

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Vox Evangelica* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_vox_evangelica.php

*Kerygma in the Fourth Gospel*¹

David R. Carnegie

[p.39]

'Kerygma' is a subject that has aroused considerable interest in New Testament study during recent years. A number of writers have, from different standpoints emphasised its formative influence on the New Testament and on the Gospels in particular. After a discussion on the nature of the Kerygma, this essay will consider the extent to which it is reflected and developed in the Fourth Gospel. As has been remarked, Kerygma 'is a slippery term',² and can be understood in more than one sense. The fact that the two scholars whose work has done most to draw attention to the subject understand Kerygma in quite different ways, makes it important to ask what we mean by the term. For C. H. Dodd, Kerygma denotes the content of preaching (the 'factual' view) whereas for Rudolf Bultmann it rather denotes the act of preaching (the 'dynamic' view). An appeal to New Testament terminology is not conclusive, but it does serve as a caution against an exclusive definition either way.³

The implications of the two views differ considerably. The factual view sees the Kerygma as the testimony of actual witnesses to the acts of God in history. From the Kerygma and the Gospel of Mark of which it is an expansion it is possible to reconstruct a factual/chronological outline of the life and ministry of Jesus. The dynamic view on the other hand sees the Kerygma as proclaiming an existentialist encounter with 'the Eschatological event', and although the Kerygma has its starting point in the existence and death of Jesus, it is not in any sense a proclamation of the historical Jesus, since this would be irrelevant and contrary to its purpose.

Now there are at least three crucial points on which Bultmann's view is open to challenge, each point bearing on the all important question of the relationship of the Kerygma to history, and to the historical Jesus in particular.

In the first place it is said that the principal features of the Kerygma have their origin in the early Church (*Gemeindetheologie*) rather than in the historical life of Jesus.⁴ If this view of the origin of the Kerygma is correct, then is it an interpretation arbitrarily imposed on the original events? Many scholars feel that a study of the Gospel material does not bear out Bultmann's contention at all.⁵

¹ The use of the term 'Fourth Gospel' through this essay does not imply any denial of the Gospel's apostolic authority. If it is the case that the Gospel has strong affinities with the earliest preaching, this should enable one to affirm with greater confidence apostolic connections with it, if not authorship itself.

² J. P. M. Sweet, 'Second Thoughts VIII: The Kerygma' *Expository Times* 76 (1965) p. 147.

³ For example κήρυγμα in Rom. 16. 25 and 1 Cor. 1. 21 appears to indicate content, whereas the same word in Tit. 1. 3 seems quite definitely to refer to activity.

⁴ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* Vol. 1 (Eng.Tr.—S.C.M. 1959), pp. 3-32.

⁵ See, for example, R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 12—S.C.M. 1954). Fuller accepts Bultmann's contention that the ministry of Jesus constituted not the irruption of God's reign but rather the dawn of it, but he shows how an unbiased study of the material in Mark does not bear out his other conclusions. He goes on to show how the life of Jesus is not un-Messianic but pre-Messianic, so that what is implicit before becomes explicit afterwards. There is therefore a continuity between history and the Kerygma, and the latter is not something arbitrarily imposed.

Secondly, Bultmann as is well known, regards the Kerygma as a mythological proclamation.⁶ If this is the case then a view of the Kerygma as something primarily factual can no longer be maintained. However, Bultmann's conclusion is based on two main assumptions which may be strongly challenged. In the first place, he draws the conclusion that the Kerygma is mythological because it uses terminology that is unacceptable to modern scientific man. However as has been pointed out, Bultmann's approach is deterministic rather than scientific.⁷ Then Bultmann's view of the Kerygma as presented in 'the contemporary mythology of Jewish apocalyptic and the redemption myths of Gnosticism' has been heavily influenced by his adherence to the theories of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, and in particular the unproven hypothesis of R. Reitzenstein of the part played by the 'redeemer myth' of Iranian origin in early Christianity.⁸

[p.40]

Thirdly, we may challenge Bultmann's insistence on the irrelevance of the historical in the Kerygma. This is partly due to the influence of existentialism, particularly that of M. Heidegger.⁹ The emphasis on the moment of encounter and deprecation of seeking security in 'things', has meant a dehistoricising of the Kerygma, a modern form of Docetism. Also of relevance to Bultmann's view are the writings of M. Kahler, in whom the *historisch/geschichtlich* distinction so radically applied by Bultmann first appears.¹⁰ According to Kahler, faith in Christ is not something dependent on the uncertain results of 'historisch' research, but rather comes through spiritual encounter with the living 'geschichtlich' Christ. In Bultmann we find this same distinction, but he draws conclusions far more drastic than Kahler himself intended in that he assumes that what is *historie* cannot be *geschichte* and vice-versa. Whilst a distinction between the two may have some value in reminding us that faith cannot be wholly dependent on the findings of a historian, it is going too far to claim that faith must be independent of the historian.

Bultmann's contention of the irrelevance of the historical is not confirmed by an examination of the Kerygma of the early church as it is recorded in the New Testament.¹¹ In the Kerygma in Acts the emphasis on history is such that it seems almost impossible to sustain a view that it is irrelevant. In fact its imperative (a summons to decision) is issued on the strength of the indicative (what God has done in history). And what are we to make of the central place that the Kerygma gives to the fact of the resurrection? Nowhere is the unsatisfactory nature of Bultmann's view more evident than in his treatment of the resurrection.¹² If we accept his

⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, 'The New Testament and Mythology: The Mythological Element in the New Testament and the problem of its Re-Interpretation', *Kerygma and Myth* (Ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, Eng.Tr. by R. H. Fuller, S.P.C.K. 1954), pp. 1-44.

⁷ John Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology* (S.C.M. 1955) p. 168 criticises Bultmann for being 'still obsessed with the pseudo-scientific view of a closed universe that was popular half a century ago'.

⁸ R. Reitzenstein, *Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (1921). Hugh Anderson, *Jesus and Christian Origins* (Oxford 1964), pp. 38-52 rightly criticises the school for magnifying similarities and ignoring differences between Gnosticism and primitive Christianity.

⁹ M. Heidegger, *Sein and Zeit* (1927).

¹⁰ M. Kahler, *Der Sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche Biblische Christus* (Leipzig 1892).

¹¹ On this cleavage see the comments of Alan Richardson, *The Bible in the Age of Science* (S.C.M. 1961), pp. 111-112.

¹² R. Bultmann, 'A Reply to the Theses of J. Schniewind' *Kerygma and Myth*, 1, p. 112 says, 'I cannot accept 1 Cor. 15. 3-8 as Kerygma. I call that line of argument fatal because it tries to adduce proof for the Kerygma.' P. Althaus, 'Fact and Faith in the Kerygma' *Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord* (Ed. C. F. Henry, Eerdmans, 1965), p. 206 comments, 'In fact Paul's line of argument is in flat contradiction with Bultmann's thesis.'

contention that all that can be assigned to '*historie*' is the bare 'loss' of the Cross, and that the resurrection is '*geschichte*' and non-historical, then the Kerygma itself becomes a riddle.

Reverting to the 'factual' view, we must now consider in what sense it may be said to be a factual proclamation. When we speak of it as 'historical' we need to clarify the term, since 'history' is an ambiguous term which can refer to a series of events or to the record of those events. The former, as Dodd has shown,¹³ does not, strictly speaking, constitute history, which consists of occurrence plus meaning to those who experienced it.¹⁴ In the case of the apostolic preaching we can speak of something factual and historical in this sense. It is a series of events plus the interpretation of the apostles, an interpretation which, it must be insisted was not the result of their guesswork or their genius, but was given by the Holy Spirit so that the message was imparted 'in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit'.¹⁵

Such a view as this not only does justice to the Biblical importance of history, but it also does justice to several features which are less satisfactorily dealt with by Bultmann. We have noted that the *historisch/geschichtlich* distinction has some value in that it reminds us that a purely historical/scientific approach to the Kerygma is not a satisfactory basis for faith. So concerned is Bultmann to stress this, that the result is a rejection of any place for the *historisch*. It is rather the case that the *geschichtlich* arises out of the *historisch*, and is in fact inseparable from it. An event is not confined to the bare occurrence but includes evaluation and there is an indissoluble unity between the two aspects. The factual view does justice to this. Then, so concerned is Bultmann to emphasise the decision aspect that he regards any appeal to history to be a stumbling-block to the true character of faith. We have seen that this can only be held by an arbitrary dis-

[p.41]

missal of the New Testament evidence to the contrary. The factual view, whilst preserving the importance of commitment, shows how this step is not hindered but aided by our enquiring as to what actually happened.

THREE MAJOR QUESTIONS

We will now examine the extent to which the primitive Kerygma has influenced the Fourth Gospel.

To prepare the way for this we must face three major questions, the first one being about the theological background of the Gospel. If, as has been alleged, it restates the Christian message in terms of Hellenism or Gnosticism then due allowance must be made for this in any comparison. If, on the other hand, we decide that the background is primarily Jewish with affinities to primitive Christianity then the Gospel may stand closer to the earliest preaching than has often been supposed.

¹³ C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (Nisbet 1938), and also more briefly in *The Bible Today* (Cambridge 1956), pp. 98ff.

¹⁴ C. H. Dodd *op. cit.*, p. 99. 'An historical event is an occurrence plus the meaning it had for some portion of the human race.'

¹⁵ 1 Cor. 2.13.

During the earlier years of the present century it was fashionable to argue that in the Fourth Gospel we have a presentation of the Gospel in terms of Hellenism.¹⁶ Although scholarship generally has tended to move away from this view, recent writers have felt that some account must be taken of Hellenistic traits,¹⁷ and so we shall look briefly at the particular systems said to have influenced the Gospel. The impact of Greek philosophy is usually said to have come to the writer indirectly, through the eclectic thought of Philo of Alexandria or the Hermetic literature.

It has been alleged that both in terminology and method the Gospel shows a dependence on Philo. As far as terminology is concerned, proper allowance must always be made for the considerable fundamental differences as well as for the similarities. For example, in the Gospel the personal and incarnate aspects of the Logos are fundamental to its whole message,¹⁸ whereas in Philo these features are not only absent but foreign to his thought.¹⁹ As far as method is concerned, a common usage of allegory has been alleged. However not only has the extent of allegory in the Fourth Gospel often been greatly overestimated, but it is often forgotten that Philo uses allegory to by-pass history in a search for the truth, whereas the Johannine method is to draw the truth out of history.

Recently attention has been drawn by C. H. Dodd to the Hermetic literature,²⁰ as a possible key to the thought background of the Gospel. Two tractates are considered by him to be of some importance. In the first, *Poimandres*, there are certain similarities of terminology, and Dodd considers that in the heavenly *Anthropos* we have a close parallel to the Johannine Son of Man. The other tractate *Peri Palingenesias* contains some parallels to what the Gospel says about the New Birth. The major problem with the Hermetic literature, however, is that it is at least a century or more later than the Gospel, and it is quite possible that it has itself been influenced by Christian sources. Although some striking verbal parallels can be shown, even these may not be held to be in any way decisive, since there is a closer linguistic affinity between the Gospel and the Septuagint than between the Gospel and the Hermetic literature.²¹ Then there are also marked differences between the Hermetic literature and the Gospel, and the supposed affinity between the *Anthropos* and the Johannine Son of Man may be challenged.²²

One does not of course deny that some similarities exist between the Gospel

[p.41]

¹⁶ E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* (Edinburgh 1906).

¹⁷ Notably C. K. Barrett and C. H. Dodd.

¹⁸ John 1. 14.

¹⁹ T. W. Manson, *On Paul and John* (*Studies in Biblical Theology* 38, S.C.M. 1963) pp. 138-141 and 149. He feels that the correspondences are due to both Philo and John drawing on the Old Testament, and notes that where Philo is indebted to Stoicism there are marked differences from John. He suggests that the affinities of the Johannine Logos are rather with the Old Testament 'Word of the Lord'. E. M. Sidebottom, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel* (S.P.C.K. 1961), pp. 26ff, likewise rejects a connection between John and Greek philosophy at this point, but feels that the affinity may be with the Memra, so that the Logos becomes the 'name bearer' of God. Both these opinions show the tendency of recent scholarship towards Jewish thought as a background for the Gospel.

²⁰ C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1963), pp. 10-53.

²¹ D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction—The Gospels and Acts* (Tyndale Press 1965), p. 296.

²² A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (S.C.M. 1961), pp. 141ff, contends against Dodd that the Johannine Son of Man derives from the teaching of Jesus which was the outcome of His meditation on the Old Testament.

and the type of thought found in Philo and the Hermetic literature. Such is not all that surprising in view of the intermingling of culture in the world of the first century, particularly if the writer had an eye for the thinking Gentile. What is quite clear though, is that as far as the facts of the Gospel are concerned his thought is not Hellenistic, in fact he significantly and frequently diverges from it. We may thus confidently affirm that the Fourth Gospel is not a surrender of the Kerygma to Hellenism.²³

It has also been contended that Gnosticism underlies the Fourth Gospel. The most influential such theory is that advocated by Continental scholars who understand 'Gnosticism' in a broad sense to refer to a pre-Christian syncretistic tradition, the salient feature of which is the myth of the redeemed Redeemer. It is on this basis that Reitzenstein²⁴ and more recently Bultmann²⁵ have attempted to find in Mandaeism a background to Johannine thought. According to Bultmann the distinctive theology of the Fourth Gospel is a revision of the myth current in Mandaeism. One of the most important of the four principal literary sources of the Gospel, the revelation discourses (*Offenbarungsreden*) originally in Aramaic, is derived from Gnostic sources hence the Gospel's presentation of Jesus in terms of the Gnostic Redeemer myth.²⁶

If this were the case our view of the Johannine message would be profoundly affected, but the whole thesis is open to strong challenge, chiefly on the grounds of lack of evidence. Many scholars are convinced that Mandaeism cannot be traced back beyond A.D. 400, so that the parallels are more readily explained by Christian influence than vice-versa. There is in fact no indisputably pre-Christian evidence for the circulation of a Redeemer myth of this type, and even if there were it would be difficult to explain why, if the Gospel is dependent on it, its idea of redemption should be so totally different from the Gnostic idea.

It remains to consider Gnosticism in the narrower sense, i.e. the heresies that threatened the church during the second century, which are described by the early fathers and upon which light has been thrown by the Nag Hammadi discoveries. C. K. Barrett²⁷ notes a certain similarity of language between the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth, but also at a deeper level some striking differences. He argues for a pre-Johannine Gnosticism which influenced the Gospel writer, possibly in his attempt 'to camouflage anti-Gnostic thought in Gnostic language so as to deceive the deceived and win back captives from the devil's snare'.²⁸ Whatever similarities there may be on the surface, it remains a fact that the Johannine thought is fundamentally anti-Gnostic, and the key to Johannine theology must be sought elsewhere.

In spite of certain resemblances between the Gospel and Hellenism or Gnosticism, it is in fact with the Old Testament that, at point after point, its fundamental affinity is to be seen. This

²³ F. V. Filson, *The New Testament against its Environment* (Studies in Biblical Theology 3, S.C.M. 1950), p. 32 comments, 'The author looks to a wider public and horizon than the Jewish world, but he has no intention of abandoning the Jewish heritage or surrendering to the Gentile world.'

²⁴ R. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* and *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grosse und die Evangelienüberlieferung* (1919).

²⁵ R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Meyer: Kritische exegetischer Kommentar Gottingen 1950).

²⁶ R. Bultmann, *The Theology of the New Testament* Vol 2 (Eng.Tr. S.C.M. 1958), pp. 10-14.

²⁷ C. K. Barrett, 'The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and of the Gospel of Truth', *Current Issues in New Testament Study* (Ed. Klassen and Snyder, S.C.M. 1962), pp. 210-223.

²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 223.

has long been acknowledged by many, and as Westcott has said, 'Without the basis of the Old Testament... the Gospel of John is an insoluble riddle'.²⁹

The influence of the Old Testament is clearly seen in the imagery of the Gospel. Its leading themes are all drawn from it. Life is an Old Testament figure, likewise Glory (1. 14 cf Ex. 40. 34) and Light (8. 12 cf Ps. 27. 1).

Again one constantly finds the imagery of the Old Testament in the Gospel. The Lamb of God (1. 29) recalls Gen. 22. 8, Ex. 12. 21ff and Is. 53. 7, the Serpent (3. 14) recalls Num. 21. 19, Water (4. 10 and 7. 38) recalls Jer. 2. 13 and the 'Bread'

[p.43]

in 6. 32 is presented against the background of the manna in the wilderness. Again, the vine of Chapter 15 is suggestive of such passages as Is. 5. 1-7 and Jer. 2. 21, whilst the Shepherd passage of Chapter 10 recalls Ezek. 34.

Further, the claims of Jesus are only fully intelligible in the light of the Old Testament, and this applies particularly to the great claim of 8. 58. Again in 5. 21 and 22, the functions of judgment and life-giving have far reaching implications when it is remembered that in the Old Testament these are the supreme prerogatives of Yahweh.³⁰

Following from this, the Old Testament is used to show how Jesus is the 'Crown of everything in Judaism'.³¹ He is the true Manna, the true Light, the true Shepherd, the true Vine, the true Shekeinah (1. 14), the true Temple (2. 21). Further the great figures of the Old Testament witnessed to Him, namely, Moses (5. 46 and 47), Abraham (8. 56) and Isaiah (12. 41).

It is scarcely surprising that many have seen the Old Testament as the supreme key to this Gospel.³² Certainly it forms a very important part of its background without which it could not be understood at all.

There are many who, whilst acknowledging the Jewish influence in the Gospel³³ have felt that there is still a 'Johannine plus'—the dualism of the Gospel, for example—which must be sought elsewhere. It is at this point that the Dead Sea Scrolls have been of such value in showing that certain of the concepts making up the 'Johannine plus' are not only present in Jewish thought but present in forms closer to that of the Gospel than are found in either Hellenism or Gnosticism. It is very doubtful whether any direct link exists between the Scrolls and the Gospel. Undoubtedly there are some striking verbal similarities and a correspondence in imagery, but against these full allowance must be made for important theological

²⁹ B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (J. Murray 1887), p. lxix.

³⁰ Gen. 18. 25, Deut. 32. 39.

³¹ J. A. T. Robinson, 'The Destination and Purpose of the Fourth Gospel' *NTS* N.S. 6, 1960, p. 122.

³² For example Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961* (Oxford 1964), pp. 320ff, says, 'I have long been convinced that the central clue to the understanding of the Fourth Gospel is to be found in the Old Testament and nowhere else, and that much careful work on the use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel still remains to be done.'

³³ In addition to the Old Testament background there is also an understanding of Rabbinic Judaism at several points in the Gospel. See C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.* pp. 74-96.

differences, especially as regards the role of the Messiah.³⁴ The latter point is, of course, of considerable importance because it suggests that whilst there may be parallels of wording and imagery, its central feature, namely its portrait of Jesus is essentially the unique one of primitive Christianity and is not in any way derived from ideas current in the Qumran community. The real value of the Scrolls, therefore, is to underline the variety of ideas circulating in first century Judaism in Palestine itself, and that the 'Johannine plus' need not be sought outside it. It is thus possible to affirm with greater confidence that the Gospel is not as far from Palestine Judaism as was previously supposed.

The second major question to be faced is that of the relationship of the Gospel to history. It has already been suggested that the 'factual' understanding of the Kerygma (in the sense of occurrence plus interpretation) is to be preferred, and that the Kerygma is therefore inseparably *historie* and *geschichte*, the latter being dependent on the former. In examining the Fourth Gospel, we need to enquire whether it preserves a similar balance of fact and interpretation. If in the Gospel *historie* and *geschichte* do part company, then we must make allowance for this in our comparison.

The characteristic liberal emphasis of the early present century was on the interpretative rather than the historical character of the Gospel. In view of its differences from the so called 'factual' synoptic records and its supposed Hellenistic affinities, it was believed that the Gospel was a non historical re-presentation of the synoptic record to the thinking Gentile.

However the increasing possibility that the Gospel was written independently

[p.44]

of the Synoptics has led many to the conclusion that differences are no argument for the non-historicity of John. The idea of an independent tradition behind the Gospel originally argued for by Gardner-Smith³⁵ has been more recently developed by Dodd³⁶ who, after a thorough examination of the Gospel concludes that there is a strong possibility that a pre-canonical oral tradition formed the basis of the Gospel although the writer himself shaped this perhaps to a considerable extent. Three things may be said about this source; firstly, it shows contact with Aramaic tradition—an indication of its primitive nature. Secondly, its references to beliefs and practices current in Judaism point to a Jewish-Christian setting, and thirdly the topographical references show a knowledge of Palestine and Jerusalem prior to the rebellion in the mid-first century A.D. Dodd sums up the position thus: 'The basic tradition, therefore, on which the evangelist is working was shaped (it appears) in a Jewish-Christian environment still in touch with the synagogue, in Palestine, at a relatively early date, at any rate before the rebellion of A.D. 66.'³⁷

On account of this possibility, some earlier views on the Fourth Gospel have had to be revised. In the first place, there is an increasing respect for the historical value of the Gospel. Secondly, it is no longer so readily assumed that the distinctive theological characteristics of the Gospel are the product of the writer's inventiveness—it is recognised that they may be

³⁴ W. F. Albright, 'Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John', *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, pp. 170ff.

³⁵ P. Gardner-Smith, *St John and the Synoptics* (Cambridge 1938).

³⁶ C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1963). For a similar though shorter treatment see A. J. B. Higgins, *The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel* (Lutterworth Press 1960).

³⁷ C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.* p. 246.

part of the primitive tradition. Thirdly, the theory places a new and significant emphasis on the importance of Palestine and primitive Christianity in the formation of the Gospel. It is, of course, very difficult to measure the degree of interpretation in the Gospel, the more so now that the older solutions proposed no longer have the same validity. For example it is no longer possible to 'check' with the Synoptics, nor is it to be imagined that by removing the 'Hellenistic superstructure' or by excising 'characteristically Johannine material' that one can arrive at 'the facts'. At the same time there are certain features in the Gospel which point to an answer to this question.

In the first place, there are aspects of the Johannine account which cannot be explained on any other thesis except that the writer was a careful recorder of fact. A striking feature of the Gospel is its precision in chronology³⁸ and care in recording incidental detail.³⁹ The ingenious attempts of the past to explain such as symbolic of spiritual truth have been utterly unconvincing.⁴⁰ References to place names show a similar regard for fact, and this may be affirmed with considerable confidence since archaeology has vindicated the Gospel in a number of such details.⁴¹ It is hardly to be expected that a writer so careful on such minute points would then write with disregard for history on the larger issues.

We may therefore say that recent study enables us to affirm that both fact and interpretation are found in the Fourth Gospel, and that in his interpretation the writer has not falsified the facts. In this Gospel the facts are presented in an interpreted way. Their deep significance in bearing witness to the fact that 'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' is shown. Although there may be a greater depth of interpretation than in the earliest preaching the method is the same.

The third main question relates to the purpose of the Gospel. If we accept Dodd's definition of the Kerygma as 'the public proclamation of Christianity to the non-Christian world',⁴² to what extent can we say that the Fourth Gospel is 'Kerygmatic'? Even if we decide that the Gospel is not Kerygmatic in the

[p.45]

fullest sense, this need not rule out finding Kerygma in it, since Kerygmatic fragments do occur in the Epistles of Paul, the purpose of which are pastoral and polemic. It would mean however, that in a comparison between the Primitive Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel, due allowance would have to be made for a difference in purpose.

³⁸ In this respect the Gospel shows a greater precision than the Synoptics e.g. 1. 39, 4. 6, 4. 52, 19. 24.

³⁹ For example, 2. 6, 6. 19, 11. 44, 19. 23, 21. 8 and 11.

⁴⁰ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (S.P.C.K. 1958), p. 104 suggests however, that the incidental details may either have come from the writer's sources, or have been added by him to give verisimilitude to his work. With regard to the first suggestion, the writer's dependence on sources is open to question. With regard to the second, it is difficult to reconcile this with the solemn emphasis on 'truth' and 'witness' throughout this Gospel, as is pointed out by Leon Morris, 'The Fourth Gospel and History', *Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord*, pp. 129-130. An indifference to historical fact on the writer's part is also difficult to credit in view of his purpose to refute Docetism.

⁴¹ Leon Morris, *ibid.*, p. 128, also mentions the fact that the discovery in the Dead Sea Scrolls of a number of remarkable parallels to the Johannine picture of John the Baptist has caused a revision of the earlier assumption that these details were non-historical. He then makes the point that if the Gospel presents a historically accurate picture of John the Baptist, is it not reasonable to suppose that it would do likewise with Jesus?

⁴² C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (Hodder and Stoughton 1963), p. 7.

This issue can only be decided by reference to the Gospel as a whole.⁴³ Various suggestions have been made as to the writer's object, and it is contended here that none of these are satisfactory if understood as an exclusive aim of the Gospel, but that each such suggestion finds a place as part of the overall aim of the writer which was evangelistic. One such suggestion is that the Gospel was intended as an anti-Jewish polemic. It is true that the tone of the writer in regard to the Jews is severe, but this reflects the grief of a Jew at the obduracy of his own people and not an attitude of racial hatred. Whilst it is just possible that the Gospel was intended to encourage those facing Jewish persecution, it is suggested that it is most satisfactory in view of the form of the Gospel as a whole to see this feature as related to the writer's evangelistic purpose. Part of his appeal consists of a warning not to repeat the tragic mistake of his fellow countrymen who rejected Christ.⁴⁴

There is no doubt that the writer intended to refute Docetism, although taking the Gospel as a whole it is doubtful that this constituted his major purpose. It is rather true to say that, since Docetic ideas were an obstacle to his aim in presenting Christ, he refutes them. This too, therefore, must be seen as a means to his chief purpose which was evangelistic.⁴⁵

It has also been suggested that the object was the refutation of a Baptist sect.⁴⁶ Whilst the existence of such a sect is highly questionable, it is certainly possible that the writer seeks to correct a more general over emphasis on the role of John the Baptist, but again this is done in the interests of his chief aim, which is to present Christ. Only when John the Baptist is set in true perspective can Christ be seen in true perspective.

Finally it has been suggested that the absence of direct references to the sacraments indicate that the writer intended to correct an over stress on the sacraments as such. It is certainly possible that the writer did intend to safeguard the sacraments from such misunderstanding, but it is very much open to question whether such a polemic constitutes a main purpose of the Gospel. Incidentally it may be argued quite differently that the non-mention of the sacraments points to an evangelistic purpose for the Gospel since the writer did not wish to disclose the sacred formula to the heathen.⁴⁷

We thus see that the so called polemical aims are present because they are necessary to the author's main purpose which was to present a true picture of Jesus Christ in the particular conditions under which he wrote. It is true to say that in the earliest preaching also, certain elements were either introduced or omitted according to circumstances and audience. The real test of the Kerygmatic nature of the Gospel will therefore be to see whether it contains the essential elements of the Kerygma.

⁴³ The author's own statement in 20. 31 as to his purpose is not, taken on its own, entirely decisive. Three important manuscripts (Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Koredethi) read the present subjunctive πιστεύητε for the aorist πιστεύσῃτε and this, if correct, suggests that the aim was to encourage existing faith rather than to create it. But whilst the grammar of this verse may be indecisive, it is surely significant that throughout the Gospel, believing is always contrasted to the disastrous nature of unbelief. A comparison with the First Epistle of John is interesting, since there belief is expounded from the standpoint of conduct, and is obviously intended for believers.

⁴⁴ This view is held by J. A. T. Robinson, 'The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel', *NTS* 6, 1960, pp. 117-131. He thinks that this is part of John's appeal to Jews of the Diaspora not to repeat the error of Palestinian Jews in rejecting Christ.

⁴⁵ See the discussion by R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Tyndale Press 1960), pp. 34ff, who concludes that without the true manhood of Jesus there can be no true saviourhood.

⁴⁶ W. Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des Vierten Evangeliums* (Freiburg 1898).

⁴⁷ This is contended by J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (S.C.M. 1966), pp. 125ff.

THE MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE PRIMITIVE KERYGMA FOUND IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

C. H. Dodd has demonstrated that the Primitive Kerygma can be reconstructed

[p.46]

from the early chapters of Acts and also from the Pauline Epistles.⁴⁸ He contends that six principal elements were involved as follows:⁴⁹

The age of fulfilment has dawned

This has taken place through the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus, of which a brief account is given, with proof from the Scriptures that all took place through the 'determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God'

By virtue of the resurrection, Jesus has been exalted at the right hand of God as Messianic head of the New Israel

The Holy Spirit in the church is the sign of Christ's present power and glory

The Messianic Age will shortly reach its consummation in the return of Christ

An appeal for repentance, the offer of forgiveness and of the Holy Spirit and the promise of salvation.

This reconstruction does raise a number of questions, for example it may be questioned whether reference to the imminent Advent was preached, and a negative conclusion has been convincingly argued for by R. H. Mounce⁵⁰ and T. F. Glasson.⁵¹ Then the stereotype impression of the outline does not seem quite to do justice to the extemporaneous character of the early preaching.⁵² Hence it is probably best to regard the outline as the 'bones' of the earliest preaching, and to allow that content and emphasis would vary according to circumstances and audience. This impression is in fact confirmed by a study of the Acts evidence.⁵³

⁴⁸ In Acts chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 and 10. The most significant fragments in the Pauline Epistles are 1 Cor. 15. 3ff, Rom. 10. 8-9. Of secondary importance may be included Rom. 1. 3 and 4, 4. 24b and 25, and 8. 34.

⁴⁹ C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-24.

⁵⁰ R. H. Mounce, *The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching* (Eerdmans 1960), pp. 81-82. He goes further and argues against the inclusion of the Advent as an essential element. Where it occurs it is referred to indirectly in relation to judgement, or to strengthen the plea for repentance.

⁵¹ T. F. Glasson, 'The Kerygma: Is our version Correct?' *Hibbert Journal* LI, 1953, pp. 131-132, also questions whether the imminent return of Christ in glory to Judge the world is an essential item in the Kerygma. It is not indisputably present in the Acts speeches, and the silence of 1 Cor. 15. 3ff is noteworthy.

⁵² H. J. Cadbury, 'Acts and Eschatology', *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, pp. 300-321, considers it is essential to allow for the life situation in which the preaching was delivered. For this reason he is hesitant to assume too much from the fact that in the sources available an item recurs, or on the other hand, does not occur at all.

⁵³ As is done by R. H. Mounce, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-64.

Turning to the Fourth Gospel, we do find that these six essential elements are present.⁵⁴ First, prophecy has been fulfilled in the incarnation. This aspect is markedly to the fore in the Prologue. Second, in the framework of fulfilment appear the humanity and even the Davidic descent of Jesus (1. 14; 7. 42), His death (11. 49-52) and resurrection (20. 8ff). Third, by the exaltation of Jesus the new and true Israel of which He is the Messianic Head has been established (15. 1-6). Fourth, the Holy Spirit given to the Church is the sign of Christ's presence and power (7. 39; 14. 18; 20. 2ff). Fifth, an eschatological consummation, accompanied by the parousia is anticipated (6. 39ff, 44 and 14. 3). Sixth, on the basis of all that has been said, an evangelistic appeal is made (20. 31).

From the above we see that the Fourth Gospel is more than Kerygmatic in intention; it actually follows the pattern of the Primitive Kerygma, and reproduces the essential elements of it. We shall now examine these common elements in detail. In certain cases the Fourth Gospel deepens the interpretation, and in such cases we shall consider the extent of the Johannine interpretation, and whether this introduces new thought or is in fact drawing out what is latent in the original proclamation.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE KERYGMA AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The central feature of the Kerygma is its proclamation of Jesus Christ. The earliest preaching is described as 'preaching Jesus'⁵⁵ or preaching 'in the name of Jesus'⁵⁶ or 'preaching Christ'.⁵⁷ The Fourth Gospel has equally as its aim a presentation of Jesus Christ.⁵⁸ We shall therefore commence by comparing the Kerygmatic and the Johannine conceptions of the Person of Christ.

[p.47]

HIS MESSIANIC STATUS

There is no doubt that a chief feature in the Kerygma's presentation of Jesus is its emphasis on the fact that He is the Messiah. In this open proclamation one sees a marked contrast to the reserve towards any open use of the title by Jesus during His earthly ministry. No doubt the reason for this change was the impact of the resurrection.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel states it to be his purpose to show that Jesus is the Messiah (ὁ Χριστός), and it is a remarkable fact that in spite of his lofty Logos doctrine he does not lose his keen interest in the Messianic nature of Jesus' ministry. It is true that he shows Jesus to be much more than the Messiah, but even this is worked out with reference to current Messianic expectations. As is well known the Gospel is the only New Testament document to use the form Μεσσίας as a transliteration of the Hebrew *Mashiah*.⁵⁹

The Kerygma uses a variety of titles to express its conviction of the Messianic status of Jesus. Apart from the explicit statement that God has made Him both κύριος and Χριστός,⁶⁰ He is

⁵⁴ See S. S. Smalley, 'New Light on the Fourth Gospel', *Tyndale Bulletin* 17 (1966), p. 49.

⁵⁵ Acts 4. 42, 8. 35.

⁵⁶ Acts 4. 4, 5. 40, 8. 12.

⁵⁷ Acts 8. 5, 9. 20, 1 Cor. 1. 23.

⁵⁸ John 20. 31.

⁵⁹ 1. 41, 4. 25.

⁶⁰ Acts 2. 36.

referred to as the Holy One,⁶¹ the Righteous One,⁶² the Author of Life,⁶³ the Stone,⁶⁴ the Saviour,⁶⁵ the Servant,⁶⁶ the Prophet like Moses,⁶⁷ and the Judge of the living and the dead.⁶⁸ We must not suppose that these represent a systematic statement of the nature and attributes of Jesus. They are rather 'the artless outpouring of men's deep gratitude as they contemplate Him Who has done everything for them'.⁶⁹ Some of these titles soon ceased to be used; but the thoughts implicit in them are developed by later New Testament writers. In particular this is true of the Fourth Gospel, and we shall now consider the significance of the titles and the extent to which they have influenced the Gospel.

The title *Holy One* occurs in the Acts speeches (2. 27) as ὅσιος and (3. 14) as ἅγιος. Although this does not appear to have been a recognised Messianic title,⁷⁰ the usage denotes that it was invested with Messianic significance. This is especially clear in 2. 27, where the citation from Ps. 16. 10 is made as part of the argument that Jesus (to whom τὸν ὅσιόν σου properly refers) is superior to David. The second word ἅγιος in the LXX represents *kādōsh*, the basic meaning of which is separation, hence separation for the service of God. In this connection it is interesting to note that in 4. 27 and 30, ἅγιος is used adjectivally with παῖς, and is suggestive that the particular role for which the Messiah is set apart is that of the Servant.

In the Fourth Gospel the expression ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs once in 6. 69.⁷¹ Some have assumed that this is based on the Synoptic account of the confession at Casarea Philippi, and that the writer has substituted ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ for the Synoptic Χριστός. There are however good reasons for supposing that the writer is not dependent on the Synoptic account which he has altered. C. H. Dodd shows that the passage in which this occurs shows no similarity to the Synoptics, and he suggests that it may rather belong to the postulated independent tradition. If this is the case then ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ may belong to an early Palestine tradition, bringing the connection between the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel closer at this point than might at first be suspected. It should further be noted that there are grounds for assuming that the Gospel has not altered the primitive sense of ἅγιος, since the term must presumably be understood in a sense consistent with the verb ἁγιάζειν in the Gospel. In 10. 36, Jesus is sanctified by the

[p.48]

Father, and in 17. 19 this is said to be in the interests of others. Thus the original idea of separation for the service of God is implicit in Fourth Gospel usage, although a new idea of benefit to others is introduced.

We may conclude that both the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel use ἅγιος in a similar sense, that of separation for the service of God. Although this cannot be pressed too far, it is just

⁶¹ Acts 2. 27, 2.14.

⁶² Acts 3. 14.

⁶³ Acts 3. 15.

⁶⁴ Acts 4. 11.

⁶⁵ Acts 5. 31.

⁶⁶ Acts 3, 13 and 26.

⁶⁷ Acts 3. 22ff.

⁶⁸ Acts 10. 42.

⁶⁹ Leon Morris, *The Lord from Heaven* (Inter Varsity Fellowship 1958), p. 59.

⁷⁰ Vincent Taylor, *The Name of Jesus* (Macmillan 1962), p. 80.

⁷¹ If, as is almost certain, the reading of Sinaiticus B. D. Sah is to be preferred.

possible that the link with *παῖς* in Acts, and the fact of service bringing benefit to others in the Fourth Gospel could suggest a further link between the two in terms of the suffering Servant.

As far as the term *Righteous One* is concerned, the idea of the Messiah's righteousness has its roots in the Old Testament⁷² and in 1 Enoch 'the Righteous One' is actually used as a Messianic title.⁷³ The title is therefore a more recognised Messianic one than 'the Holy One'. In view of the emphasis on the Servant passages in the early church, the echo of Is. 53. 11 may give the clue to the understanding of this title by them. The title does not appear in the Fourth Gospel, but if it is correct that it is part of the proclamation of Jesus as Servant, then the link may be sought under that concept.

Turning to the term the *Author of Life*, we note that the term ἀρχηγός is confined to the Acts speeches and the Epistle to the Hebrews, suggesting that it belonged to early Palestinian tradition. Although the actual title does not occur in the Fourth Gospel, we shall see that it is suggestive of one of the chief categories of it. Further we shall see that ἀρχηγός on its own (Acts 5. 31) also suggests ideas which are developed in the Gospel.

The Kerygma's usage of ὁ ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς as a Messianic title is understandable in view of the fact that in later Judaism 'Life' is an eschatological concept connected with the Messianic Age. The concept is variously expressed in later books of the Old Testament. In Ezek. 37. 1-18, it appears in the context of a national resuscitation of Israel, which is accomplished by the Spirit of God (Ezek. 37. 14). Then in Dan. 12. 2 the idea of a general resurrection of individuals is expressed, a theme elaborated in the Inter-Testamental writings. 'Life' again appears as an eschatological concept in the expectation that living waters will flow out from Jerusalem in the Messianic Age, bringing life to the world.⁷⁴ The Kerygma proclaims that with the arrival of the 'latter days', Life is available in the person of the Messiah, Jesus Christ.

The term 'Life' which plays such a leading part in the Fourth Gospel is not, therefore, a new concept;⁷⁵ it is nevertheless true to say that it is developed considerably and we must enquire whether new and Hellenistic ideas are introduced, or whether the Gospel theme of 'Life' is developed along Jewish eschatological lines.

Just as in the Kerygma, Jesus is the source of Life, although the implications of this are profoundly developed. Life is present in the Logos (1.4), He is the Life (11. 25 and 14. 6) and the purpose of His coming is to bestow Life (10. 10, cf 4.14, 6.33, 51 and 54). Life is available in His Name (20.31).

Looking more closely at the Johannine doctrine of Life, we can say that it is firmly grounded in the Old Testament. The notion of Life as found only in God⁷⁶ and possessed by man only

⁷² 2 Sam. 23. 3, Isa. 32. 1, 53. 11, Zech. 9. 9.

⁷³ 1 En. 38. 2, 53. 6, and cf Ps. of Sol. 17. 35.

⁷⁴ Ezek. 47. 1-12, Zech. 14. 8, Joel 3. 18.

⁷⁵ T. W. Manson *op. cit.*, p. 111, '...the particular concept chosen by John is one which is already in use in the earliest records, not one freshly coined by him or borrowed from without. It is found... in the early speeches of Acts.'

⁷⁶ 5. 26, 6. 57.

as it is bestowed by Him⁷⁷ is the doctrine of the Old Testament, and differs sharply from all Greek ideas of immortality as something belonging inherently to man.

Secondly, the key to the particular Johannine term ζωὴ αἰώνιος, is, as C. H.

[p.49]

Dodd has shown to be found in the doctrine of the two ages found in later Judaism.⁷⁸ Thus ζωὴ αἰώνιος has the sense of 'life of the age to come' rather than any Platonistic sense of timelessness. In keeping with this the Johannine doctrine of Life is developed along Jewish eschatological lines. Thus the expectation of the healing river of living waters is fulfilled in Jesus,⁷⁹ He is the life giver imparting resurrection life to the dead,⁸⁰ and He is identified with the quickening spirit.⁸¹

There is also a third and distinctive aspect of the Johannine doctrine of Life. Whereas in Jewish eschatology the hope invariably lies in the future, certain passages in the Gospel show eternal life to be something that may be enjoyed by the believer in Jesus here and now.⁸² Whilst the futurist eschatology of Judaism is present and confirmed, a new and 'realised' element is introduced. In the case of the dialogue just prior to the raising of Lazarus, the two concepts stand side by side in impressive contrast.⁸³ Because life of the age to come can be enjoyed here and now, the term αἰώνιος includes a sense of qualitative difference from merely physical life. Some have contended for a certain influence of Greek philosophy in the whole idea,⁸⁴ but this is surely to underestimate the fact that the major reason for the 'realisedness' and all that accompanies it is the resurrection, a historical fact. Thus the Fourth Gospel in its 'realised life' is bringing out what is implicit in the first proclamation of 'Jesus and the resurrection'.

Finally it should be noted that ἀρχηγός in its absolute sense (Acts 5. 31) does correspond to the teaching of John 15, where Jesus is both Head of the New Israel, and the Source of Life to its members.

We must therefore affirm that ideas latent in ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς and ἀρχηγός are developed in the Fourth Gospel.

We now turn to the reference to Jesus as *the Stone* (Acts 4. 11). According to evidence cited by Jeremias,⁸⁴ the Old Testament passages to which the New Testament refers were, in late Judaism, interpreted Messianically. The title here, therefore, would be understood as having Messianic significance. The meaning behind the description in the Kerygma appears to be a two fold one. In the immediate context it amplifies the argument of verse 10, namely that the judgment of man has been dramatically reversed by God. In view of the probable prominence of the Servant theme in primitive preaching, it is more than likely that the rejected and exalted stone echoes the humiliation/vindication pattern of Is. 53.

⁷⁷ 10.10.

⁷⁸ C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 146-147.

⁷⁹ 4. 10 and 14, 7. 37-39

⁸⁰ 5. 21, 6. 33, 11. 25ff.

⁸¹ 6. 63.

⁸² For example in 5. 24.

⁸³ 11. 23 and 24; cf 25 and 26.

⁸⁴ C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-150.

There is however, a deeper significance in the citation from Ps. 118. 22ff both here and in Mark 12. 10ff. By 'head of the corner', Jeremias⁸⁵ thinks that the Stone that crowns the building is meant, and he contends that the building is the Temple in the sense of the redeemed community. It is noteworthy that the 'Stone' idea is developed along these ideas in Eph. 2. 20-22 and 1 Pet. 2. 1-10. A clear link is therefore possible with the sayings of Jesus about the destruction of the Old Temple and the building of the New One. In this case John 2. 19-22 is of considerable importance, since it shows that although the actual term 'Stone' does not occur in the Fourth Gospel, the idea latent in it is present and developed.

Turning now to *the Saviour*, this title has an Old Testament background where it is used as a designation for Yahweh, and by derivation for men of God and for the Messiah Himself. Its usage in the Kerygma in the context of deliverance of the people from sin (Acts 5. 21) clearly links the concept of 'Saviour' with the Old Testament.⁸⁶

[p.50]

It is remarkable in view of the prominence of the verb σώζειν in the Fourth Gospel that the title σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου occurs once only.⁸⁷ Insofar as this single Johannine usage is concerned, it has been observed that the full title σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου can be paralleled in pagan inscriptions, and it has been claimed that this title and the doctrine of salvation in the Gospel have been influenced by paganism.

The whole question of whether such influences have affected the Johannine doctrine of salvation will be considered shortly, but it should be noted that there is no reason to suppose that the title σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου does not have the same Old Testament connotations as does the Kerygma's σωτήρ. The added reference to 'the world' is surely quite understandable in view of the Samaritan context, and in any case is no Johannine innovation, for the universal note is struck in the Kerygma when it is preached to the Gentiles.⁸⁸

We conclude that although the term σωτήρ is present in the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel, and is employed in the same general sense, it is for neither a term of primary importance. The proclamation of salvation is made by means of other concepts.

The *Servant* theme is almost certainly one of the greatest importance in the early preaching. The title παῖς occurs four times in the early chapters of Acts and nowhere else,⁸⁹ so whatever its significance it points to a Christology belonging to a very early period only. Many Scholars consider that the description of Jesus in Acts as παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ does in fact point to the existence of an ancient Christology, according to which Jesus was thought of in terms of the 'suffering Servant' of Isaiah.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ J. Jeremias, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, Ed. G. Kittel, iv, pp. 276ff.

⁸⁶ In contrast to Hellenistic ideas (where 'salvation' corresponds to a general providence) and mystery cults (where 'salvation' consists of deliverance from the thralldom of matter).

⁸⁷ 4.42.

⁸⁸ Acts 10. 34 and 35 with which cf John 10. 16 and 12. 32.

⁸⁹ Acts 3. 13 and 26, 4. 27 and 30.

⁹⁰ O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (S.C.M. 1963), pp. 74-75, but for a contrary conclusion M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (S.P.C.K. 1959), pp. 107-110.

Apart from the explicit identification of Jesus with Is. 53 in Acts 8. 26 and following, we find that $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ is several times associated with themes which recall the Servant passages. Thus in 3. 13 the reference to the glorifying of the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ is suggestive of Is. 52. 13 where the LXX uses the same verb ($\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$). The allusion to the anointing of Jesus as the Holy Servant of God (4. 27 cf 10. 38) is reminiscent of what is said about the Servant in Is. 61. 1. The whole picture in Acts speeches of the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus, corresponds to the 'catabatic and anabatic' line of Is. 53.⁹¹ Evidence as a whole points strongly to the conclusion that the proclamation of Jesus in terms of the suffering Servant was an important aspect of the Primitive Kerygma.

At first sight it may appear that the Fourth Gospel shows no connection with the concept, but a careful study points to the strong possibility that the Kerygma's emphasis on the Servant is also to be found in the Gospel. If this is so, then a link exists between the Gospel and one of the major features of the Kerygma's view of the Person and Work of Christ.

In the first place, it must be remembered that the atoning death of Christ has definitely not been forced into the background by other concepts. The Gospel's stress on the atoning death, its necessity and especially on its voluntary character do suggest the influence of the Servant theme.

Further, we do find allusions to the relevant Isaianic passages at two significant points in the Gospel, namely at the start and conclusion of Jesus' ministry. An echo of Is. 42. 1 is found in a well attested reading of John 1. 34, according to which this Gospel alone preserves the term $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ which is the correct LXX rendering of *bāhir*. In this case, the Gospel recognises that the voice at the Baptism is a summons to fulfil the role of the 'ebed Yahweh. A further reference

[p.51]

to the Servant passages is found in the citation of Is. 53. 1 in Chapter 12. 37ff.⁹² Further possible influence of the Servant passages may be seen in the Gospel's usage of the verbs $\acute{\upsilon}\psi\acute{\omega}\omega$ ⁹³ and $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ ⁹⁴ to describe Christ's death. Not only is there a correspondence between the actual wording of Is. 52. 13 where both verbs occur in the LXX, but the choice of such terms to denote the death of Christ seems to echo the theme of the Servant passages, namely, that through humiliation comes vindication and glory.

Some have seen a further allusion to the Servant in references to Jesus as the 'Lamb of God' in this Gospel. According to one suggestion the term refers to the lamb spoken of in Is. 53. 7. The earliest preachers do appear to have identified Jesus with this specific reference,⁹⁵ and if we have a similar identification here, then we have a definite and important point of contact between the Gospel and the earliest preaching. There are however serious problems with such a theory. In the first place, the language of John 1. 29 indicates expiatory sacrifice, whereas the Isaianic lamb is not sacrificial, but rather an incidental detail, illustrating the silence of the Servant. This is not an insuperable objection since it does appear in a context dealing with the

⁹¹ H. N. Ridderbos *The Speeches of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles* (Tyndale Press 1961), p. 23.

⁹² M. D. Hooker *op. cit.*, p. 106, however, questions whether this reference may be taken as an identification with the Suffering Servant, since it is not used in the context of suffering but rather illustrates Israel's obduracy.

⁹³ 3. 14, 8. 28, 12. 32.

⁹⁴ 7. 39, 12. 16 and 23, 13. 31.

⁹⁵ Acts 8. 32-35.

vicarious sacrifice of the Servant of the Lord.⁹⁶ A more formidable objection is the difficulty of connecting the title 'Lamb of God' with Is. 53. 7 without more positive evidence for such a link, such as would be the case if Is. 53 as well as the lamb concept were regarded as Messianic⁹⁷ at the time.⁹⁸

The crux of the problem is that the title 'Lamb of God' which is unknown prior to the Gospel is really too indefinite to attach to any one particular idea. We may however affirm that the 'lamb' imagery in the Old Testament is generally suggestive of sacrifice, and that the language of John 1. 29 also indicates sacrifice. Thus we can say that the term does carry the notion of sacrifice.⁹⁹ It is possible that there is even a deliberate indefiniteness with the object of linking the Lamb of God not with one sacrifice, but with all sacrifice. In this case a partial allusion to Is. 53 is possible, but this cannot be pressed too far.

Summing up the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, whilst one cannot say that the Servant imagery is dominant, it is difficult to deny that its influence is discernible. Yet again, therefore, we find a continuity between the Kerygma and the Gospel.

In Acts 3. 22ff, Jesus is described as fulfilling the prophecy of Deut. 18. 15ff of *the Prophet like Moses*. The fact that the quotation does not follow the Deuteronomy text exactly, but is a conflation with Lev. 23. 29, suggests that the quotation may have been taken from a series of testimonies used by the early preachers.¹⁰⁰ A similar allusion in 7. 37 shows that this prophecy was regarded with some importance by the early church, who, it seems, identified Jesus with the coming Prophet.

It is interesting to note that the one other place in the New Testament where Jesus is spoken of in terms of 'the Prophet' is the Fourth Gospel, namely in 6. 14 and 7. 40 (cf 1. 21 where it is used in reference to John the Baptist). There is some uncertainty as to the meaning of the title in these references, since in 1. 21 and 7. 40 it appears to be an alternative to ὁ Χριστός, whereas in 6. 40 the recognition of Jesus as 'the Prophet' leads the crowd to attempt to make Him King.¹⁰¹

C. H. Dodd considers it doubtful that the Gospel identifies Jesus with the Prophet, and in any case the title would not be an appropriate one for Him although it might be a stage towards a true estimate of the status of Jesus.¹⁰² If

[p.52]

this is the case, then there is no continuity between the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel at this point.

⁹⁶ Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (S.C.M. 1961), p. 227.

⁹⁷ Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Tyndale Press 1965), pp. 133-134.

⁹⁸ According to one theory made by C. J. Ball and more recently advocated by J. Jeremias, *Theologisches Worterbuch* i, pp. 342-344 and v, p. 700, ἀμνός in John 1. 29 is the mistranslation of an Aramaic word which properly meant 'Servant'. In this case we would have a direct allusion to Christ as Servant. But the conjecture runs into serious difficulties as Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-236, has shown.

⁹⁹ Although this is denied by Dodd, *ibid.*, pp. 236ff, who thinks that the title is based on the Apocalyptic idea of the lamb as a military leader.

¹⁰⁰ F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Tyndale Press 1952), p. 113.

¹⁰¹ It may, however, be a mistake to read too much into the apparent inconsistency which may rather reflect a certain fluidity characteristic of Jewish Messianic ideas.

¹⁰² C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-240.

On the other hand, a recent study by T. F. Glasson¹⁰³ points in a different direction. He refers to the likening of the Messianic hope to a second Exodus, which presupposes a second Moses as its leader. He then examines the Gospel, and suggests that much of its imagery can be understood in terms of this, the intention being to show that Jesus not only corresponds to Moses, but outshines him. In this case there is a correspondence between the Kerygma and the Gospel, but there is also a development. Whilst the Kerygma is content to show how Christ fulfils the prophecy, the Gospel, aided by the Exodus typology develops the theme, showing how Christ also exceeds Moses in glory.

We turn now to the last Messianic title, *the Judge of the living and the dead*. In Acts 10. 42, Jesus is spoken of as Judge, one of the two places in the New Testament where He is given the title, which is elsewhere reserved for God. However the function of judgment is ascribed frequently to Him as a Messianic activity in the New Testament. We may therefore say that part of the Kerygma's proclamation of Him as Messiah is that He is to exercise the Messianic function of judgment.

In the Fourth Gospel, judgment, like life, becomes one of the major themes. We must therefore examine carefully the key features of the Johannine doctrine of judgment to see whether they are developed along lines consistent with the original proclamation.

In the first place, the Johannine doctrine of judgment is closely related to the other key themes of light and life. Thus the coming of Jesus is not primarily on a mission of judgment but of salvation;¹⁰⁴ nevertheless the fact of His presence amongst men as the Light reveals their true condition, and compels them to take up a position in relation to Him, involving either salvation or condemnation.¹⁰⁵ Although the Kerygma does not use the same terminology, the thought is present nevertheless that in the coming of Jesus we have a final, decisive visitation from God which makes it impossible to plead ignorance but demands decision,¹⁰⁶ with all the consequences that this entails. Thus the Johannine feature of relating judgment to the appearance of Jesus amongst men is not new, but finds its counterpart in the earliest proclamation.

Secondly, a key feature in the Johannine doctrine of judgment is that it involves the separation of men into two categories. The principle of separation is not metaphysical, such as might be the case if Greek thought had influenced the Gospel, but rather an attitude to Christ which reveals a moral condition.¹⁰⁷

To be more precise, the revelation shows who are and are not the true Israelites within Israel.¹⁰⁸ Now at this latter point a connection of thought with the Kerygma may be affirmed. In his speech in Acts 2, Peter draws a distinction between the present evil generation destined for judgment, and those who, by response to Christ are to be saved out of it.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰³ T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (Studies in Biblical Theology 40, S.C. M., 1963).

¹⁰⁴ 3. 17, 12. 47.

¹⁰⁵ 3. 19- 21 and cf 15. 22.

¹⁰⁶ Acts 2. 40, 3. 17-19 cf 17. 30 and 31. S. S. Smalley, *op. cit.*, p. 47, considers the idea of a final visitation from God to be one of the principal links between the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel.

¹⁰⁷ 3. 19-21.

¹⁰⁸ See N. A. Dahl, 'The Johannine Church and History', *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 130ff.

¹⁰⁹ 2.40.

A third important feature in the Fourth Gospel is that since judgment is determined by the individual's attitude to Christ, it is something that is settled in the present rather than in the future.¹¹⁰ At first sight this might appear to be in contrast to the Kerygma, where judgment appears to be thought of as impending rather than present. It must however be noted that the 'realised' element in the Fourth Gospel does not cancel the futurist element; the two rather exist

[p.53]

side by side as different aspects of the one truth.¹¹¹ Also the Acts speeches are condensed, and it is possible that if we had the full versions, traces of a 'realised' doctrine could be detected. This may be affirmed, since the idea of judgment on the basis of the individual's present attitude to Jesus is found in the Synoptics, which would confirm its presence in His original teaching;¹¹² it is not a product of 'Johannine theologising'.

From the above it may be concluded that not only is the idea of judgment present in both, but that the key features of the doctrine as developed in the Gospel may be traced back to the earliest proclamation.

The above consideration of Messianic titles reveals two ways in which a correspondence between the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel may be affirmed. Firstly, that in varying degrees each one of the titles attributed to Jesus in the Acts speeches has had a formative influence on the thought of the Fourth Gospel. Secondly, in cases where the ideas latent in the titles are developed in the Fourth Gospel, such development takes place along lines consistent with their Old Testament and Jewish eschatological background in the original proclamation; the Gospel does not distort their original meaning by the use of Hellenistic thought, but rather brings out the full implications of their original meaning.

There are two final points in relation to the Messianic status of Jesus. The first relates to the Messiahship of Jesus and current expectation. Both the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel regard the Messiahship of Jesus in terms different to those of current speculation. The Kerygma contains no trace of the political Messiah of Judaism. On the contrary heaven must receive Him 'until the times of the restoration of all things'—there is no hint of an earthly ruler. It is true that the Davidic descent of the Messiah is spoken of, but the Kingship is over the church and not over an earthly realm.

The Fourth Gospel works out the paradoxical nature of the Messiahship of Jesus in a more subtle way. His Messiahship is shown to have nothing in common with current expectation, and yet to fulfil it in a way that is deeper than those at the time could have imagined possible. Thus the 'hidden Messiah' pales into insignificance in the light of the pre-existent One, and the descent from David is overshadowed by the significance of His divine origin. The 'signs' expected of the Messiah are fulfilled in Jesus, and His death, far from disqualifying Him from Messianic status enables Him as Messiah 'to abide forever'.

¹¹⁰ 3. 18, 5. 24.

¹¹¹ 5. 45, 12. 48.

¹¹² T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge 1951), pp. 270ff, draws attention to the presence of this element in both Mark and Q.

The last point of correspondence between the Messianic preaching of the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel is that both appeal to signs as proof of the Messianic status of Jesus.

On two occasions in the Acts speeches, appeal is made to works of power as proof of the divine activity in Jesus.¹¹³ Thus W. Manson comments: 'At the most ancient level of preaching known to us, the proclamation of Jesus as Messiah was supported primarily by appeal to the "signs" attending His ministry.'¹¹⁴

The Fourth Gospel also appeals to signs, but on a much larger scale, so that we might even say that the whole Gospel is a series of 'signs'. There is thus a correspondence in that both appeal to signs as proof of Jesus' Messiahship. But there is also a development, in that the Fourth Gospel dwells deeply on the inner significance of signs, whereas the Kerygma refers to them more briefly. But the Fourth Gospel also regards them as proof of the divine Sonship of Jesus. Apart from Rom. 1. 3, the Sonship of Jesus is not a term used in the Kerygma.

[p.54]

We must therefore enquire whether this development makes explicit what is already implicit in the earliest preaching.

THE SONSHIP OF JESUS

In the Fourth Gospel the understanding of Jesus as the 'Son of God' is a feature of the greatest importance.

Now it has been contended that 'Sonship' in the Johannine sense is a development for which Hellenism was responsible. This follows the original work of W. Bousset¹¹⁵ who claimed that 'Son of God' was not a Jewish title for the Messiah as this would have endangered the strong Monotheism of Judaism. Bousset therefore considered it unlikely that the early church used this title, and he traces its development to Paul.

R. Bultmann¹¹⁶ thinks that the 'Son of God' may have been used in the early church as a Messianic title, but only later in the full 'mythological' sense under the influence of the Hellenistic idea of 'divine men', the belief in son divinities, and the Gnostic idea of a divine redeemer.¹¹⁷

More recently R. H. Fuller¹¹⁸ and F. Hahn¹¹⁹ have suggested that the title developed in three stages according to the growth of the church. In the Palestinian Jewish church, the title was not applied to the exalted, but to the returning Christ. Secondly in the Palestinian Hellenistic church, it was applied to the exalted Jesus, but also elements of the 'divine man' concept were applied to the earthly Jesus so that the title 'Son of God' was used of His earthly function as bearer of the Spirit. Finally in the Hellenistic Gentile Church, Jesus became regarded as the pre-existent Son of God, and the title became the expression of His divine nature.

¹¹³ Acts 2. 22 and 10. 38.

¹¹⁴ W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, p. 33.

¹¹⁵ W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 3rd Ed. 1926).

¹¹⁶ R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* Vol. 1, p. 50.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 128-133.

¹¹⁸ R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (Lutterworth Press 1965).

¹¹⁹ F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1964).

For us, the important point of these theories is that Sonship in the Johannine (or ontological) sense could not have been part of the earliest preaching. The early church was interested in the Person of Jesus in a purely functional sense, and the ontological interest only developed later under Hellenistic influence. We must therefore consider whether this type of theory does justice to the material in the Kerygma, or whether we do find ontological implications, capable of bearing the developed doctrine of Sonship found in the Fourth Gospel.

In the first place we note that in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is the Son in the fullest (i.e. ontological) sense, in that it is not by miraculous conception nor by rebirth but by nature that He belongs to the highest sphere.¹²⁰ Now if this understanding of His Person had developed in a Hellenistic environment, we should certainly expect Hellenistic features to be prominent; but the fact is, as we shall now see, the cardinal features are all soundly Biblical.

We see, for example, that the Sonship of Jesus, which is something unique and unshared is based on His knowledge of God.¹²¹ Now this knowledge is not an intellectual knowledge of the kind supposed by the Greek notion of *gnosis*, but rather reflects the Biblical idea of knowledge as personal intercourse. The relationship is on the basis of loving confidence on the part of the Father,¹²² and perfect obedience on the part of the Son. Because of this moral likeness, the Son is the perfect revealer of the Father, and to know the Son is to know the Father.

Then, in the Fourth Gospel, the Sonship of Jesus is described in terms of obedience. Throughout the Gospel the Son is presented as the One Who has been

[p.55]

sent,¹²³ and Who acts in complete obedience to the Father's will. This total obedience¹²⁴ and dependence¹²⁵ of the Son are factors which are repeatedly emphasised. These features too are foreign to Greek thought, but entirely Biblical.

Further, the Sonship of Jesus is described in terms of unity of action. As a son 'takes after' his father, so the work of Jesus declares the character of God. This unity of action is seen particularly in the signs, which reveal the glory of God. It is particularly important to observe that the purpose of the signs which play such an important part in the Gospel, is to appeal to the heart. Spiritual discernment is required to understand them. They are not performed merely to arouse wonder; in fact the seeking of signs in this spirit is something to be deprecated.¹²⁶ This sets Jesus apart from the wonder worker, associated with the Greek divine men concept.

¹²⁰ John 8. 23, 16. 28.

¹²¹ 7. 29, 8. 55, 10. 15, 17. 25.

¹²² 3. 55.

¹²³ R. H. Mounce, *op. cit.*, p. 148, comments on this aspect of Sonship in the Fourth Gospel: 'The Sonship of Jesus is patterned after the model of the ideal prophet of the Old Testament economy.'

¹²⁴ 4. 34, 5. 30, 6. 38, 10. 36-38, 8. 29 and 17. 4.

¹²⁵ The dependence of Jesus as Son in the Fourth Gospel is fully treated by J. N. Davey, *The Son of St. John* (Lutterworth Press 1958).

¹²⁶ 4.48.

This summary shows that 'the Johannine conception of Sonship is Biblical in a way which has nothing in common with pagan myths about "Sons of God"'.¹²⁷ We may therefore turn to the Kerygma to see whether a more promising foundation is to be found there.

Some scholars claim that the Acts speeches (and the Kerygmatic fragment in Rom. 1. 3 and 4) show evidence that the Christology of the earliest preaching was adoptionist.

A recent exposition of the view is that of John Knox¹²⁸ who contrasts the 'incarnationism' of the Fourth Gospel with the 'adoptionism' of the Kerygma. According to Knox, the speeches in Acts (especially the statement of 2. 36) suggest a primitive adoptionism whereby the man Jesus was exalted to Messianic status only at the resurrection.¹²⁹ This primitive stage soon developed further, since the strong emphasis on 'foreordination' in the speeches laid the foundation for a doctrine of pre-existence. This was followed (via a brief stage of 'kenoticism') by incarnationism. Paul stands on the left wing of incarnationism, being almost kenotic, whereas John who is almost docetic stands on the extreme right wing. On such a view we have a considerable difference between the primitive adoptionism of the Kerygma, and the near docetism of the Fourth Gospel.

J. A. T. Robinson¹³⁰ not only accepts the adoptionist interpretation of Acts 2. 36, but believes that an even more primitive Christology is revealed in Acts 3. 20, which he regards as evidence of a belief that Jesus is the Messiah only on His return from heaven. Thus Robinson finds two different adoptionist Christologies in the speeches; the first that Messiahship begins at the resurrection, and the second and more primitive, that Jesus is still the 'Christ elect', only to attain Messianic status on His return to earth.

It is, of course, correct that the Acts speeches emphasise the earthly life and humanity of Jesus, but they do so in such a way as to show that it is the powerful impact of these very things that attest His already possessed Messianic authority. This impression can be supported by the fact that in certain places He is explicitly referred to as the Messiah in situations prior to the resurrection.¹³¹ It can hardly be argued that the title 'Christ' is applied retrospectively when we take into account such a reference as 10. 38, where His anointing (ἐχρίσεν) is said to be the basis on which His earthly miracles were wrought.¹³² H. N. Ridderbos¹³³ feels that a case for adoptionism can only be made if the above explicit references are treated as interpolations.

The significance of the resurrection is that it constitutes the vindication of an

[p.56]

¹²⁷ A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

¹²⁸ John Knox, *The Humanity and Divinity of Christ* (Cambridge 1967).

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8

¹³⁰ J. A. T. Robinson 'The Most Primitive Christology of All?' *JTS*, N.S. VII (1956), pp. 177-189.

¹³¹ See especially 3. 18 and 4. 10.

¹³² Compare also 2. 22.

¹³³ H. N. Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

already existing status, and it is in this sense that Acts 2. 36 is to be understood. As H. R. Mackintosh puts it, 'It is by the resurrection that He has taken His place openly as the Christ'.¹³⁴

This is also the most satisfactory approach to the other passage claimed to be adoptionist, namely, Rom. 1. 3 and 4. A. M. Hunter¹³⁵ claims that this pre-Pauline fragment shows that primitive Christianity regarded Jesus as becoming the Son of God at the resurrection (or on his rearrangement following the Peshitta, at His Baptism). In arguing for the pre-Pauline origin of this material, Hunter maintains that its adoptionism contrasts with the incarnationism of Paul. But this supposed contrast meets an obstacle. Since Paul's own teaching excludes adoptionism¹³⁶ it is difficult to believe that he would have incorporated a fragment teaching it. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the crucial participle ὁρισθέντος is used in a sense consistent with Paul's own teaching. Such an interpretation is possible if we regard this passage as having the same sense as Acts 2. 36, and regard the resurrection as the vindication of Jesus' Sonship.¹³⁷ Thus the importance of the resurrection is not that it makes Jesus either Messiah or Son, but that it constitutes an open declaration of these things.

It may be agreed that the early preaching was not adoptionist, but at the same time contended that the terms used to describe the Person of Jesus are intended in a purely functional sense.¹³⁸ If this is the case, then there is a gap between the purely functional view of the early preaching, and the ontological conception of Sonship found in the Fourth Gospel.

It is maintained here, however, that the evidence is such that a purely functional view is inadequate. Although the full import is only worked out much later, the earliest preaching concerning Jesus does contain ontological implications¹³⁹ which the Fourth Gospel develops.

It is correct that apart from Rom. 1. 3 and 4, the term 'Son of God' does not occur in the earliest preaching. Vincent Taylor considers that this is due to the fact that this preaching was to Jewish audiences, and 'Son of God' is not a Jewish Messianic title.¹⁴⁰ However, as he shows, the terminology of the early preaching is fully sufficient to bear the weight of this term,¹⁴¹ and to bear it in a sense that is more than simply functional.

We see this firstly in the titles given to Jesus. He is proclaimed as the fulfilment of prophecy, the Servant, the Prophet like Moses, the Stone and the Lord. The latter is particularly significant, being the LXX term for Yahweh, and in this connection it is certainly noteworthy that Old Testament prophecy is quoted in such a way that κύριος which originally referred to

¹³⁴ H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* (T. and T. Clark 2nd Ed. 1937), p. 40. He adds that an adoptionist interpretation of Acts 2. 36 'makes a chaos of the Synoptic narrative'.

¹³⁵ A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (S.C.M. 1961), pp. 24ff.

¹³⁶ E.g. 1 Cor. 10. 4, 2 Cor. 8. 9, Col. 1. 15-19.

¹³⁷ For example, *The New English Bible* rendering 'Declared Son of God'.

¹³⁸ A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ* (Appended note 'On the alleged "Adoptionism" of Primitive Christianity', pp. 265-269) claims that those who find adoptionism fail to do justice to the Jewish background. For a Jew, 'Sonship' involved no more than a recognition of a function. It expressed no theory of ultimate nature. This only became a crucial issue later.

¹³⁹ For an exposition of this view see Vincent Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (Macmillan 1959). A similar but shorter treatment is the article by I. H. Marshall 'Development of Christology in the Early Church', *Tyndale Bulletin* 18, 1967. He contends that the earliest preaching contains ontological implications in speaking of Sonship, and that this is the teaching of Jesus Himself.

¹⁴⁰ The usage in Acts 9. 20 to a Damascus audience is significant.

¹⁴¹ Vincent Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-197.

Yahweh is now applied to Jesus.¹⁴² As Vincent Taylor comments, 'We must accept the testimony of our sources that it is the Lordship of Christ to which prominence was given, and infer that the idea is far richer in Christological meaning than the name "Lord" might itself suggest'.¹⁴³ This impression is certainly confirmed by the fact that Jesus is said to have been raised to God's right hand,¹⁴⁴ which denotes participation in divine power and glory. The gift of the Spirit is bestowed by Him,¹⁴⁵ and the Spirit is the Spirit of God. He is preached as the object of faith,¹⁴⁶ the only Saviour beside Whom is no other,¹⁴⁷ and the returning Judge.¹⁴⁸ In the same context prayer is made to Him,¹⁴⁹ and baptism is conducted in His Name.¹⁵⁰ The only conclusion possible from such evidence is that 'Jesus was already viewed as having His place somehow within the sphere of the Godhead'.¹⁵¹

[p.57]

All this points to the conclusion that whilst 'Sonship' is certainly developed in the Fourth Gospel, it is true to say that its development is no new doctrine but rather a drawing out of what is implicit but undeveloped in the earliest preaching.

We should also look briefly at the treatment in the Kerygma and the Gospel of *the Humanity of Jesus*. The Kerygma leaves us in no doubt as to the genuine humanity of Jesus. It is remarkable that this emphasis in the Fourth Gospel is not eclipsed by the teaching on His deity, but is, in fact, more pointedly affirmed than in the Synoptics.¹⁵²

The Kerygma affirms that the One Who is now proclaimed as Lord and Christ is none other than 'this same Jesus' Who lived among them and was crucified by them. In other words, it is in the human Jesus that God has decisively spoken. In the Fourth Gospel, the same truth is expressed in that it is in the human Jesus that the divine Logos is at last revealed to men.¹⁵³ There is no doubt that the writer of this Gospel laid special emphasis on this aspect in view of the docetic threat to the truth of the original proclamation.

In the Fourth Gospel the thought is developed further in that we are presented with a balance of the human and divine in Jesus. On the one hand, the human is emphasised to counteract a false spirituality, but on the other hand it is stressed that a mere seeing of the flesh from the standpoint of 'this world' is inadequate and leaves the observer blind to the significance of Jesus.¹⁵⁴ This latter aspect which the Gospel develops so profoundly is not specifically present in the Kerygma, unless perhaps the rulers' actions in crucifying Jesus reflect the spiritual blindness of the representatives of this world.¹⁵⁵

¹⁴² E.g. in the quotation of Joel 2. 32 in Acts 2. 21.

¹⁴³ Vincent Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

¹⁴⁴ Acts 2. 33.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁶ Acts 3. 16.

¹⁴⁷ Acts 4. 12.

¹⁴⁸ Acts 10. 42.

¹⁴⁹ Acts 1. 24ff.

¹⁵⁰ Acts 2. 38, 10. 48.

¹⁵¹ H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

¹⁵² See John 1. 14, 4. 6, 8, 40, 11. 35, 12. 27, 19. 28 and 34.

¹⁵³ John 1. 14, where the pointed use of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\xi}$ in preference to $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ is striking.

¹⁵⁴ E. K. Lee, *The Religious Thought of St. John* (S.P.C.K. 1962), pp. 135ff.

¹⁵⁵ As in 1 Cor. 2. 8.

Thus the humanity of Jesus features prominently in both the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel, and for the same purpose, that is to present (or in the case of the Gospel to preserve) the truth that it is in the human Jesus that God has finally and decisively spoken. The thought is, however developed in the Gospel along the lines just indicated.

Our study of Christology has indicated that all the main features of the Kerygma's Christology are reproduced in the Fourth Gospel. More than the Synoptic Gospels, the Fourth Gospel maintains the interest of the earliest preaching in the Messiahship of Jesus, and it takes up and develops the original categories by which it was proclaimed, making some of these its leading themes. The Johannine doctrine of Sonship has been seen to be a development of ideas implicit in the Kerygma. The humanity of Jesus which is seen in the Kerygma receives equal emphasis in the Fourth Gospel. But not only is there an agreement in actual features, but the development of ideas in the Fourth Gospel is in keeping with the Jewish and Biblical emphasis of the Kerygma.

SALVATION IN THE KERYGMA AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

In both the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel the work of Christ no less than the Person is important. This fact is sometimes overlooked, or it is argued that for neither does the death of Christ have the same cardinal significance as it does for Paul. It has been claimed that in the Primitive preaching the death of Christ has been eclipsed by the resurrection, and in the Fourth Gospel it has been eclipsed by the revelation of the Logos.

[p.58]

In the case of the earliest preaching it has sometimes been affirmed that for the earliest Christians the death of Christ was without significance or even a stumbling-block which was overcome practically by stressing the resurrection and theoretically by attaching some saving significance to His death. James Denney rightly contends that such a view is untenable since the message of the Cross could never have become what it did from a purely negative starting point.¹⁵⁶ Besides, the Kerygmatic fragment in 1 Cor. 15. 3ff confirms the importance attached to the death of Christ in the earliest preaching. It is true that in the Acts speeches there is a stress on the resurrection, but this does not eliminate interest in the death, as the following discussion will show.

In the Fourth Gospel it is sometimes contended that the all important feature is revelation. The death of Christ insofar as it appears is but the logical outcome of the Word becoming flesh. A corollary of this is that the Gospel appears less interested in the redemption of sinners than in those who receive the Light.¹⁵⁷ James Denney points out that any idea of relegation of the death of Christ in favour of revelation is only tenable if the Prologue is emphasised to the exclusion of the main body of the Gospel. If the latter be taken into account then 'the death of Christ comes to the front in a great variety of ways as something which is of peculiar significance for the evangelist'.¹⁵⁸ Apart from specific passages, the reader senses that the whole account is moving towards the climactic 'hour', that of the uplifting and glorifying of Jesus in His death.

¹⁵⁶ James Denney, *The Death of Christ* (Tyndale Press 1960), pp. 48-49.

¹⁵⁷ E. F. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 225, says, 'In the true Johannine doctrine there is no logical place for the view of the death of Christ as an atonement.'

¹⁵⁸ James Denney, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

If we are agreed that the death of Christ is of no secondary importance either for the Kerygma or the Fourth Gospel, we may proceed to enquire whether this correspondence in importance is matched by a correspondence in thought on the subject. We shall see how despite its distinctive terminology the underlying thought of the Gospel is in fact the primitive one.

Turning first to the *Divine purpose in Christ's death*, we see that in the Kerygma it is stressed that the death of Christ was no accident, but the outworking of a divine plan. This truth is emphasised in two ways, firstly by explicit statements of which the clearest is in Acts 2. 23. Although the Jews are responsible for having 'denied the Holy One and Just, and desired a murderer to be granted to them', what happened was 'by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God'.¹⁵⁹ Secondly, it is emphasised by the constant reiteration that what happened was in fulfilment of scripture,¹⁶⁰ which is but another way of saying that His sufferings followed a predetermined course.

The Fourth Gospel elaborates the idea and in certain places uses distinctive terminology, but in essence it says exactly what the Kerygma said. This is unmistakable in 3. 14ff and 12.24 wherein both cases $\delta\epsilon\iota$ is used. That the necessity is a divine one is clearly indicated by the fact that Christ in His voluntary surrender to death displays total accord with the Father's will.¹⁶¹ The Fourth Gospel presents this aspect in the distinctive terms of the inner accord between the Father and the Son, but the underlying idea of divine necessity is primitive. The Fourth Gospel also elaborates the Kerygma in its explicit affirmation that the necessity is grounded in the love of God.¹⁶²

Like the Kerygma, the Gospel is interested to demonstrate that Christ's death constitutes fulfilment of the Scriptures. A feature of the Johannine passion narrative is the care to show how even the smallest details correspond to scriptural predictions.¹⁶³ This implies in the most forceful way that nothing happened apart

[p.59]

from the control of God. The idea of a predetermined course is reinforced by the frequent allusions to the appointed hour, before which Jesus was inviolable.¹⁶⁴ The terminology is Johannine, but the underlying thought is primitive.

Then in both we see that Christ's death is related to sin. As Denney points out, a divine necessity is not a blind, but a seeing one.¹⁶⁵ Just what that purpose was is clear both in the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel—it was for sin. It is true that in the Acts speeches it is not explicitly stated that forgiveness from sin is made possible by Christ's death and this has led some to suppose that the connection was made only later. A. M. Hunter¹⁶⁶ acknowledges that there is no explicit connection in Acts between Christ's death and sin, but he considers it to be sufficiently implied by the Servant motif, and by the offer of forgiveness in His Name that is

¹⁵⁹ E.g. Acts 4. 28.

¹⁶⁰ Acts 3. 18, 1 Cor. 15. 3.

¹⁶¹ John 10. 17ff.

¹⁶² E.g. John 3. 16.

¹⁶³ John 13. 18, 19. 24 and 28 and 36ff.

¹⁶⁴ John 2. 4, 7. 6, 8. 20, 12. 23, 27, 13. 1, 16. 32, 17. 1.

¹⁶⁵ James Denney, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

¹⁶⁶ A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament* (S.C.M. 1957), p. 92.

repeatedly made.¹⁶⁷ This impression is abundantly confirmed when we refer to the Kerygmatic fragments in 1 Cor. 15. 3ff,¹⁶⁸ Rom. 4. 25¹⁶⁹ and 8. 32.¹⁷⁰

In the Fourth Gospel the connection between Christ's death and sin is very plain. Perhaps the clearest expression is in 1. 29 with its reference to the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. This verse is important not only for its teaching but also in view of its position at the opening of the Gospel, suggesting that in it we have the key to the Gospel's interpretation of the mission of Christ as culminating in a sacrificial death for the sin of the world.

The idea of such a connection is carried further by indications that Christ's death as well as being a necessity from the standpoint of divine predestination, is also a necessity called forth by the world's sin. This is unmistakable in 3. 14ff, where apart from the gift of the Son (at least a partial allusion to His death) the world will perish. Again it is noteworthy that the power conferred on the disciples by Christ after His death is a power to pronounce sins forgiven,¹⁷¹ and in 17. 19 the intention of Jesus is by death to establish a new relationship between God and men, a relationship which men themselves are unable to establish by reason of sin. Another way in which the Fourth Gospel shows the connection between Christ's death and sin, is its conception of His death as a victory over the author of sin, the Devil. Although this latter concept is greatly elaborated in the Gospel, we shall see it is by no means absent from the Kerygma.

We now consider what the two have to say on *the nature of Christ's death*. From 1 Cor. 15. 3, we learn that the Kerygma proclaimed that Christ died for (ὑπέρ) our sins. The question we must now ask is, in what sense did the Kerygma regard Christ's death as 'for sins'. This cannot be answered by reference to the preposition ὑπέρ alone in view of its flexibility of meaning.¹⁷² The issue can only be decided from context, which means reference to the Kerygma as a whole.

It may be considered fairly certain that it is possible to interpret the Kerygma as regarding Christ's death as both vicarious and representative on account of its use of the Servant who suffers vicariously (on behalf of others) and representatively (in the name of others). Although no explicit allusion to the sacrificial nature of His death is made, the statement that 'Christ died for our sins' would be sufficient to imply such a concept to Jewish hearers.¹⁷³ Once again a sacrificial understanding of His death would be natural in view of the use made of the Servant concept, He who pours out His life as a sin offering.¹⁷⁴

¹⁶⁷ Acts 2. 38, 5. 31, 10. 43.

¹⁶⁸ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

¹⁶⁹ παρέδοθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν.

¹⁷⁰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν.

¹⁷¹ John 20. 23.

¹⁷² ὑπέρ normally means 'on behalf of' or 'in the interests of' but it cannot be pinned down to any inflexible meaning. R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament* (Macmillan 1908), pp. 310-313, points out that in certain cases ὑπέρ has the sense of 'instead' of and is therefore the equivalent of ἀντί. It is therefore legitimate to regard it as capable of bearing this sense. On the other hand, there are cases in Hellenistic Greek where ὑπέρ seems to have lost even its sense of 'in the interest of' and has simply the meaning 'with regard to', as is shown by G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri* (1910), p. 24. This all shows the necessity of determining meaning from context.

¹⁷³ In the opinion of A. M. Hunter, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

¹⁷⁴ Isa. 53. 10, where the technical term *asham* is used.

It may however be contended that there is at least a hint of substitution in the Acts speeches on two counts. Firstly, the reference to the Cross as 'a tree' is unusual and is not, apart from the New Testament, used to describe crucifixion.¹⁷⁵

[p.60]

The expression is, however, intelligible in the light of Deut. 21. 22ff, where it is explained that hanging on a tree is an outward sign of bearing the curse. It is therefore possible that this rather curious term expresses the conviction of the early preachers that in dying Jesus bore the judgment of God on sin—a judgment that should have been borne by men.¹⁷⁶ Secondly, as F. V. Filson points out, the preaching of forgiveness on the basis of Christ's death which formed the Apostolic message does in itself yield some idea of substitution.¹⁷⁷

In the Fourth Gospel the vicarious and representative elements are present although not very prominent. The vicarious nature of Christ's death is implied by the use of ὑπέρ¹⁷⁸ in such passages as the death of the Good Shepherd (10. 11 cf 15), the prediction of Caiaphas (11. 50 cf 18. 4), and the allusion of Jesus to His death for His friends (15. 13). A representative view is also possible in the first two examples above, and also in the Lamb of God concept. If, as has been suggested, the suffering Servant concept has influenced the Gospel, this would strengthen the vicarious and representative ideas.

The sacrificial element is rather more prominent in the Gospel. This is doubtless to be expected if the contention is correct that the position given to the Lamb of God concept at the start of the Gospel means that it is the category par excellence in which the Gospel interprets the mission of Jesus.¹⁷⁹ A survey of the Gospel confirms the importance that is attached to the idea of sacrifice. The death of Jesus is depicted in sacrificial terms both in the eucharistic passage in 6. 53-58 and in the allusion to the corn of wheat in 12. 24. A still clearer instance is in 17. 19, where His death is conceived of as a sacrifice to consecrate His disciples as the people of God, i.e. the covenant sacrifice. Turning to the passion narrative, we find more that would confirm the idea. Without going into the vexed question of the date of the crucifixion, we should note that the fact that on the Johannine account this takes place at the time of the killing of the Passover is not without significance. A reference, at least partial, to the Passover Lamb in 19. 36 is unmistakable. It is possible that the cry 'It is finished' intends to convey the idea of a completed sacrifice.¹⁸⁰

In dealing with the Kerygma, we saw that it is impossible to exhaust the teaching on the death of Christ without some reference to substitution. The same is true of the Fourth Gospel. Leon Morris who argues for a substitutionary element in the Gospel does so on two counts.¹⁸¹ Firstly, he draws attention to the emphasis in the Gospel that in dying Christ took the place of

¹⁷⁵ ξύλον. Even in the New Testament the term is used sparingly. Apart from the Acts speeches it is used only in Gal. 3. 13 and 1 Pet. 2. 24.

¹⁷⁶ Which is the explanation given quite explicitly in Gal. 3. 13.

¹⁷⁷ F. V. Filson, *One Lord—One Faith* (Philadelphia 1943), p. 172.

¹⁷⁸ The caution about restricting ὑπέρ in meaning does however apply here, and as we shall see each of the above examples of vicarious suffering also contain hints of substitution.

¹⁷⁹ As we have seen, although the precise idea behind this imagery is doubtful, there can be little question that the total idea is that of sacrifice.

¹⁸⁰ A. M. Hunter, *The Gospel According to John* (Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible, Cambridge 1965), p. 179, comments that the verb (τελέω) was sometimes used of completing sacrifice, hence the meaning may be 'The sacrifice is complete'.

¹⁸¹ Leon Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Paternoster Press 1965), pp. 173-175.

sinners. Two examples are of special importance. The first is the prediction of Caiaphas, in which, in a sense beyond his power to grasp he points to the truth that Christ would die not only in the place of the nation, but of a sinful world. In other words, He died as a substitute. In the second example, the reference to Jesus' death on behalf of His friends (15. 13), the meaning is clearly that Jesus dies in order that His friends might live, i.e. He took their place. Secondly, he argues that substitution is implicit in the idea of sacrifice, so that we may legitimately include the concept in the sacrificial references of 1. 29 and 17. 19.

We now turn to the *Spiritual blessings issuing from Christ's death*. The Kerygma concludes with an appeal for repentance, and a promise of forgiveness and of the Holy Spirit. As we have seen, it is impossible to deny that this forgiveness is offered other than on the basis of His death. In the Fourth Gospel life is offered to the believer also on the basis of His death.¹⁸² We shall now look at four of the

[p.61]

great blessings offered and see how, in spite of differences of terminology there are strong links so that the blessings in the Kerygma not only reappear in the Gospel, but that at least two are unified in the Johannine concept of eternal life.

The first great blessing the Kerygma offers to those who repent is *forgiveness of sin*.¹⁸³ The whole mission of Jesus is one of dealing with sin, and the 'blessing' that God sends through His Servant consists of turning men away from their iniquities.¹⁸⁴ At first sight it might appear that forgiveness is not an important feature of the Fourth Gospel, and that illumination has displaced the primitive emphasis on forgiveness. A closer study, however, reveals that forgiveness is not unimportant to the Gospel. It is surely significant that the power that the risen Lord confers on His disciples on the basis of His completed work, is the power to proclaim forgiveness of sins.¹⁸⁵ The disastrous consequences of rejecting Christ, namely, death in sin¹⁸⁶ and exposure to the wrath of God¹⁸⁷ which are presented as the antithesis of 'life' make it plain that forgiveness must have formed an important part of ζῶν ἀιώνιος.

The second blessing offered is *renewed fellowship*. This and its attendant benefits is the aim of the mission of Christ, as is implied in Acts 10. 36,¹⁸⁸ Christ brings peace by restoring men to closest fellowship with Himself and with God. Although the gift of peace is only spoken of twice in the Fourth Gospel the under lying thought of renewed fellowship is of the utmost importance. The idea is clearly indicated in 17. 19 where Jesus refers to His death and the sentence means that 'now, in His own Person, through death, He is about to establish between God and man a relation which men could never have established for themselves, but into which they can truly enter and into which they will be drawn once it is established by Him'.¹⁸⁹ It is also clear that this fellowship is the key to the Johannine concept of eternal life.

¹⁸² John 3. 14ff.

¹⁸³ Acts 2. 38, 10. 43.

¹⁸⁴ Acts 3. 26.

¹⁸⁵ John 20. 23.

¹⁸⁶ John 8. 24.

¹⁸⁷ John 3. 26.

¹⁸⁸ 'Peace' is, of course, to be understood in the Old Testament sense of spiritual wholeness which is the outcome of a right relationship with God.

¹⁸⁹ James Denney, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

Having already noted that 'Life', although given a distinctive meaning in the Fourth Gospel is found in the earliest preaching. Now we see that two great features of it, forgiveness and fellowship, correspond to features of the earliest preaching also.]

A third feature that is important for both the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel is the idea that the death of Christ *establishes the New Covenant*. 'Covenant' is, of course, an idea rooted in the Old Testament, and the later prophets anticipated the New Covenant which God would establish with His people.¹⁹⁰ The fact that the Acts speeches contain pleas for a national repentance must not blind us to the fact that they clearly regard the New Covenant as made good not to Israel after the flesh, but to the Christian group.¹⁹¹

In the Fourth Gospel we find that this idea of Jesus as establishing the New Covenant congregation is developed. We find it in the parable of the Good Shepherd, whose death plays a necessary part in constituting the sheep as one flock. It is further the thought underlying the Caiaphas prediction, which the Gospel sees not only as a prophecy of Jesus' death for the nation but 'more particularly as the Covenant sacrifice which constituted the scattered children of God one people'.¹⁹² Once again the idea of the Covenant sacrifice is uppermost in 17. 19, and in the idea that Christ's death is the event which draws all men unto Him.¹⁹³

Then the idea that the death of Christ constitutes a *victory over the Devil* is a particular feature of the Fourth Gospel. At the opening of the Gospel we

[p.62]

are presented with the antithesis of light and darkness, and the idea that they are in conflict.¹⁹⁴ It is in this conflict with darkness that we must, at least partially, understand the references to Christ as the Light. The idea of conflict between Christ and evil powers is further seen in the opposition of men, where the reader senses that such opposition is but part of the vaster conflict raging between good and evil.¹⁹⁵ This struggle reaches its zenith at the Cross, which is seen as a coming of the Prince of this World.¹⁹⁶ However the outcome is that the Prince of this World is both 'cast out'¹⁹⁷ and 'judged'.¹⁹⁸ Thus the Fourth Gospel sees the death of Christ as a victory over the Devil.

Though the Fourth Gospel elaborates it, the idea is nevertheless present in the Kerygma. The earliest preachers regarded the ministry of Jesus as in a sense a combat with the Devil. From Acts 10. 38 we see that His ministry consisted not only of 'doing good' but of 'healing all that

¹⁹⁰ See especially Jer. 31. 31-34.

¹⁹¹ See particularly Acts 3. 25-26, 'which reflects the proud claim of the earliest Christians to be not a party within Israel, but Israel itself, the people of God, to whom in Jesus belong the promises made to God's chosen people' (A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament*, p. 62). The same idea permeates the speech of Stephen in Chapter 7.

¹⁹² E. K. Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

¹⁹³ 12. 32 and 33.

¹⁹⁴ 1. 5.

¹⁹⁵ E.g. 8. 44, where it is plainly stated that those who oppose Jesus are under the control of the Devil. Cf the statements about Judas in 13. 2 and 27.

¹⁹⁶ 14. 30.

¹⁹⁷ 12. 31.

¹⁹⁸ 16. 11, which is to be understood in the Old Testament sense of victory over an enemy: Leon Morris *op. cit.*, p. 170.

were oppressed of the Devil'.¹⁹⁹ We see too that the great theme of the Kerygma is that the resurrection represents a mighty victory over the holding powers of death and hell. The Johannine doctrine is certainly implicit here, and may even be explicit if the contention is correct that ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς has the sense of 'the victorious Captain Who brought to nought him that had the power of death'.²⁰⁰

We thus see how in the doctrine of Salvation, all the great and developed thoughts of the Fourth Gospel are implicit in the earliest proclamation. Although the ideas are given a new depth, the basic thought remains the same, and there are no discrepancies but an astonishing unity. There is however one feature of difference that should be noted, namely the usage of the terms 'glorification' and 'exaltation' relating to Christ's death in the Fourth Gospel. What is new are not the terms—they are used in the Acts speeches,²⁰¹ and probably there and in the Fourth Gospel find their origin ultimately in Is. 52. 13. What is new is the application of them in the Fourth Gospel not to the resurrection but to His death. The Gospel sees that the glory and exaltation of Christ is not something after Calvary, but involved in it. For it is in Calvary that He supremely reveals God's love in His obedience to the Father's will—it is therefore appropriately spoken of as His glorification. It is at Calvary that eternal life is made available to men—it is thus appropriately spoken of as His exaltation.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE KERYGMA AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The Holy Spirit dominates the book of Acts in which the Kerygmatic passages are set, and this atmosphere pervades the speeches themselves. The first speech is of the nature of an apologia for the appearance of the Spirit,²⁰² the speeches are made by men filled with the Spirit,²⁰³ who urge their hearers to receive the gift of the Spirit,²⁰⁴ and they are followed by the convicting power of the Spirit,²⁰⁵ and on one occasion by its outpouring.²⁰⁶

The Holy Spirit is also important in the Fourth Gospel, where allusions fall into two parts, namely those in the main body of the Gospel, and then those in the Paraclete sayings in Chapters 14-16. In the latter we find some of the deepest teaching on the Holy Spirit in the New Testament.

We thus see the importance of the subject for both, so that if Acts can be called 'The Acts of the Holy Spirit', then the Fourth Gospel may appropriately be termed 'The Gospel of the Holy Spirit'.²⁰⁷ In view of this we shall look at the teaching of both in order to determine the correspondence between them.

[p.63]

In the Kerygma, the first important feature to be noted is the *eschatological character of the Holy Spirit*. In Acts 2. 16ff, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is seen as a fulfilment of the

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 133 footnote.7

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 131 footnote.

²⁰¹ For 'glorification' see Acts 3. 13 and for 'exaltation' see 2. 33 and 5. 30 and 31.

²⁰² Acts 2. 14ff.

²⁰³ 4. 8.

²⁰⁴ 2. 38.

²⁰⁵ 2. 37, 4.13.

²⁰⁶ 10.44.

²⁰⁷ William Barclay, *The Promise of the Spirit* (Epworth Press 1960), p. 39.

prophecy in Joel 2. 28-38. This in effect proclaims the inauguration of the Messianic Age, but it should be observed that this is made explicit by the replacement of μετὰ ταῦτα of the LXX with ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.²⁰⁸ This is, of course, important since it leaves no doubt as to the eschatological character of the Spirit. The eschatological character of what has happened is also made plain by the statement in 2. 33, that the gift of the Holy Spirit belongs exclusively to the exalted Christ.

The eschatological character of the Holy Spirit is important for the Fourth Gospel, where it is emphasised in three major ways.

Firstly, like the Kerygma, it is made clear through linking it with the Old Testament passages which refer to the 'last days'. The likening of the Holy Spirit to the living water in 7. 38 reminds the reader of the Scriptures which speak of the living waters which will flow from Jerusalem in the last days.²⁰⁹ Further, the distinctive Johannine term παράκλητος has an eschatological significance,²¹⁰ as the usage of παράκλητος in Luke 2. 25 shows. It points to those passages in Isaiah which promise comfort and consolation to the remnant within Israel.²¹¹

Secondly, the Kerygmatic affirmation that the gift of the Holy Spirit belongs to the exalted Christ is elaborated by the Fourth Gospel in its insistence that the Holy Spirit could not be made available until the 'glorification' of Jesus.²¹² Despite the usage of distinctive terminology, the idea is primitive.

Thirdly, in describing the activity of the Holy Spirit in the Church, the Gospel uses markedly eschatological language. It is especially noteworthy that a convicting activity is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, which in effect places the world in the position it will occupy at the last Judgment.²¹³

The second feature is that the *Holy Spirit is a power with which the people of God (the Church) are invested*. This fact is specifically stated in Acts 2. 38, and from 10. 45 we see that it is available to Jew and Gentile alike. The Kerygma links this activity of the Holy Spirit with baptism, with forgiveness,²¹⁴ and with witness.²¹⁵ To this may be added that the boldness of the early preaching, its content and effects are impossible to account for without such a power.²¹⁶

In the Fourth Gospel this aspect too is profoundly developed. Outside the Paraclete passages the future work of the Holy Spirit is referred to in 7. 39, and like the Kerygma it is linked with baptism²¹⁷ and with forgiveness of sins.²¹⁸

²⁰⁸ Supported by the majority of authorities. B however is an important exception.

²⁰⁹ Notably Isa. 12. 3 and Ezek. 47. 1.

²¹⁰ For a discussion of the eschatological significance of παράκλητος, see Alan Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-115.

²¹¹ Isa. 40. 1, 51. 12, 66. 13.

²¹² 7. 39, cf 20. 22.

²¹³ C. K. Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

²¹⁴ Acts 2. 38.

²¹⁵ Acts 5. 32.

²¹⁶ E.g. Acts 4. 13.

²¹⁷ John 3. 5.

²¹⁸ John 20. 22.

The Paraclete passages deal entirely with the future operations of the Holy Spirit through the Church, and it is here, therefore, that we have a profound elaboration of the simple Kerygmatic ideas.

In these passages the Holy Spirit, as the Paraclete, is the present helper of the Church. As the Spirit of Truth, He is with us forever,²¹⁹ i.e. until the Parousia. He guides the Church into all truth and interprets the words and works of Jesus;²²⁰ He bears witness to Christ, and testifies to the world along with the Church's own witness.²²¹ In relation to the world, He is the accuser;²²² finally, He declares to the Church the things that are to come.²²³

The Fourth Gospel thus elaborates the idea of the Holy Spirit as a power at work in the Church, which is the primitive one. In addition we should notice that there is a significant parallel between the Kerygma and the Paraclete passages on the aspect of the Holy Spirit's joint witness to the world with the Church.²²⁴

[p.64]

It should also be briefly noted that the Kerygma regards the Holy Spirit as a power with which the Messiah was anointed,²²⁵ a thought clearly in keeping with the Old Testament idea that men of God are anointed by the Holy Spirit; more particularly the early preachers may have had such a passage as Isa. 61. Iff in mind in view of the linking of the anointing with works of power. This aspect is also present in the Fourth Gospel although it is not a key thought, doubtless on account of its emphasis on the Holy Spirit as available after Christ's glorification as a power for the Church. It is however present in the reference to the Spirit's descent at His baptism,²²⁶ and later in 3. 34 where 'God the Father gives the Spirit in its fulness and not "by measure" to Christ'.²²⁷ Here the Kerygmatic idea is placed in a Johannine setting that this anointing with the Spirit is the outcome of the loving relationship between Father and Son.

We have seen then, that two of the major aspects of the Gospel's doctrine of the Holy Spirit are, despite development and expression in distinctive terminology, not new but elaborations of primitive ideas. Even the distinctively Johannine *παράκλητος* points to the eschatological character of the Spirit, an idea present from the first.

The distinctive contribution of the Fourth Gospel also consists in making explicit the close relationship between the Spirit and the risen Christ, and also in making explicit the personal character of the Spirit.

²¹⁹ John 14. 16 and 17.

²²⁰ John 14. 26, 16. 13.

²²¹ John 15. 26ff, 16. 14.

²²² John 16. 9-11.

²²³ John 16. 13.

²²⁴ Acts 5. 32, 'We are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost.' F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Eerdmans 1964), p. 122, comments, 'A noteworthy agreement with the words of Jesus reported in John 15. 26 and following.'

²²⁵ Acts 2. 22 and explicitly in 10. 38.

²²⁶ John 1. 32 and 33.

²²⁷ J. H. Bernard *The International Critical Commentary—St. John* (T. and T. Clark, 5th Ed. 1958), p. 125. This is a more satisfactory interpretation than that of M. J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Jean*, pp. 98ff, according to which this refers to a gift bestowed by Christ on the believer.

In the Paraclete passages it is clear that not only does the Holy Spirit derive from Christ (15. 26, 16. 7b) the truth found in the Kerygma (Acts 2. 33), He is in fact equivalent to His living presence, His *alter ego*.²²⁸ This is a thought which, however implicit, is not made explicit in the Kerygma.

This is related to the second point, namely, that in the Paraclete sayings the Holy Spirit is personalised beyond anything found in the Kerygma. Not only is a masculine form (παράκλητος) used, but the Spirit clearly exercises the functions of a person. Some have overemphasised the development from what they feel to be a 'quasi-material' conception in the early part of Acts to the fully personal concept of the Paraclete passages. It may be agreed that there are certain features in Acts which suggest an influence, but these must be balanced by references which leave no doubt as to the personal character of the Spirit.²²⁹ Possibly a clue to the nature of the development is provided by N. Snaith's dictum, 'Whoever is responsible for the basic details of those first chapters of Acts knew exactly what the Old Testament meant by the ruach adonai'.²³⁰ The Kerygma proclaims that, the Messianic Age having arrived, the Spirit is now active in the Church. The conception recalls strikingly what is said about the Spirit of God in the Old Testament. The distinctive development of the Fourth Gospel is to show that whilst not ceasing to be the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit is pre-eminently the Spirit of Christ. It is this thought that governs the Gospel's teaching. It is because of this that we observe a certain difference between the 'pouring out' of the Spirit in Acts, and the idea of the Fourth Gospel that the gift of the Spirit is the culmination of personal relationship with Christ.²³¹

ESCHATOLOGY IN THE KERYGMA AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

In this last section we shall compare the eschatological standpoint of the Kerygma with that of the Fourth Gospel. Firstly we look at eschatology and the present,

[p.65]

and we shall see how two of the major eschatological features of the Gospel, namely fulfilment and visitation are features of similar importance in the Kerygma. The all important theme of the Kerygma is that the time of eschatological fulfilment has dawned, so that what was hitherto anticipated, can now be experienced. It is true that this is explicitly stated in only a few places, but nevertheless this underlying presupposition is the one that gives significance to the whole contents of the message.²³² Through the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus Who is the promised Messiah, the days predicted by the prophets are now present.²³³ The fact that the 'last days' are now present is attested by the presence of the Holy Spirit.²³⁴

²²⁸ John 14. 16-18 and 25, and especially 16. 7.

²²⁹ Note references in these early chapters to the Spirit speaking, sending forth, hindering, testifying. Also the Spirit may be deceived, tempted, resisted. Cf A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, p. 92.

²³⁰ N. Snaith, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 25.

²³¹ John 14. 23, cf 20. 22. Too much must not be inferred from the supposed difference. In the Kerygma the reception of the Holy Spirit is conditional on repentance which presupposes a certain relationship to Christ so that ultimately the two ideas merge into one—a right relationship to Christ.

²³² C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, p. 13, '... a proclamation of the facts of the death and resurrection of Christ in an eschatological setting which gives significance to the facts.'

²³³ Acts 2. 16-20, 3. 18 and 24, 4. 11.

²³⁴ Acts 2. 16ff and 33, 5. 32.

This aspect of eschatological fulfilment also pervades the Fourth Gospel. Three points are worthy of particular note. Firstly, like the Kerygma, the Fourth Gospel emphasises the Messianic nature of Jesus' mission, so that it follows that with His coming the Messianic Age is inaugurated. Secondly, the Gospel shows interest in Old Testament prophecy, but as well as showing how this is fulfilled with regard to specific passages it works out more deeply how Jesus fulfils all that the Scriptures anticipated. Thirdly, and perhaps most important, the Gospel works out the implications of the arrival of the Messianic Age. ζωὴ αἰώνιος, 'Life of the Age to Come', always looked for in the future, may now be enjoyed here and now. The Messianic function of judgment is now being exercised in the present. In these ways the Gospel proclaims the conviction that with Christ the 'last days' are brought into the present.

As regards the second thought *visitation*, prominent in the Kerygma is the idea that in recent events God has decisively spoken to or visited His people.²³⁵ The idea of visitation is clearly implied in Acts 10. 36,²³⁶ and indeed in the whole emphasis of the Kerygma that Christ's death is the outworking of God's plan, God has raised Him from the dead and exalted Him, a fact attested by the appearance of the Holy Spirit. In the past men may have been excusable but there is now no longer any reason for this, since God has unmistakably spoken.²³⁷

That this theme of visitation is important for the Fourth Gospel has been shown by S. S. Smalley, who comments, 'It can scarcely be too fanciful to propose that we have in the Fourth Gospel an expansion of precisely this basic Kerygmatic motif'.²³⁸ He shows how starting with the Prologue with its affirmation that 'in the Logos made flesh we are face to face with God's visitation par excellence', the Gospel shows how in Jesus, God has spoken. The same is true of the affirmations of Jesus Himself in the Gospel, and the importance of 'witness' (Father to Son and Son to Father) 'emphasises the central position in John of this idea'. The fact that visitation has been rejected by 'His own' provides the particular evangelistic motive of the Gospel.

We thus see how in both the Kerygma and the Fourth Gospel the eschatological present is important, and that the twin ideas of fulfilment and visitation stressed in the Kerygma are developed and enriched in the Fourth Gospel.

Secondly we turn to eschatology and the future. Looking at the Kerygma, we see that the fulfilment of which it speaks is partly present, but also partly future. Whilst the days predicted by the prophets are now present, the Kerygma also looks forward to a final judgment²³⁹ and to the return of Jesus Christ.²⁴⁰

It is important to see this future aspect in proper perspective in view of the tendency of some to assume that it was this that the early church stressed above

[p.66]

²³⁵ Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 33, 'The main burden of the Kerygma is that the unprecedented has happened: God has visited and redeemed His people.'

²³⁶ Cf the allusion to the above in Acts 15. 14.

²³⁷ Acts 3. 17 and 18, with which cf 17. 30 and 31.

²³⁸ S. S. Smalley, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

²³⁹ Acts 10. 42.

²⁴⁰ Acts 3. 19-21.

all else. Two things should be noted in this connection. Firstly, it is clear from the Acts speeches that the future expectation though spoken of, is nevertheless subordinated to the impact of what has already taken place. Secondly, there is nothing to suggest that the second advent is immediately expected—the idea of some scholars of a ‘*nah-erwartung*’ in the early church is not supported by the evidence in Acts. In fact there is no New Testament evidence in support of such a view being held except in 2 Thessalonians where a certain section of the church had been side-tracked.

C. H. Dodd has claimed that ‘In the Fourth Gospel the crudely eschatological elements in the Kerygma are quite refined away’,²⁴¹ and he goes on to suggest that in the Gospel the ‘futurist’ eschatology of the early church has been deliberately subordinated to a ‘realised eschatology’. It is claimed that the Johannine doctrine of the Holy Spirit replaces the primitive parousia hope²⁴² and that futurist ideas attached to life and judgment have been replaced by an emphasis on the present.

Dealing with the contention that the parousia is realised in the Holy Spirit’s coming, we should note that this is emphatically not the teaching of the Kerygma. Whilst the early preachers regarded the coming of the Holy Spirit as indicative of the ‘last days’, it is quite clear that they did not understand this in an absolute sense, but rather in the sense of ‘the last days before the end’.²⁴³ They still looked for a second advent of Christ, and in the Holy Spirit ‘they had but received the firstfruits of salvation; they looked for its completion at the advent of Christ’.²⁴⁴

Now in the Fourth Gospel we see that whilst certain statements might lend support to the view under consideration,²⁴⁵ there are others which make it quite clear that the Gospel’s emphasis on the present does not replace the hope of the parousia.²⁴⁶ Furthermore, a study of Johannine doctrine shows that, like the Kerygma, the Gospel regards the Holy Spirit as the earnest or firstfruits vouchsafed to the believer now by which he knows ‘the certainty of the revelation of Jesus Christ in His unveiled glory at His parousia’²⁴⁷. In the present age, Christ is known only to the believer through the Holy Spirit, but in the ‘last day’ He will be visible to all.

We have already noted the prominence of a ‘realised eschatology’ in connection with what the Gospel says about life and judgment. But we must also observe that side by side with this realised emphasis, there is an equally distinct reference to the future. Thus, whilst ‘Life’ can be experienced here and now, there is still a ‘last day’ at which the dead will rise²⁴⁸ and at which final judgment will be passed.²⁴⁹

²⁴¹ Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 66 ‘...it is made clear that the promise of a second coming is realised in the presence of the Paraclete.’

²⁴³ T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 282, points out that Peter did not regard the Holy Spirit’s coming as a fulfilment of Mark 9. 1, but rather the prophecy of Joel.

²⁴⁴ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Christ is Alive!* (Lutterworth Press 1947), p. 173.

²⁴⁵ John 14. 18, 16. 16.

²⁴⁶ 14. 3, 21. 22.

²⁴⁷ Alan Richardson, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Torch Bible Commentary S.C.M., 1959), p. 172.

²⁴⁸ John 6. 39, 40, 44, 54.

²⁴⁹ John 5. 29, 12. 48.

We must briefly consider how these clear references to a 'last day' are to be understood. It has, of course, been contended that the references are interpolations.²⁵⁰ Such a view is not satisfactory, and rests on dogmatic presuppositions.²⁵¹ Similar objections may be made to the contention of E. F. Scott that the allusions are 'concessions to popular thought that obscure the characteristic teaching of the Gospel'.²⁵² A further suggestion is that the 'last day' is not intended as temporal but in a qualitative sense, so that the Gospel, whilst using language of earlier belief has invested it with a timeless meaning.²⁵³

If we may rule out the theory that allusions to the 'last day' are interpolations, we must ask whether is any reason for supposing that they are to be interpreted other than at their face value. It should be noted that such interpretations proceed on the assumption that the 'realised eschatology' of the Gospel is of such a nature that it is incompatible with futurist elements.

[p.67]

In fact the 'realised eschatology' of the Gospel does leave room for futurist elements. It is true that emphasis is laid on the fact that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and continues His work. But this does not replace the anticipation of a personal, visible return of Christ that was part of primitive belief.²⁵⁴ The references to the personal return of Christ in the Gospel show that, although in the background, the belief is not repudiated in any way at all. It is true to say that life can be enjoyed here and now, but it is also clear that this is of the nature of a firstfruit of the raising up that will take place at the last day. Again, it is true that judgment is decided on the basis of the individual's attitude to Christ, but it is nevertheless a judgment to be ratified at the last day.

It is interesting to note that in the Fourth Gospel just as in the Kerygma, the two elements, realised and future appear side by side, without explanation and without tension. Had the intention of the Fourth Gospel been to correct the future emphasis, we should expect some hint of this in the way that the subject is treated. The general impression is, however, that whilst the Gospel elaborates the idea, the primitive balance of 'even now' and 'not yet' is maintained.

CONCLUSIONS

This study suggests two major conclusions. In the first place, it seems impossible to deny that the Primitive Kerygma has exerted a profound influence on the Fourth Gospel. Again and again we have observed how the great developed themes of the Gospel may be traced back to the earliest preaching. We may therefore stress the claim that the really significant background to the Fourth Gospel must be sought in the earliest Christianity. Arising from this we may affirm that the real contribution of the Gospel is not to innovate nor to correct, but to

²⁵⁰ H. H. Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Eng.Tr. 1899), Vol. 1, pp. 249ff; cf R. H. Charles, *Eschatology: Hebrew, Jewish and Christian* (1899), p. 429. More recently Bultmann has contended that these references are the work of an ecclesiastical redactor since they do not square with the Christian Gnosticism which he supposes is the nature of the Gospel, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol. 2, p. 39.

²⁵¹ See for example the comments of C. K. Barrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 219, 244, where he criticises the arbitrary nature of such treatment.

²⁵² E. F. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

²⁵³ E. K. Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 165, 'The terms of primitive eschatology are put on the lips of our Lord, but these are reinterpreted in such a way that "the last day" is no longer an apocalyptic event of some future date, but a fact realised by the present attitude of men to Christ.'

²⁵⁴ Acts 1. 11.

enrich the content of already existing ideas. The strong link with primitive Christianity also increases the confidence with which we can assert Apostolic connection with it, if not actual authorship.

The second major point is that we have seen that the Fourth Gospel develops and enriches the original concepts along lines that are primarily Biblical and Jewish. The Fourth Gospel does not, therefore, represent a development along lines foreign to the original proclamation.

Since it has been consistently argued that the influence of Hellenism and Gnosticism is marginal (if that), it should be added that this does not mean that the writer did not present his material in such a way as would be intelligible to those of such outlooks. The intention of this study has rather been to stress how at every vital point the writer reveals his affinity to be firmly with the primitive preaching. It is surely part of the wonder of this Gospel that, inspired by the Holy Spirit, the writer has presented a message capable of reaching the mind of the Hellenist or Gnostic which was nevertheless entirely true to the earliest preaching of the Gospel.

© 1971 *London School of Theology* (<http://www.lst.ac.uk/>). Reproduced by permission.

Prepared for the Web in March 2007 by Robert I. Bradshaw

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
