will this one hears. <sup>32</sup>Out of the ages it has not been heard that anyone opened the eyes of one being born blind; <sup>33</sup>If this one was not from God, he would not be able to do anything." <sup>34</sup>They answered and said to him, "In complete sin you have been born and you teach us (?)" And they threw him out. <sup>35</sup>Jesus heard that they had thrown him out, and finding him said, "You believe into the Son of the Human Being (?)" <sup>36</sup>That one answered and said, "And who is he, Sir, so that I may believe into him?" <sup>37</sup>Jesus said to him, "Even you have seen him and the one speaking with you that one he is." <sup>38</sup>And he said, "Lord, I believe." And he worshipped him. <sup>39</sup>And Jesus said, "I came into this world into judgement, so that those not seeing may see and those seeing may be blind." <sup>40</sup>Some of the Pharisees heard these things, being with him, and said to him, "Surely we are not blind?" <sup>41</sup>Jesus said to them, "If you were blind, you would not have sin, but now you say, 'We see.' your sin abides."

**10** "Truly, truly I say to you the one not coming in through the door into the courtyard of the sheep but ascending from another place that one is a thief and a bandit; <sup>2</sup>the one coming in through the door is the shepherd of the sheep. <sup>3</sup>To this one the doorkeeper opens and the sheep hear his sound and he calls his own sheep by name and he leads them out. <sup>4</sup>Whenever he puts out all his own, he goes before them and the sheep follow him, because they know his sound; <sup>5</sup>but a stranger they will not follow, but they will flee from him because they do not know the sound of the stranger." <sup>6</sup>This common saying<sup>xxx</sup> Jesus said to them but they did not know that which he had said to them. <sup>7</sup>Then Jesus again said, "Truly, truly I say to you that I am the door of the sheep, <sup>8</sup>All, however many, who came before were thieves and bandits, but the sheep did not hear them. <sup>9</sup>I am the door, whoever comes in through me will be saved and will come in and go out and will find pasture. <sup>10</sup>The thief comes not except to steal and kill and perish utterly; I have come so that

---

30. Often translated as "parable" or has connotations of speaking in a secret manner.



they may have life and have (it) beyond the regular. <sup>11</sup>I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd places his life<sup>xxx</sup> concerning the sheep; <sup>12</sup>The one with pay and not being a shepherd whose own sheep they are not, perceives the wolf coming and departs from the sheep and flees - and the wolf takes them and scatters them - <sup>13</sup>because he is the one with pay and does not care concerning the sheep. <sup>14</sup>I am the good shepherd and I know that which is mine and that which is mine knows me, <sup>15</sup>as the Father knows me I know the Father, and I place my life concerning the sheep. <sup>16</sup>And I have other sheep which are not of this courtyard; it is necessary for me to lead them and they will hear my sound and they will become one flock one shepherd. <sup>17</sup>Because of this the Father loves me because I place my life so that I may take it again. <sup>18</sup>No one takes it from me, but I place it from myself. I have the authority to place it and I have the authority to take it again this the command I received from my Father." <sup>19</sup>Again there was division in the Judeans through these words. <sup>20</sup>Many of them said, "He has a demon and he is mad; why do you listen to him?" <sup>21</sup>Others said, "These are not the words of one with a demon, no demon is able to open the eyes of the blind (?)" <sup>22</sup>It was then the feast of renovation in Jerusalem, it was winter, <sup>23</sup>and Jesus was walking in the temple in the colonnade of Solomon. <sup>24</sup>Then the Judeans encircling him said to him, "Until when do you keep us in suspense? If you are the Anointed One, tell us openly." <sup>25</sup>Jesus answered them, "I told you and you do not believe; the works which I do in the name of my Father, these things testify concerning me; <sup>26</sup>but you do not believe, because you are not my sheep. <sup>27</sup>My sheep hear my sound and I know them and they follow me, <sup>28</sup>and I give them life eternal and they will not die into the ages and none will snatch any out of my hand. <sup>29</sup>My Father, who has given to me all things is greater, and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand. <sup>30</sup>I and the Father are one." <sup>31</sup>The Judeans again picked up stones in order that they may stone him. Jesus answered them, "I displayed to you many good works out of my Father; because of which of these works you stone me(?)" <sup>32</sup>The Judeans answered him, "We do not stone you on account of good work but on account of blasphemy, and that you being a human being make yourself God." <sup>33</sup>Jesus answered them, "Is it not written in your law, '*I said, 'you are Gods'?*'" <sup>34</sup>If that one said Gods towards whom the word of God came, - and the writing is not possible to be broken, - <sup>35</sup>whom the Father holified and sent into the world you say that he blasphemes, because I said, '*I am the Son of God (?)*'" <sup>36</sup>If I do not do the works of my Father, do not believe me; <sup>37</sup>but if I do; even if you do not believe me, believe in the works, so that whenever you know you may know that the Father is in me and I am in the Father." <sup>38</sup>Then they sought to lay hold of him, and he went out from their hands. <sup>39</sup>And he went again across the Jordan into the place where John was first baptizing and he abode there. <sup>40</sup>And many came towards him and they said, "John did not one sign but everything whatsoever John said concerning this one was true." <sup>41</sup>And many believed into him there.

11 And there was a certain man, Lazarus from Bethany, out of the village of Mary and Martha her sister. <sup>2</sup>And it was Mary who anointed with sweet-oil the Lord and handled his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick. <sup>3</sup>Then the sisters sent towards him they say, "Lord, see the one whom you love is sick." <sup>4</sup>But when he heard Jesus said, "This sickness is not towards death but for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it." <sup>5</sup>And Jesus loved

---

31. ψυχή. This word is difficult to translate. I have kept the translation as "life" but this must be seen in opposition to the translation of ζωή which I have also translated as "life." The latter particularly refers to the life that Jesus brings to those who believe into him. The former refers to the life that one gives to Jesus so that they may receive ζωή.

Mary and her sister and Lazarus. <sup>6</sup>Then when he heard that he is sick, then he abode in the place where he was two days, <sup>7</sup>after this he said to the disciples, "Let us go to Judea again."<sup>8</sup> The disciples say to him, "Rabbi, now the Judeans were seeking to stone you and again you go there (?)"<sup>9</sup> Jesus answered, "Surely there are twelve hours of the day? Whoever walks in the day will not stumble because they see the light of this world; <sup>10</sup>But whoever walks in the night, stumbles because the light is not in."<sup>11</sup> These things he said and after this he said to them, "Lazarus, our friend has fallen asleep, but I go so that I may unsleep him."<sup>12</sup> Then the disciples said to him, "Lord if he has fallen asleep he will be saved."<sup>13</sup> But Jesus had spoken concerning his death, but they thought that he spoke concerning the rest of sleep. <sup>14</sup>Then therefore Jesus said to them openly, "Lazarus has died."<sup>15</sup> And I rejoice for you so that you may believe, because I was not there; but let us go towards him. <sup>16</sup>Then Thomas, the one called Didymus said to (his) disciples with him, "Let us also go in order that we may die with him."<sup>17</sup> Then coming Jesus found him already four days having been in the tomb. <sup>18</sup>But Bethany was near Jerusalem about fifteen stadia. <sup>19</sup>And many of the Judeans had come towards Martha and Mary in order that they may be consoled concerning their brother. <sup>20</sup>Then Martha when she heard that Jesus had come she went to meet him, but Mary sat in the house. <sup>21</sup>Then Martha said to Jesus, "Lord, if you were here then my brother would not have died. <sup>22</sup>But even now I know whatever you would ask from God, God will give to you."<sup>23</sup> Jesus said to her, "Your brother will rise again. <sup>24</sup>Martha said to him, "I know that he will rise again in the resurrection on the last day."<sup>25</sup> Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life, whoever believes into me even though they die will live, <sup>26</sup>and all living and believing into me will not die into the ages. You believe this (?)"<sup>27</sup> She said to him, "Yes Lord, I have believed that you are the Anointed One, the Son of God, the one coming into the world."<sup>28</sup> And having said this she went and called Mary her sister speaking secretly, "The teacher is here and he calls you."<sup>29</sup> And that one when she heard rose quickly and went towards him. <sup>30</sup>But Jesus had not yet come into the village, but was still in the place where Martha had met him. <sup>31</sup>Then the Judeans, those being with her in the house and consoling her, seeing that Mary rose quickly and went out, they followed her thinking that she goes to the tomb so that she may weep there. <sup>32</sup>Then Mary when she came where Jesus was, seeing him she fell towards his feet saying to him, "Lord, if you were here my brother would not have died."<sup>33</sup> Then Jesus when he saw her weeping and the Judeans coming with her weeping, was enraged in his spirit and was troubled, <sup>34</sup>and he said, "Where have you (plural) placed him?" They say to him, "Lord come and see"<sup>35</sup> Jesus wept. <sup>36</sup>Then the Judeans said, "See how he loved him."<sup>37</sup> But some out of them said, "Surely the one who opens the eyes of the blind could make this one not die (?)"<sup>38</sup> Then Jesus again enraged in himself came to the tomb and it was a cave and a stone had been placed on it. <sup>39</sup>Jesus said, "Lift up the stone." Martha, the sister of the one having been completed said to him, "Lord already he smells for it is four days."<sup>40</sup> Jesus said to her, "Did I not say to you that if you believe you will see the glory of God?"<sup>41</sup> Then they lifted up the stone. And Jesus lifted the eyes up and said, "Father I give you thanks that you have heard me. <sup>42</sup>And I know that you hear me at all times, but because of the crowd standing I said that they may believe that you sent me."<sup>43</sup> And having said these things he cried out with a great sound, "Lazarus come out."<sup>44</sup> The one who had died came out the feet and the hands being bound with grave clothes and his face having been bound with a cloth. Jesus said to them, "Loose him and release him to go."<sup>45</sup> Then many of the Judeans, those who had come towards Mary and having seen that which he did believed into him. <sup>46</sup>But certain out of them went towards the Pharisees and said to them that which Jesus did. <sup>47</sup>Then the high-priests and the Pharisees gathered the Sanhedrin and said, "What must we do because this human being does many signs?"<sup>48</sup> If we release him, everyone will believe into him and the Romans will come and snatch our place and nation."<sup>49</sup> But a certain one out of them,

Caiaphas, being high-priest of that year said to them, "You know nothing whatsoever, <sup>50</sup>do you not reckon that it is useful<sup>xxxii</sup> to us that one human being may perish for the people and not the whole nation should die." <sup>51</sup>This he did not say from himself, but being high-priest that year he prophesied that Jesus intended to die on behalf of the nation, <sup>52</sup>and not for the nation only but that the children of God, those having been scattered may be brought together into one. <sup>53</sup>Then from that day they took council so that they might kill him. <sup>54</sup>Then Jesus no longer walked about openly in Judea, but went from there into the region near the desert, into a city called Ephraim and there he abode with the disciples. <sup>55</sup>And the Passover of the Judeans was near, and many ascended into Jerusalem out of the region before the Passover so that they may purify themselves. <sup>56</sup>Then they sought Jesus and said with one another standing in the temple, "What do you think?" "Will he not come into the feast?" <sup>57</sup>The high-priests and the Pharisees having given commands that whoever might know where he is should reveal it, so that they may lay hold of him."

**12** Then Jesus six days before the Passover came into Bethany, where Lazarus was, whom Jesus raised out of the dead. <sup>2</sup>Then they made for him a main meal there and Mary served and Lazarus was one of those lying with him. <sup>3</sup>Then Mary taking a measure of sweet oil of pure nard costly, she anointed the feet of Jesus and handled his feet with her hair, and the house was filled with the scent of the sweet oil. <sup>4</sup>But Judas Iscariot one out of his disciples, the one intending to hand him over said, <sup>5</sup>"Why has this sweet oil not been sold for three hundred denarii and been given to the poor?" <sup>6</sup>But he said this not because he was concerned about the poor himself, but because he was a thief and having the treasury that which was thrown in he took. <sup>7</sup>Then Jesus said, "Release her so that she may keep it for the day of my burial; <sup>8</sup>For you always have the poor with yourselves, but me you don't always have." <sup>9</sup>Then a large crowd of Judeans knowing that he was there and they came not because of Jesus only but so that they may also see Lazarus who he raised out of the dead. <sup>10</sup>And the high-priests took council that they may kill Lazarus also, <sup>11</sup>because many of the Judeans because of him went away and believed into Jesus. <sup>12</sup>The next day the large crowd, the one which came into the feast, hearing that Jesus comes into Jerusalem <sup>13</sup>took the branches of palm trees and went to meet him and they cried out, "*Hosanna, happy is the one coming in the name of the Lord, [and] the ruler of Israel.*" <sup>14</sup>And Jesus finding a young ass sat on it, even as it has been written, <sup>15</sup>"*Do not fear, daughter of Zion, See your ruler comes, sitting on the foal of an ass.*" <sup>16</sup>These things his disciples did not know first, but when Jesus was glorified then they remembered that these things had been written about him and they did these things to him. <sup>17</sup>Then the crowd who being with him when he called Lazarus out of the tomb and raised him out of the dead testified. <sup>18</sup>Because of this the crowd met him because they heard he had done this sign. <sup>19</sup>Then the Pharisees said to one another, "You perceive that you can help nothing; see the world has gone behind him." <sup>20</sup>And there were some Greeks among those ascending so that they may worship in the feast; <sup>21</sup>These then came to Philip who was from Bethsaida of Galilee and asked him saying, "Sir we want to see Jesus." <sup>22</sup>Philip comes and said to Andrew, Andrew and Philip come and they speak to Jesus. <sup>23</sup>But Jesus answered them saying, "The hour has come so that the Son of the Human Being may be glorified. <sup>24</sup>Truly, truly I say to you unless a seed of grain falling into the earth dies, it abides alone; but if it dies, it produces much fruit. <sup>25</sup>The one loving their life destroys it, and the one hating their life in this world will guard it into life eternal. <sup>26</sup>Whoever serves me, must follow me and where I am there also my servant is; whoever serves me the Father

---

32. Literally "Carry with". Giving the idea of being useful.



will honour. <sup>27</sup> *Now my life<sup>xxxiii</sup> is troubled* and what shall I say? Father, save me out of this hour? But because of this I came into this hour. <sup>28</sup> Father, glorify your name” Then a sound came out of the heaven, “I have glorified and again I will glorify.” <sup>29</sup> Then the crowd standing when they heard said that it had thundered, but others said, “An angel has spoken to him.” <sup>30</sup> Jesus answered and said, “Not for me this sound happened but for you. <sup>31</sup> Now is the judgement of this world, now the one ruling this world will be thrown out; <sup>32</sup> and I whenever I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all towards myself.” <sup>33</sup> And he said this showing by what death he intended to die. <sup>34</sup> Then the crowd answered him, “We have heard out of the law that The Anointed One abides into the ages, and how do you say that it is necessary for the Son of the Human Being to be lifted up? Who is this Son of humanity?” <sup>35</sup> Jesus said to them, “For a short time still the light is amongst you, walk when you have the light so that the darkness does not take hold of you, and those walking in the dark do not know where they go. <sup>36</sup> When you have the light, believe into the light so that you may be children of light.” Having said these things Jesus, going away he hid from them. <sup>37</sup> Having made so many signs before them, they did not believe into him, <sup>38</sup> so that the word of Isaiah the prophet may be fulfilled which said, “*Lord, who has believed that which we have heard? and to whom has the arm of the Lord been uncovered?*” <sup>39</sup> Because of this they were unable to believe, because again Isaiah said, <sup>40</sup> “*He has blinded their eyes, and he hardened their hearts so that they do not see with their eyes and perceive with their hearts and turn and I will cure them.*” <sup>41</sup> These things Isaiah said because he saw his glory, and he has spoken concerning him. <sup>42</sup> Nevertheless many of those ruling believed into him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess so that they may not be separated from the synagogue; <sup>43</sup> for they loved the glory of humanity instead of the glory of God. <sup>44</sup> And Jesus cried out and said, “The one believing into me does not believe into me but into the one who sent me, <sup>45</sup> and the one perceiving me perceives the one who sent me. <sup>46</sup> I, the light, have come into the world so that all who believe into me should not abide in the darkness. <sup>47</sup> And whoever hears my words and does not guard them I do not judge them; for I did not come to judge the world but to save the world. <sup>48</sup> The one not receiving me and not receiving my words has a judge; that word which I have spoken (will) judge(s) that one on the last day. <sup>49</sup> Because I have not spoken out of myself, but the Father who sent me he himself gave me a command what I say and what I will speak. <sup>50</sup> And I know that his command is life eternal. That which I speak, even as my Father has spoken, so I speak.”

**13** And before the feast of the Passover Jesus knowing that his hour had come so that he may pass out of this world towards the Father having loved his own in the world into the end he loved them. <sup>2</sup> And during the main-meal, the devil having already placed into the heart of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, that he may hand him over <sup>3</sup> Knowing that the Father had given him all thing into his hands, and that he had come from God and he goes towards God, <sup>4</sup> he rose out of the main-meal and placed the garments and taking a cloth he girded himself; <sup>5</sup> then he throws water into a washing vessel and he began to wash the feet of the disciple and to handle them with the cloth with which he was girded. <sup>6</sup> Then he came towards Simon Peter, he said to him, “Lord, you wash my feet (?)” <sup>7</sup> Jesus answered and said to him, “That which I do you do not know now, but after this you will know.” <sup>8</sup> Peter said to him, “You shall not wash my feet into the ages.” Jesus answered him, “If I do not wash you, you have no part with me.” <sup>9</sup> Simon Peter said to him, “Lord, not me feet only; but even the hands and the head.” <sup>10</sup> Jesus said to him, “The one having washed does not have need except to wash the feet, but is clean completely and you are clean, but not all.”

---

33. Again the ambiguity between life and soul should be maintained.

<sup>11</sup>For he knew the one handing him over, because of this he said, "You are not all clean." <sup>12</sup>When he washed their feet and he took his garments and sat again, he said to them, "You know what I have done to you (?) <sup>13</sup>You call me, 'Teacher', and , 'Lord' and you speak well for I am. <sup>14</sup>Then if I washed your feet, your Lord and teacher, even you ought to wash the feet of one another; <sup>15</sup>for I gave to you a token that even as I did to you, you also do. <sup>16</sup>Truly, truly I say to you, a slave is not greater than his Lord nor a messenger greater than the one who sent him. <sup>17</sup>If you know these things, happy are you if you do these things. <sup>18</sup>I do not speak concerning all of you; I know those I chose; but in order that the writing may be fulfilled, *'The one gnawing my bread lifted up against me his heel.'* <sup>19</sup>I speak now to you before it happens, that you may believe whenever it happens that I am (he). <sup>20</sup>Truly, truly I say to you the one receiving those whom I will send, receives me, and the one receiving me received the one who sent me." <sup>21</sup>Saying these things Jesus was troubled in spirit and testified and said, "Truly, truly I say to you that one of you will hand me over." <sup>22</sup>The disciples looked at one another being uncertain of whom he spoke. <sup>23</sup>One of the disciples was lying on the breast of Jesus, whom Jesus loved. <sup>24</sup>Then Simon Peter nodded to this one to learn by inquiry whom it might be of whom he spoke. <sup>25</sup>Then that one falling so onto the breast of Jesus said to him, "Lord who is it?" <sup>26</sup>Jesus answered, "It is that one to whom I will dip the morsel and I will give it" Then he dipped the morsel he gave to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. <sup>27</sup>And after the morsel, then The Accuser<sup>xxxv</sup> entered into that one. Then Jesus said to him, "That which you will do, do quickly." <sup>28</sup>And no one of those lying knew why he said this towards him; <sup>29</sup>for some thought that since Judas had the treasury, that Jesus said to him, "Buy that which we have need for the feast." or in order to give something to the poor. <sup>30</sup>Then receiving the morsel that one went out at once. And it was night. <sup>31</sup>Then when he had gone out Jesus said, "Now the Son of the Human Being is glorified and God is glorified in him. <sup>32</sup>If God is glorified in him, and God will glorify him in him and at once he will glorify him. <sup>33</sup>Little children, I am with you still a short time; you will seek me, and even as I said to the Judeans, now I speak to you that where I go you are not able to come. <sup>34</sup>I give you a new command, that you love one another, even as I loved you, so that you also love one another. <sup>35</sup>In this all will know that you are my disciples, if you have love in one another." <sup>36</sup>Simon Peter said to him, "Lord, where do you go?" Jesus answered him, "Where I go you are not able to follow now, you will follow later." <sup>37</sup>Peter said to him, "Lord why am I not able to follow you now? I will place my life for you." <sup>38</sup>Jesus answered, "You will place your life for me (?) Truly, truly I say to you, the cock will not call until you deny me three times."

**14** "Do not let your hearts be troubled; believe into God and believe into me. <sup>2</sup>In my Father's house there are many abiding-places; if it is not would I have said to you that I go to make ready a place for you? <sup>3</sup>And when I go and make ready a place for you, again I will come and I will receive you towards myself, so that where I am also you may be. <sup>4</sup>And where I go you know the way." <sup>5</sup>Thomas said to him, "Lord, we do not know where you go, how are we able to know the way?" <sup>6</sup>Jesus said to him, "I am the way and the truth and the life; no one comes towards the Father except through me. <sup>7</sup>If you had known me, you will know my Father. And from now you know him, and have seen him" <sup>8</sup>Philip said to him, "Lord, display to us the Father and it is enough to us." <sup>9</sup>Jesus said to him, "For such a time I am with you and you have not known me, Philip (?) The one having seen me has seen the Father; how do you say, 'display to us the Father?' <sup>10</sup>You do not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me (?) The words which I speak to you

---

34. σατανᾶς, I have translated as "The Accuser."

I do not speak from myself, but the Father abiding in me does his work. <sup>11</sup>Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father is me; if not, believe because of these works. <sup>12</sup>Truly, truly I say to you, the one believing into my works, that one will do that which I do and will do greater things than these, because I go towards the Father; <sup>13</sup>and whatever you may ask in my name this I will do so that the Father may be glorified in the Son. <sup>14</sup>Whatever you may ask in my name I will do. <sup>15</sup>If you love me, keep my commands; <sup>16</sup>And I will ask the Father and another paraclete he will give to you so that he may be with you into the ages, <sup>17</sup>the spirit of truth whom the world is not able to receive, because it does not perceive (it) not knows (it) you will know it because it abides<sup>xxxv</sup> with you and is in you. <sup>18</sup>I will not leave you parentless, I come towards you <sup>19</sup>For a short while and the world perceives me no longer, but you perceive me because I live and you will live. <sup>20</sup>In that day you will know that I am in my Father and you are in me and I in you. <sup>21</sup>The one having my commands and keeping them, this is the one who loves me; and the one loving me will be loved by my Father, and I will love them and I will disclose myself to them.” <sup>22</sup>Judas said to him, not Iscariot, “Lord, how is it that you intend to disclose yourself to us and not to the world?” <sup>23</sup>Jesus answered and said to him, “Whoever loves me will keep my word, and my Father will love them and will come toward them and will make a abiding place with him. <sup>24</sup>The one not loving me does not keep my words; and the word which you hear is not mine but of the Father who sent me. <sup>25</sup>These things I have spoken to you while abiding with you; <sup>26</sup>but the paraclete, the holy spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, that one will teach you all things and he will cause you to remember all things which I have said to you. <sup>27</sup>I leave peace with you, I give you my peace; not as the world gives, I give to you. Do not let your hearts be troubled nor afraid. <sup>28</sup>You heard that I said to you, ‘I go and I come towards you.’ If you loved me you would rejoice because I go towards the Father, because the Father is greater than me. <sup>29</sup>And now I have told you before it happens, so that whenever it happens you may believe. <sup>30</sup>I will no longer speak many things with you, for the ruler of the world comes; and in me he has nothing, <sup>31</sup>but in order that the world may know that I love the Father even as the Father has commanded me, so I do. Rise, let us go from here.”

15 “I am the true vine and my Father is the vinedresser. <sup>2</sup>Every branch in me that does not produce fruit he lifts, and every one that does produce fruit he cleans that it may produce more fruit. <sup>3</sup>Already you are clean through the word which I have spoken to you; <sup>4</sup>abide in me and I in you. Even as the branch is not able to produce fruit from itself unless it abides in the vine, so you, unless you abide in me. <sup>5</sup>I am the vine, you are the branches. The one abiding in me and I in them, this one produces much fruit, because apart from me you are not able to do anything. <sup>6</sup>Whoever among you does not abide in me, is thrown out as the branch and becomes dried up and they are gathered together and thrown into the fire and are burnt. <sup>7</sup>If you abide in me and my words abide in you, ask whatever you wish and it will happen for you. <sup>8</sup>In this my Father is glorified, so that

---

35. The text reads  $\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota$  which is the present tense of the verb, given the accent, this is supported by B<sup>2</sup>;  $\mu\epsilon\vee\epsilon\iota$  which is the future tense and is supported by pc; vg; sa; ac<sup>2</sup>; pbo. Another alternative reading is  $\mu\epsilon\vee\epsilon\iota$  without any accents and this is supported by P<sup>66,75</sup>;  $\aleph$ ; A; B\*; D; L; Q; W;  $\Delta$ ;  $\Theta$ ;  $\Psi$ . This reading has by far the better attestation from the external evidence. And from an internal point of view is also to be feared as it maintains the ambiguity of whether it should be future or present. It would be more likely for a scribe to add accents than to take them away, and the future is more likely to be changed from the present due to the delay in the parousia. For these reasons I prefer alternate three, but have left the translation using the present tense as English will not allow the absence of a tense for a verb.

you may produce much fruit and you may be<sup>xxxvi</sup> my disciples. <sup>9</sup>Even as the Father loved me, and I loved you; abide in my love. <sup>10</sup>If you keep my commands you will abide in my love even as I have kept the commands of my Father and abide in his love. <sup>11</sup>These things I have spoken to you in order that my joy may be in you and your joy may be complete. <sup>12</sup>My command is this, that you love one another even as I loved you. <sup>13</sup>No one has greater love than this, that they place their life on behalf of their friends. <sup>14</sup>You are my friends if you do that which I have commanded you. <sup>15</sup>I no longer speak to you as slaves, because a slave does not know what his Master does; I have spoken to you as friends because all that I heard from my Father I made known to you. <sup>16</sup>You did not call me out, but I called you out and placed you that you may go and produce fruit and your fruit may abide so that<sup>xxxvii</sup> whatever you ask the Father in my name he may give you. <sup>17</sup>These things I have commanded you so that you may love one another. <sup>18</sup>If the world hates you know that it has hated me first. <sup>19</sup>If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I have called you out of the world, through this the world hates you. <sup>20</sup>Remember the word which I spoke to you, 'A servant is not greater than his Master.' If they pursued me and they will pursue you; if they kept my word and they will keep yours. <sup>21</sup>But they will do all these things to you because of my name, because they do not know the one who sent me. <sup>22</sup>If I did not come and speak to them they would not have sin but now they have no excuse concerning their sin. <sup>23</sup>The one hating me and hates my Father. <sup>24</sup>If I did not do the works among them which no other person did, they would not have sin' but now they have seen and have hated me and my Father. <sup>25</sup>But that the word may be fulfilled which is written in their law, '*They hated me without reason.*' <sup>26</sup>Whenever the paraclete comes which I will send to you from the Father, the spirit of truth whom comes out from the Father, that one will testify concerning me; <sup>27</sup>and you testify that from the beginning you were with me."

---

36. The textual support for the reading in the text (γενησθε = present tense, Middle voice, similar translation to the active voice) is well attested. The apparent reading of P<sup>66</sup>; and the other manuscripts B; D; L; Θ; 0250; 1; 565 *al.* all support this reading. However, because P<sup>66</sup> is only an apparent reading, and one cannot be sure, it lends weight to the textual variant, which also has good textual evidence. The textual variant (γενησεσθε = Future tense, Middle voice) provides a slightly more difficult translation (You will be my disciples). The evidence, Ν; Α; Ψ; f<sup>3</sup>; M; is good but not conclusive. The fact that Nestle-Aland chose the alternative reading in its previous edition, and now has given this reading, also lends weight to the alternative. The difference in tense may have been brought about by a later scribe changing the present tense, and so the implied present reality of salvation, into the future tense, and implied future reality of salvation. This seems to be more likely than changing the other way around. On the weight of this evidence I will keep the textual reading of the present tense.

37. At this point there are numerous variants in the text. The first variant inserts a και instead of the ινα of the text. This is supported by f<sup>3</sup> and l, taking away the indefiniteness of the 'so that' and replacing it with the definite 'and'. The second variant omits the ινα, this is supported by Ν\*, this removes any conjunction between the phrases. Part two of the second variant has the inclusion of the ινα but the changing of the last two words of the phrase to read δωσει υμιν. This is supported by Ν\*; Θ; 892\*; *al.* This takes what ever indefiniteness may have caused at the beginning of the phrase and removes it by the definite future at the end. And the final variant has a lengthy insertion, τουτο ποιησω, ινα δοξασθη ο πατηρ εν τω υιω and is supported by f<sup>3</sup>. This phrase echoes 14:13, and the insertion could be a repetition of this. The external evidence supports the reading of the text, and the scarcity of evidence for variants one and three, remove them from consideration. But the changing of the subjunctive δω to the future δωσει reveals again the desire to make a present indefiniteness into a future definiteness. On internal grounds I favour the textual reading.



16 "I have said these things to you in order that you do not take offense<sup>xxxviii</sup>. 2 They will separate you from the synagogues; but the hour comes that all who kill you will think to be carrying a service to God. 3 And these things they will do because they did not know the Father or me. 4 But I have spoken these things to you so that whenever their hour comes you may remember them because I spoke to you. I did not tell these things to you out of the beginning because I was with you. 5 But now I go towards the one who sent me, and no one out of you has asked me, "Where do you go?" 6 but because I have spoken these things to you pain has filled your hearts. 7 But I speak the truth to you it is better for you that I go. For if I do not go the paraclete will not come towards you; but if I go, I will send him towards you. 8 And coming that one will convict the world concerning sin and concerning righteousness and concerning judgement; 9 concerning sin, because they did not believe into me; 10 concerning righteousness, because I go towards the Father and they do not perceive me; 11 concerning judgement, because the ruler of this world is judged. 12 I have many things still to tell you, but you are not able to support them now; 13 whenever that one comes, the spirit of truth, he will lead you into all truth for he will not speak from himself but whatever he hears he will speak and he will announce to you the things coming. 14 That one will glorify me, because he will take out of mine and announce it to you. 15 All things whatsoever the Father has are mine; because of this I said that he will take out of mine and announce to you. 16 A short time and you no longer perceive me, and a short time again you will see me." 17 Then some out of his disciples said towards one another, "What is this which he said to us, 'A short time and you do not perceive me, and again a short time and you will see me.' and 'I go to the Father?'" 18 Then they said, "What is this which he said, 'A short time?' We do not know what he said." 19 Jesus knowing that they wished to ask him, and he said to them, "Concerning this you seek with one another because I said, 'A short time and you do not perceive me and again a short time and you will see me(?)' 20 Truly, truly I say to you that you will weep and you will sing a dirge, but the world will rejoice; you will be in pain but your pain will become joy. 21 Whenever a woman has the pain with childbirth, because her hour has come; but whenever she gives birth to a child, she no longer remembers the tribulation because of the joy that a human being has been born in to the world. 22 And you then now have pain; but I will again see you and you hearts will rejoice and no one lifts up from you your joy. 23 And in that day you will ask nothing from me. Truly, truly I say to you whatever you may ask the Father in my name he will give you. 24 Until now you have not asked anything in my name; ask and you will receive in order that your joy may be complete. 25 These things I have spoken to you in common sayings, the hour comes when I will no longer speak to you in common sayings, but I will announce to you openly concerning the Father. 26 In that day you will ask in my name, and I do not tell you that I will ask the Father concerning you; 27 for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came out of God. 28 I came out of the Father, and I have come into the world; again I leave the world and I go towards the Father." 29 His disciples say, "See now you speak openly and you no longer speak with common sayings. 30 Now we know that you know all things and you have no need that anyone ask you; we believe in this, that you have come from God." 31 Jesus answered them, "You believe now (?) 32 See the hour comes and has come in order that you will be scattered each one into their own and you will leave me alone; and I am not alone, because the Father is with me. 33 I have said these things to you in order that in me you may have peace. You have in the world tribulation; but be of good courage, I have defeated the world."

---

38. The active form of this verb is translated "to make to offence". The passive form is translated "to take offence."

17 Jesus, having said these things and lifting up his eyes to the heaven said, "Father, the hour has come, glorify your Son so that the Son may glorify you. <sup>2</sup>Even as you gave to him authority (over) all flesh; so that all whom you have given to him he may give to them life eternal. <sup>3</sup>And life eternal is this, that they may know you the only true God and the one you sent, Jesus, The Anointed One. <sup>4</sup>I glorify you on earth having completed the work which you have given me that I may do; <sup>5</sup>and now Father glorify me with the glory I had being with you before the world came to be. <sup>6</sup>I revealed your name to humanity whom you gave to me out of the world. They were yours and you gave them to me and they have kept your word. <sup>7</sup>Now they know that all whatever you have given to me is from you; <sup>8</sup>that the words which you gave to me I have given to them, and they took it and they know truly that I came out from you, and they believe that you sent me. <sup>9</sup>I ask concerning them, not concerning the world I ask, but concerning those whom you have given to me, because they are yours, <sup>10</sup>and all my things are yours and your things mine, and I have been glorified in them. <sup>11</sup>And I am no longer in the world, and they are in the world, and I come towards you. Holy Father keep them in your name which you have given to me, so that they may be one even as we. <sup>12</sup>When I was with them I kept them in your name which you have given to me, and I guarded, and no one out of them is perished except the son of perishment that the writing may be completed. <sup>13</sup>And now I come towards you and I speak these things into the world so that they may have my joy being completed in them. <sup>14</sup>I have given to them your word and the world hated them because they are not of the world even as I am not of the world. <sup>15</sup>I do not ask in order that you may lift them out of the world but that you may keep them out of grievousness. <sup>16</sup>They are not of the world even as I am not of the world<sup>xxxix17</sup> Holify them in the truth; your word is true. <sup>18</sup>Even as you sent me into the world and I sent them into the world;<sup>19</sup> and about them I holify myself in order that they also may be holy in truth. <sup>20</sup>But not concerning these do I pray only, but also concerning those believing into me through their word, <sup>21</sup>that they may all be one, even as you Father, are one with me and I in you, so that they also may be in us, that the world may believe that you sent me. <sup>22</sup>And I have given the glory which you have given to me, to them, so that they may be one even as we are one; <sup>23</sup>I in them and you in me, so that they may be completely into one that the world may know that you sent me and you loved them even as you love me. <sup>24</sup>Father, I wish, that those you have given to me, that where I am they also may be with me, so that they may perceive my glory which you have given to me because you loved me before the laying down of the world. <sup>25</sup>Righteous Father, even the world did not know you, but I have known you and they have known that you sent me. <sup>26</sup>And I made known to them your name and I will make known that the love with which you loved me may be in them and I in them."

---

39. I have linked this textual problem with the omission in verse 14. In verse 14 the phrase καθὼς ἔγω οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου is omitted by P<sup>66</sup>; D; f<sup>3</sup>; pc; it; sy<sup>s</sup>. And included by the constant witnesses. In verse 16 we have a similar problem. The phrase ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσὶν καθὼς ἔγω οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου is omitted by P<sup>66</sup>; 33; pc; bo<sup>ms</sup>. And included by the constant witnesses. For those witnesses that are common to the two verses, the omission can be explained by the fact that it was left out for the sake of continuity. For D, the inclusion of the phrase in v16 could be explained by saying that there was no need to repeat the same phrase within two verses of each other. On internal grounds, I think that the text presents a harder reading in this case as the alternatives try to deny the earthly aspect of Jesus. I maintain the textual reading.



18 Saying these things Jesus went out with his disciples across the winter-flowing Kidron where there was a garden into which he and his disciples came. <sup>2</sup>And Judas the one handing him over also knew the place, because often Jesus gathered there with his disciples. <sup>3</sup>Then Judas taking the cohort and attendants of the chief-priests and of the Pharisees he came there with lights and lamps and weapons. <sup>4</sup>Then Jesus knowing all that was coming to him, went out and said to them, "Who do you seek?" <sup>5</sup>They answered him, "Jesus the Nazarene." He said to them, "I am (he)." And Judas the one handing him over was standing with them. <sup>6</sup>Then when he said to them, "I am (he)." they went behind and fell to the ground. <sup>7</sup>Then again he asked them, "Who do you seek?" And they said, "Jesus the Nazarene." <sup>8</sup>Jesus answered, "I told you that I am (he). If then you seek me, leave these ones to go." <sup>9</sup>In order that the word which he had said may be fulfilled, "Those you have given to me, I destroyed not any of them." <sup>10</sup>Then Simon Peter having a short sword drew it and he struck the slave of the high priest and cut off his right ear; and the name of the slave was Malchus. <sup>11</sup>Then Jesus said to Peter, "Put the short sword into the sheath; the cup which my Father has given to me shall I not drink it (?)" <sup>12</sup>Then the cohort and the captain and the attendants of there Judeans took Jesus and bound him, <sup>13</sup>and led him first towards Annas; for he was the father in law of Caiaphas who was the high priest that year. <sup>14</sup>And it was Caiaphas the one counselling the Judeans that it was expedient that one human being die on behalf of the people. <sup>15</sup>Simon Peter followed Jesus and another disciple. And that disciple was known to the chief-priest and he entered with Jesus into the courtyard of the chief-priest. <sup>16</sup>But Peter stood before the door, outside. Then the disciple, the one who was known by the chief-priest entered and spoke to the doorkeeper and led Peter in. <sup>17</sup>Then the maid keeping the door said to Peter, "Are you not one of the disciple of this human being?" That one said, "I am not." <sup>18</sup>And the slaves and attendants having made a charcoal fire were standing because it was cold, and they were warming themselves; and Peter also was with them standing and warming himself. <sup>19</sup>Then the chief-priest asked Jesus concerning his disciples and concerning his teaching. <sup>20</sup>Jesus answered him, "I have spoken openly to the world, I have always taught in the synagogues and in the temple, where all the Judeans gather, and in secret I have said nothing. <sup>21</sup>Why do you ask me? Ask those who have heard what I have said. See they know what I said." <sup>22</sup>When he said these things one of the attendants standing near gave Jesus a slap saying, "In this way you answer the chief-priest (?)" <sup>23</sup>Jesus answered him, "If I have spoken wrongly testify concerning this wrong; but if well, why do you thrash me?" <sup>24</sup>Then Annas sent him being bound towards Caiaphas the chief-priest. <sup>25</sup>And Simon Peter was standing and warming himself. He/they said to him, "Surely you are one of his disciples?" He denied that and said, "I am not." <sup>26</sup>One of the slaves of the chief-priest, being a relative of the one whose ear Peter cut off said, "Did I not see you in the garden with him?" <sup>27</sup>Again Peter denied it and at once the cock called. <sup>28</sup>Then they led Jesus from Caiaphas into the praetorium; and it was early; and they did not enter into the praetorium so that they may not be polluted but may eat the Passover. <sup>29</sup>The Pilate came out towards them and said, "What denouncement do you carry against this human being?" <sup>30</sup>They answered and said to him, "If this one was not doing evil, we would not have handed him over to you." <sup>31</sup>Then Pilate said to them, "You take him and judge him according to your law." The Judeans said to him, "It is not lawful for us to kill anyone." <sup>32</sup>That the word of Jesus which he said may be fulfilled showing with what death he intended to die. <sup>33</sup>Then Pilate entered again the praetorium and called Jesus and said to him, "You are the ruler of the Judeans (?)" <sup>34</sup>Jesus answered, "You say this from yourself, or others told you concerning me (?)" <sup>35</sup>Pilate answered, "Am I a Judean? Your own nation and chief-priests have handed you over to me; what have you done?" <sup>36</sup>Jesus answered, "My realm is not of this world, If my realm was of this world, my attendants would struggle that I may not be handed over to the Judeans; but now my realm is not here." <sup>37</sup>Then Pilate said to him, "Are you

not a ruler then?" Jesus answered, "You say that I am a ruler, I have been born into this and into this I have come into the world, so that I may testify to the truth; all who are of the truth hear my sound." <sup>38</sup>Pilate said to him, "What is truth?" And saying this he again went out towards the Judeans and said to them, "I find in him nothing wrong." <sup>39</sup>But it is accustomed for you in order that I may release to you one person in the Passover. Do you council that I should release to you the king of the Judeans?" <sup>40</sup>They cried out again saying, "Not this one but Barabbas." Barabbas was a bandit.

19 Then Pilate took Jesus and whipped him. <sup>2</sup>And the soldiers plaiting a crown out of thorns placed it on his head and they threw around him a purple garment <sup>3</sup>and when they came towards him they said, "Hail ruler of the Judeans." And they gave him slaps. <sup>4</sup>And again Pilate went out and said to them, "See, I lead him out to you, that you may know that I find nothing wrong in him." <sup>5</sup>Then Jesus came out bearing the thorn crown and the purple garment. And he said to them, "See the Human Being." <sup>6</sup>Then when the chief-priests and the attendants saw him they cried out saying, "Crucify (him), crucify (him)." Pilate said to them, "You take him and crucify him; for I find in him nothing wrong." <sup>7</sup>The Judeans answered him, "We have a law and according to the law he ought to die because he made himself the Son of God." <sup>8</sup>Then when Pilate heard this word, he was more afraid, <sup>9</sup>and he entered into the praetorium again and said to Jesus, "From where are you?" But Jesus gave him no answer. <sup>10</sup>The Pilate said to him, "You do not speak to me (?) Do you not know that I have authority to release you and I have authority to crucify you?" <sup>11</sup>Jesus answered him, "You would have no authority over me except it has been given to you from above; because of this the one handing me over to you has the greater sin." <sup>12</sup>Out of this Pilate sought to release him, but the Judeans cried out saying, "If you release this one, you are not a friend of Caesar, everyone making themselves a king speaks against Caesar." <sup>13</sup>Then Pilate when he heard these words led Jesus out and sat<sup>xl</sup> (him) on a raised place being called The Stone Place, in Hebrew, Gabbatha. <sup>14</sup>And it was the preparation of the Passover, it was about the sixth hour. And he said to the Judeans, "See your ruler." <sup>15</sup>Then they cried out, "Lift up, lift up<sup>xl1</sup>, crucify him." Pilate said to them, "I will crucify your ruler(?)" The chief-priests answered, "We have no king except Caesar." <sup>16</sup>Then he handed him to them that he may be crucified. Then they/he took Jesus <sup>17</sup>and bearing his own cross he went out into that being called The Place of the Skull, which is called in Hebrew, Golgotha, <sup>18</sup>there they crucified him, and with him two others one on each side, and Jesus in the middle. <sup>19</sup>And Pilate wrote an inscription and placed it on the cross, and it read, "Jesus the Nazarene the King of the Judeans." <sup>20</sup>Then many of the Judeans read this inscription, because the place was near the city where Jesus was crucified; and it was written in Hebrew, Latin, Greek. <sup>21</sup>Then the chief-priests of the Judeans said to Pilate, "Don't write, 'The King of the Judeans.' but that he said, 'I am the king of the Judeans.'" <sup>22</sup>Pilate answered, "What have written, I have written." <sup>23</sup>Then the soldiers when they had crucified Jesus took his garments and made four parts, a part for each soldier, and the tunic. But the tunic was seamless woven from the top through out. <sup>24</sup>Then they said towards one another, "Let us not tear it but casting lots concerning it, it will be someone's." In order that the writing may be fulfilled which said, "*They parted my garments among them, and against my clothing they threw a lot.*" Then the soldiers

---

40. Either Pilate sat (In-transitive verb) or Pilate sat Jesus on the pavement (transitive verb)

41. ἄρῳν is the imperative of ἄρῳ and as mentioned previously the ambiguous meaning of ἄρῳ is important. The Judeans crying out, "lift up, lift" are at the same time crying, "Glorify him, glorify him" which is the appropriate response to greet their ruler. The hour of Jesus' glory is the hour of his crucifixion.

did these things. <sup>25</sup>And standing by the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother's sister Mary the one of Klopas and Mary Magdalene. <sup>26</sup>Then Jesus seeing his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing near, he said to his mother, "Woman see you son." <sup>27</sup>Then he said to the disciple, "See your mother." And from that hour the disciple took her into his own. <sup>28</sup>After this Jesus knowing that he had already completed all things so that the writing may be completed said, I thirst." <sup>29</sup>There was a vessel filled with poor wine then placing a sponge filled with poor wine on hyssop they forced it to his mouth. <sup>30</sup>Then when he took the poor wine Jesus said, "It is finished." And he inclined his head and handed over his spirit. <sup>31</sup>Then the Judeans, since it was preparation (day), so that the bodies did not abide on the cross on the Sabbath, for it was a great day of the Sabbath, asked Pilate that they break the legs and that they may remove them; <sup>32</sup>Then the soldiers came and broke the legs of the first one and the other one of those crucified with him; <sup>33</sup>But coming to Jesus, they saw he had already died, they did not break his legs, <sup>34</sup>but one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear and at once blood and water came out. <sup>35</sup>And the one seeing testified, and his testimony is true, and that one knows that he speaks the truth so that you may believe. <sup>36</sup>For these things happened in order that the writing may be fulfilled, "*They will crush no bone of his,*" <sup>37</sup>And again another writing said, "*They will look upon the one they have stabbed.*" <sup>38</sup>After these things Joseph from Arimathea asked Pilate, being a disciple of Jesus secretly through fear of the Judeans, that he may lift up the body of Jesus, and Pilate turned (it) over. Then he came and lifted up his body. <sup>39</sup>And Nicodemus also came, who came towards him by night first, carrying a mixture of myrrh and aloes about a hundred measures. <sup>40</sup>Then they took the body of Jesus and bound it with grave clothes with sweet herbs, even as it is the custom with the Judeans to burry. <sup>41</sup>And in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new tomb in which no one was ever placed. <sup>42</sup>Then because it was the preparation of the Judeans, because the tomb was close they placed Jesus there.

20 And on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene comes, early being still dark to the tomb, and she sees the stone being lifted up from the tomb. <sup>2</sup>Then she runs and comes towards Simon Peter and towards the other disciple whom Jesus loved and said to them, "They have lifted up the Lord out of the tomb and we don't know where they have placed him." <sup>3</sup>The Peter came out and the other disciple and they went towards the tomb. <sup>4</sup>And the two of them ran; and the other disciple ran quickly before Peter and came first to the tomb, <sup>5</sup>and bending he saw the grave clothes lying, but he did not enter. <sup>6</sup>The Simon Peter comes following him and entered the tomb, and he perceives the grave clothes lying, <sup>7</sup>and the cloth which was on his head, not lying with the grave clothes but apart having been twisted up into one place. <sup>8</sup>Then the other disciple, the one coming first to the tomb, entered and he saw and he believed; <sup>9</sup>for they did not know the writing that it was necessary for him to rise out of the dead. <sup>10</sup>Then the disciples went back towards theirs. <sup>11</sup>But Mary stood outside the tomb weeping. Then as she wept she bent into the tomb <sup>12</sup>and perceived two angels in white sitting one towards the head and one towards the feet, where the body of Jesus was placed. <sup>13</sup>And they say to her, "Woman, why do you weep?" She said to them, "They have lifted up my Lord and I do not know where they have placed him." <sup>14</sup>Saying these things she turned behind, and she perceives Jesus standing and she does not know that it is Jesus. <sup>15</sup>Jesus said to her, "Woman, why do you weep, whom do you seek?" That one thinking that he is the gardener said to him, "Sir if you carried him, tell me where you placed him, and I will lift him." <sup>16</sup>Jesus said to her, "Mary." That one turning said to him in Hebrew, "Rabboni" - which said Teacher -. <sup>17</sup>Jesus said to her, "Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended towards the Father,

go towards my friends<sup>xiv</sup> and tell them, 'I ascend towards my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.'" <sup>18</sup>Mary Magdalene went announcing to the disciples that she had seen the Lord and he said these things to her. <sup>19</sup>Being late that day, the first of the week and the doors having been shut where the disciples were through fear of the Judeans, Jesus came and stood in their midst and said to them, "Peace to you." <sup>20</sup>And saying this he displayed to them the hands and his side. Then the disciples rejoiced seeing the Lord. <sup>21</sup>Then Jesus said to them again, "Peace to you, even as the Father sent me, I send you." <sup>22</sup>And saying this he blew and said to them, "Take the holy spirit, <sup>23</sup>whose sins you release they are released, whose you take hold of they are taken hold of." <sup>24</sup>But Thomas one of the twelve, being called Didymus was not with them when Jesus came. <sup>25</sup>Then the other disciples said to him, "We have seen the Lord." But he said to them, "Unless I see in his hands the effect of the nails and put my finger into the mark of the nails and put my hand into his side, I will not believe." <sup>26</sup>Eight days after this his disciples were again inside and Thomas with them. Jesus comes, the doors having been shut, and stands in their midst and said, "Peace to you." <sup>27</sup>Then he said to Thomas, "Place your finger here and see my hands and place your hand and touch into my side, and do not be without belief but believe." <sup>28</sup>Thomas answered and said to him, "My Lord and my God." <sup>29</sup>Jesus said to him, "Because you have seen me you have believed (?) Happy those not seeing and (yet) believing." <sup>30</sup>Jesus did many and other signs before his disciple which have not been written in this book. <sup>31</sup>But these things have been written in order that you may believe that Jesus is the Anointed One the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name.

**21** After this Jesus displayed himself again to the disciples by the sea of Tiberias; he displayed himself so: <sup>2</sup>Simon Peter and Thomas, being called Didymus, and Nathanael from Cana of Galilee and the sons of Zebedee and the two other disciples were there. <sup>3</sup>Simon Peter said to them, "I go to fish." They say to him, "We also come with you." They went and embarked in a boat, and that night they laid their hands on nothing. <sup>4</sup>As it was becoming early, Jesus stood on the beach, but the disciples did not know that it was Jesus. <sup>5</sup>Jesus said to them, "Children do you have anything to eat?" They answered him, "No." <sup>6</sup>Then he said to them, "Throw the net onto the right side of the boat and you will find." Then they threw, and they were not strong enough to drag it from the fullness of the fish. <sup>7</sup>Then the disciple whom Jesus loved said to Peter, "It is the Lord." Then Simon Peter when he heard that it is the Lord put his clothes on, for he was naked, and threw himself into the sea, <sup>8</sup>and the other disciples came by boat, for they were not far from the land but about two hundred cubits, bringing with the net of fish. <sup>9</sup>Then when they disembarked onto the land, they saw a charcoal fire there and fish having been placed on it and bread. <sup>10</sup>Jesus said to them, "Fetch from the fish which you have caught now." <sup>11</sup>Then Simon Peter went up and dragged the net onto the land full of large fish, one hundred and fifty three; and being so many the net did not break. <sup>12</sup>Jesus said to them, "Come, eat breakfast." Not one of the disciples dared to question him, "Who are you?" knowing that he is the Lord. <sup>13</sup>Jesus came and he takes bread and he gave it to them and likewise the fish. <sup>14</sup>This was the third time Jesus displayed himself to the disciples, being raised out of the dead. <sup>15</sup>Then when they had eaten breakfast Jesus said to Simon Peter, "Simon, son of John, you love me more than these (?)" He said, "Yes Lord, you know that I love you." He said to him, "Feed my lambs." <sup>16</sup>He said to him again, a second time, "Simon son of John you love me (?)" He said to him, "Yes Lord, you know that I love you." He said to him,

---

42. ἀδελφούς - this is the first appearance of this word in the text referring to the disciples. Normally it would be translated as brother. I have kept to an inclusive translation of "friends". It does appear with reference to the family of Lazarus and his two sisters.

“Shepherd my sheep.”<sup>17</sup> He said to him a third time, “Simon son of John, you love me (?)” Peter being pained because he asked him a third time, “You love me (?)” and he said to him, “Lord, you know all things, you know that I love you.” Jesus said to him, “Feed my sheep”<sup>xliii</sup>.<sup>18</sup> Truly, truly I say to you, when you were young you clothed yourself and walked where you wished, when you are old, you stretch out your hand and another will clothe you and will carry you where you do not wish.”<sup>19</sup> This he said showing by what death he would glorify God. And saying this he said to him, “Follow me.”<sup>20</sup> Peter turned and he saw the disciple who Jesus loved following, who had fallen onto his breast at the supper and said, “Lord, who is the one handing you over?”<sup>21</sup> Then seeing this one Peter said to Jesus, “Lord what about this one?”<sup>22</sup> Jesus said to him, “If I wish for him to abide until I come, how does it concern you? You follow me.”<sup>23</sup> Then this word went to the friends that that disciple would not die, but Jesus did not say to him that he would not die, but, “If I wish for him to abide until I come, what is it to you?”<sup>24</sup> This is the disciple, the one testifying concerning these things and the one writing these things, and we know that his testimony is true.<sup>25</sup> And there are many other things which Jesus did, if each one were written I don’t think the world itself would make room for the books being written.

7:53-8:11.

<sup>53</sup> And they went each one into their house.

**8** And Jesus went into the mount of Olives.<sup>2</sup> And at daybreak again he was into the temple and all the people came towards him, and sitting he taught them.<sup>3</sup> And the scribes and the Pharisees led a woman having been caught in adultery and standing her in the middle<sup>4</sup> they said to him, “Teacher, this woman has been caught in the act of committing adultery; <sup>5</sup>in the law Moses commanded us to stone such as these. You then, what do you say? <sup>6</sup>This they said testing him in order that they may have to denounce him (with). But Jesus bent down he wrote with a finger into the earth.<sup>7</sup> But they remained asking him, and he bent up and said to them, “The one without sin among you first throw the stone against her.”<sup>8</sup> And again he bent down he wrote in the ground.<sup>9</sup> But those hearing, leaving one by one, starting from the eldest and being left alone and the woman being in the middle.<sup>10</sup> And Jesus bent up said to her, “Woman, where are they? No one has judged/condemned you (?)”<sup>11</sup> And she said, “No one Lord/sir.” But Jesus said, “I do not judge/condemn you, go, and from now sin no longer”<sup>xxliiv</sup>

---

43. There is a textual problem here. The text reads βόσκει τὰ πρόβατά μου. The previous edition of Nestle-Aland (25th) read προβατία, which is the diminutive of πρόβατά. The textual evidence for the diminutive is scarce: A, B, C 565 *pc*. But the evidence for the text is overwhelming:  $\aleph$ , D, W,  $\Theta$ ,  $\Psi$ ,  $f^{1,13}$ , M, sy. It may be a harder reading to use the diminutive, but I think that on textual evidence, the normal rendering of πρόβατά must be kept.

44. The most ancient and authoritative texts do not include 7:53-8:11. It is generally regarded as a late second century addition. A beautiful account, but one that does not belong in the original text of the Gospel.