

“My Lord and my God”: The locus of confession

Timothy Radcliffe OP

Most New Testament scholars would agree with Raymond Brown when he claims that there are only three passages in Scripture which indisputably call Jesus God, and that two of these are in John's gospel, in the first verse and at the very end, in Thomas' confession (20:28).¹ And theologians are divided in their reaction to this “high” johannine christology between those who welcome it as an unambiguous declaration of the divinity of Christ, the first step towards Nicea, and those who find it very odd, perhaps intolerably odd, to address any man, even this man, as God and so can only accept it as an eccentric way of claiming that Jesus is the definitive revelation of God², or that, at worst, this is the beginning of a dogmatic tradition that betrays the man Jesus. I would like to suggest that the way forward is to recognise that something very curious is indeed happening in the Prologue and in Thomas' confession but rather than cope with these odd statements by pretending that they are actually saying something much less scandalous (“Jesus is the man who definitively reveals God”), we must admit that they only have meaning within a particular context.

It should be possible to write a sociology of the early church which would show that particular sorts of christological claims only came to be made at a certain point in the history of the church because it was only then that the ecclesial context existed in which such claims could make sense. If John calls Jesus God and Paul does not it is not enough to say that John has a more developed theology than Paul or that he is further away from the original proclamation of the gospel. Paul does not call Jesus God because his church did not provide a context within which that claim could possibly have been made.³ But John writes on the other side of the break with Judaism, the expulsion of the christians from the synagogues, and indeed the emergence of a new religion we call Christianity, with clearer boundaries between insiders and outsiders, and between the language of those who belong and those who do not. It was this ecclesial transformation that made possible, though it did not demand, Thomas' confession before Jesus, “My Lord and my God”.

It has often been claimed that christological development tends to occur first of all in hymns and prayers. Brown says, “We think that the usage of calling Jesus God was a liturgical usage and had its origin in the worship of the Christian community”.⁴ It is often implied that one can

let oneself be carried further in poetry than in prose. This has been explored in a recent article by Martin Hengel.⁵ He approvingly quotes Von Rad: "There was a kind of knowledge for Israel which, although perhaps strange for us, could only be expressed in the form of a hymn".⁶ And, applying this to christology, he says, "Just as in ancient Israel with David and the prophets, as well as with the Greeks, the spirit attempted to say things in *poetic form* which were not yet 'ready' to be expressed in *prose*; things which could be described only in the form of narrative praise."⁷ Now I think that Hengel is right to locate the sharp edge of christological development in the church's hymns and prayers, but not necessarily because they are poetic but because they are the language of the centre; they have as their context of usage the very heart of the community gathered together. It is there that the language of the community is at its greatest distance from the language of outsiders.

Paul says, "What, then, brethren? When you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all be done for edification". (1. Cor. 14:26). By "edification" (*oikodome*) Paul does not mean that which is morally uplifting, but that which builds the *oikos*, constructs the house. Singing hymns builds the household of faith, nurtures the centre, sustains the community in its sense of identity. It is this social and ecclesial function of the hymn rather than its poetic form which make it especially appropriate for expressing esoteric beliefs that mark off the community from its environment. One might, of course, argue that poetry is especially suitable for performing this function, but that is another question. This is important because, I believe, one cannot explain John's Prologue and the confession of Thomas by saying simply that they are poetic or doxological. They are significant theological statements because they belong to the centre of the life of a particular sort of ecclesial community, a church which only became possible after the break from Judaism.

It may sound as if I am claiming that theological language is always the esoteric discourse of some religious group, reflecting its "form of life", beyond any duty to justify itself to the outsider. So, faced with Thomas' confession, all one need do is to say: Join the group and live its life and *then* you will understand. But the religious life of a church and its religious language will be far too complex to allow any such over-simple analysis.⁸ Theological language functions in all sorts of ways in the exchanges between members of a church and in their relationships with those who do not belong. It is not enough to describe a group to understand its theology; one must also ask what is the particular social and ecclesial function of the particular theological statement.

If I may be vastly over-simplistic, one can make an instructive contrast between Paul and John. Paul wrote for groups that were, compared with the Johannine church, relatively open, but his letters are addressed to insiders and have the function of welding communities

together in the face of forces of destruction. They reinforce the boundaries. John writes for a community which is far more enclosed, more separated from “the world”, and yet the function of his gospel is, I believe, quite the opposite of Paul’s letters. Its function is to mediate across boundaries, to offer a thread to follow, a route inwards, so that, like the disciples, one can pass beyond understanding and come to say: “Ah., now you are speaking plainly, not in any figure” (16:29). John’s gospel is, I shall try to show, not a wall but a membrane. It brings one to the point at which Thomas’ confession will make sense. So, then, we must recognise that in confessing Jesus as his Lord and God, Thomas was doing something that was very odd; it is not a free-floating claim that could have been made anywhere or at any time; it could not have been made by Paul. It gains its meaning from the social and symbolic world that was the Johannine church.

However, that is *not* to say that this claim is immune from all interrogation, hermetically and hermeneutically sealed within the private consciousness of a sect. If such were the case, it might have meaning for its own community but it would be hard to see how it could have meaning for us. For Thomas’ confession has a dual place, not only within the Johannine community but also within the Johannine gospel, and that gospel is mediator, broker, go-between and pontifex so that one may attain the moment and the place at which and in which one can join with Thomas. The gospel works a transformation of the meaning of the word “God”. And such a transformation has always to be worked again and again, for the meaning of the word “God” is always in the beginning the one whom Jesus called his Father. Let us try to see what sort of transformation this might be by exploring a little further the contrast between Paul and John.

Wayne Meeks, in his excellent book *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, has suggested how the apostle’s letters nourished and sustained the internal life of his small communities, shored up the boundaries between insiders and outsiders. He says: One cannot read far in the letters of Paul and his disciples without discovering that it was concern about the internal life of the Christian groups that prompted most of the correspondence. The letters also reveal that those groups enjoyed an unusual degree of intimacy, high levels of interaction among members, and a very strong sense of internal cohesion and of distinction both from outsiders and from the world.⁹

Meeks points out how the language that Paul uses sustains that sense of apartness. The Christians are the chosen, the saints, the elect; baptism has made them brothers and sisters in removing them from their old kinship patterns. Their use of odd words oddly, what Meeks calls their ‘in-group jargon’, marks them off from the rest of society. They speak what he calls “a language of separation”. So various linguistic usages

reinforce their sense of having acquired a new identity. They have passed from being under the law to being in grace; they have become members of the body of Christ; they have received the Spirit of God and so call upon him as their Father.

Now, one might imagine that this was a group with a sufficiently tight sense of identity to sustain even such a radically new confession as that Christ was truly God, and that Paul's break from his Pharisaic past was so total as to open up almost indefinite theological possibilities. But that would be, I believe, to mistake the relationship between Judaism and Christianity for Paul. Judaism was not for Paul *a* religion. It was simply religion, the confession of the one God. Paul's faith was still defined by the one fundamental confession, that Yahweh alone was true God. He had simply moved from being a Pharisaic to being a Messianic Jew.¹⁰ And the terms that Paul uses to describe conversion to Christianity are just the same as those which he would have originally used to describe conversion to Judaism, turning to the one true God (1.Th.1.9). Meeks says:

It was precisely their single devotion to the One God, their abhorrence of sharing his worship with that of any other, that gave to the Jews their sense of being a unique people. That exclusive monotheism was part of the very fabric within which the earliest followers of Jesus grew up, and it was no less a part of the premises with which the Pauline wing began. For them as for the Jews in a Greek city, it served as the focus of their difference from others and signified also the basis for unity among believers.¹¹

And Jews and Christians shared not just monotheism but a particular and exclusive form of monotheism summed up in the confession that Yahweh alone was God. It was the monotheism of the jealous God rather than the tolerant monotheism of Hellenistic philosophy. It would have been unthinkable for Paul to confess the divinity of Christ, since that would have contradicted the confession that defined the Judaism to which he still belonged. To properly understand what sort of boundaries were being crossed when a Jew became a Christian in the time of Paul, one would have to explore what precisely was the relationship between monotheism and the law in the definition of Jewish identity. This would be difficult to do both because most of the sources are later, and because Judaism was still such a complex phenomenon that this relationship was probably conceived of in a variety of ways. For a Pharisee, I would tentatively suggest, the two would have virtually coincided. To submit to the revealed will of God in the Torah was what being a monotheist meant. One might say that the law was the *visibility* of monotheism. Obedience to the commandments was practical monotheism and disobedience was idolatry. But Judaism was still larger than Pharisaism, and Paul can establish he is a truly religious person, i.e. stands within the tradition of

Jewish monotheism, by showing how the community of the crucified Messiah, in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, is the proper expression of belief in the one God. So Paul can say in his letter to the Romans: "For we hold that a man is justified by faith apart from works of the law. Or is God the God of the Jews only? Is he not God of the Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of their faith and the uncircumcised through their faith" (3:28—30). So Paul has very cunningly here made salvation outside the law a consequence of true monotheism. Christianity becomes the proper expression of Judaism, and this is only a paradoxical statement once Judaism has come to be seen as a *religion*. Käsemann remarks acutely: "Justification by faith, without distinction between Jew and Greek, is in full harmony with the universal monotheism which the Jew also professes, but the radical consequences of which he fails to draw."¹²

In Galatians Paul adopts far more dubious ploys to substantiate his claim that Christians are the real monotheists. The law, which for Jews was what marked off the one people of the one God, is here seen as a sign of multiplicity. He says: "Why then the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the offspring should come to whom the promise had been made; and it was ordained by angels through an intermediary. Now an intermediary implies more than one; but God is one" (Gal.3:19f) And Paul tells his converts that to adopt such Jewish practices as circumcision and dietary laws is, effectively to revert to polytheism: "Formerly, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to beings that are by nature no gods; but now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back to weak and beggarly elemental spirits, whose slaves you want to be once more?" (4:8—11).

So, then, the context within which Paul speaks of Christ is complex. In the face of strong forces of disintegration, he writes his letters to try to hold the communities together, to reinforce the boundaries between inside and outside, to sustain their identity as those who are "in Christ". And yet it is inconceivable for Paul that Christianity should be another religion, sharing any other claim than the one which founds Judaism, that Yahweh alone is God. Beker can say the Christian churches had for Paul a merely proleptic, interim value: "The Church of the Gentiles is an extension of the promises of God to Israel and not Israel's displacement"¹³ And it is the tension between the exclusivity of the social identity of the churches and the inclusivity of their theology that may provide the context for one of Paul's most important christological tactics, which is giving to Jesus the Divine Name. Jesus is Lord.

Dahl has shown that later rabbis coped with the tension between the claim that Yahweh was God over all the world, and his exclusive worship in Israel, by claiming that it was Israel alone that had received the true name of God.¹⁴ How was he God of all the Universe and yet God of

Israel, since he had told Israel alone the name by which he was to be called? Both Dahl and Käsemann quote Exodus Rab.29 (88d): “I am God over all that comes into the world but I have been joined in name only with you; I am not called the God of idolators, but the God of Israel.”¹⁵ It is probable that the Pharisees of Paul’s time adopted a similar solution, as did Paul. The particularity of the community is defined by the confession of the one who bears the name of the universal God. It is the confession that Jesus is Lord that gives one entry into the body of the church (1.Cor.12:3). It defines the community without compromising the universality of its hope. And if G. Howard is right,¹⁶ and the divine name would have been written in hebrew characters in greek translations of the Bible in the time of Paul, even when they were quoted in his letters, then one might argue that it would have been even more evident what a daring claim Paul was making in calling Jesus Lord. Paul, then, has a very high christology, but he could not make the further claim that Jesus was God, because in the context from within which he spoke such a claim could not have born its proper significance.

When we turn to John’s Prologue after reading Paul it is the christological claims that most forcibly strike us. The Prologue opens with the dramatic claim that “In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” And if we accept Raymond Brown’s reading of the text, the Prologue closes with a similar and balancing claim: “No one has ever seen God; it is God the only Son, ever at the Father’s side, who has revealed him” (v.18).¹⁷ But Culpepper’s recent analysis of the Prologue suggests the centre and focus of the Prologue is nothing that John says about Jesus, but what he says about us, that we are “the children of God”.¹⁸ Along with an almost endless list of NT scholars, Culpepper claims that the Prologue is a chiasm, which is to say that it is a carefully structured text the key to which is to be discovered at its centre. The exegetes may disagree as to exactly where the centre of the Prologue is to be found but Lund, Boismard, Feuillet, Lamarche, Hull and Culpepper himself, to name but a few, all agree that it is located in verses 12–13: “But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God; who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God”. So the Prologue starts and finishes with the assertion of the divinity of the Word or Son, ever with the Father, but these christological claims sketch out a space which is the home of the Christian and the identity of the church. We are God’s children. One might say that John has turned upside down Paul’s understanding of the relationship between the identity of the church and the nature of God. For Paul the unity of Jew and Greek expresses the oneness of God. For John it is the other way round: the oneness of the church is grounded in the unity of Father and Son. So the identity of the church depends upon a claim that could never have been made from

Judaism.

What separates John's Prologue and Paul's letters is not just decades of theological speculation but a social transformation, and the birth of two "religions", Christianity and rabbinical Judaism. Between the Prologue and the letters we have the destruction of the Temple in AD 70, the gathering of the rabbis at Jamnia under Jochanan ben Zakkai, the emergence of a Jewish orthodoxy, and the expulsion of the Christians from the synagogues. The Judaism of the time of Jesus and Paul had been for them the only conceivable context for the worship of God, the God whom Jesus claimed as his Father. It had been a wide enough phenomenon to embrace all sorts of odd groups, the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Zealots and even the Christians. It has been argued by Martyn that it was the Temple cult that enabled Judaism to cope with this diversity: "For most of these groups the Temple cult, with all its imperfections, was a decisive cohesive force. Now that was gone, there arose the danger that centrifugal forces would shatter the loosely knit phenomenon of Judaism, leaving pieces widely scattered indeed".¹⁹ Now Judaism could only survive by defining itself in terms of the orthodoxy of one group, the Pharisees. The complex relationship between obedience to the Torah and monotheism as markers of Jewish identity collapsed with synonymity, and so the space from within which Paul could speak was squeezed out of existence. The Christian churches were precipitated into a search for a new identity apart from Judaism. The Johannine churches moved from the claim of *Jewish* monotheism that Yahweh alone was God, to the exclusively Christian claim that we are those who abide in the love of the Father and Son. The locus of the Christian community is the community of Father and Son.

John certainly talks of Jesus as the revelation of the Father: "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:9). However, it is not enough to understand his claim that Jesus is divine as saying *merely* that Jesus is the culmination of revelation, since John wishes to oppose *mere* revelation to presence. He contrasts speaking about God to living in him. Moses wrote about Jesus (5.46), and the scriptures speak about him, but we abide in him branches of the vine.

The break with Judaism, which separates John from Paul, is dramatised by the end of the Prologue, verses 14 to 18, which Morna Hooker has shown to be a commentary on Exodus 33:12–23.²⁰ The OT text tells of how Moses asks God to show him his ways, and be with them: "Is it not in thy going with us that we are distinct, I and thy people, from all other peoples that are upon the face of the earth?" Moses requests a presence an epiphany that will ground the distinctive identity of the Israelites. It is a foundation document for the people. But God does not grant to Moses to see his face. He passes before him and proclaims his name. In these final verses of the Prologue John shows it is the church which is a truly distinctive people. Moses never saw God: "No

one has ever seen God". Hooker comments, "Christ is not only the one who has seen the face of God, but is himself the *source* of divine *doxa*, full of grace and truth. The difference is brought out in the use of different verbs in 1:17; the Law was given through Moses (in the theophany on Mount Sinai) —but grace and truth themselves have come through Jesus Christ".²¹ This is the moment of the true proclamation of the name, when Jesus proclaims I AM, the divine name. In 17:6 Jesus will claim that he has manifested his Father's name to his disciples. But this is not just a further degree of revelation, more knowledge about God. It is dwelling in the name (17:12).

John makes it perfectly clear that his christological claims not only legitimate the church in its new and separate identity but that the claims only make sense from within the community. Nicodemus cannot see what Jesus is on about because he is an outsider. Jesus says to him: "Truly, truly I say to you, unless one is born anew, he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (3:3). Outside the context of the community of the Spirit, John's christological claims are senseless. And this context is defined not merely in ecclesial and social terms, but ethically. The new revelations of the Last Discourse are interwoven with the new commandment to love one another, for it is the confession of Christ that constitutes the community, but also the practice of this communitarian way of life that makes sense of the confession. The connection becomes most explicit in the First Letter of John: "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God and he who loves is born of God and knows God. He who does not love does not know God; for God is love" (4:7f.).

The love of the gospel is not, like that of the Beatitudes, a love of enemies; it is a love of the brethren. And one might well conclude that the gospel is an esoteric book whose function is to set the community apart from the world. Its theological language marks off the community from the world, erects a barrier against people like Nicodemus who cannot make any sense of what the Johannine Jesus is talking about. Meeks said: "It provided a symbolic universe which gave religious legitimacy, a theodicy, to the group's actual isolation from the larger society."²² Jesus, the stranger from heaven, makes sense of the experience of these Christians of being strangers in the world.

Now, I think that Meeks is absolutely right to draw our attention to a connection between the odd theological claims that John makes for Jesus and the probable isolation of the church, but one must remember that these statements belong not only within a community but within a text, and I believe that the function of the text is not to shut out the rest of the world but to mediate across the boundaries. We should take seriously the description of the purpose of the gospel given in what may have originally been the last words of the text: "Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ,

the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name' (20:30f). It is interesting that these words come immediately after Thomas' confession, "My Lord and my God", and may seem a little anti-climactic, describing Jesus merely as Christ and Son of God. But the point is surely that Thomas' confession does not make sense to outsiders, and it is to them that this postscript is addressed. The book offers them a way in, so that they may believe. And indeed Meeks seems to recognise this, without drawing the conclusions, when he describes what happens as follows: "The story describes the progressive alienation of Jesus from the Jews. But something else is happening, for there are some few who do respond to Jesus' signs and words, and these, while they also frequently 'misunderstand', are progressively enlightened and drawn into intense intimacy with Jesus, until they, like him, are 'not of this world'".²³ The gospel not only describes their enlightenment, but offers it to the reader, so that the reader can come to the point of making Thomas' confession. So though the christological *claims* may only be comprehensible in terms of the group's isolation from the larger Christian and non-Christian world, it does not follow that the *gospel* is intended to reinforce that isolation. The gospel redeems them from the irrelevancy of a merely private language.

In his beautiful book, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*,²⁴ Raymond Brown shows how the evangelist recognises that he belongs to and with a wider fellowship than that of his own immediate church. He accepts that he is one with the disciples of Peter who do not accept his own high christology, and that the gospel is written to bring them to that faith. The gospel makes that same offer of *koinonia* to the wider non-Johannine Church which the first letter of John offers to the later divided Johannine community: "That which we have seen and heard we proclaim to you, so that you may have fellowship with us; and our fellowship is with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ" (1.Jn.1:3). The gospel starts where the other gospels end, with the confession of Jesus as Messiah and the cleansing of the Temple. As Brown says, it gives us "the autobiography of the community when it began to be different."²⁵ The plot progresses by misunderstandings which do not exclude but which invite the reader to progress beyond the impasse.

The conversation with Nicodemus certainly shows him up as someone who cannot understand a word of Jesus because he does not belong, but the dialogue moves towards the proclamation of the Son who has come not to condemn the world but to save. The invitation is to step into the light. The conversation with the Samaritan woman is fraught with similar misunderstandings, and yet it moves towards enlightenment and faith, like the gospel as a whole. Understanding is what is promised at the end, when the Spirit of truth will be given. After the discourse about the bread of life in chapter six, the disciples are thrown, confused, and yet they cannot give up following the thread which leads to light and

the gift of the Spirit. Nowhere is this clearer than in how the gospel talks about God. The Prologue lets one into the secret that in the beginning the Word was with God and was God, but that is a claim that will only make sense at the end of the gospel, when the Spirit has been breathed upon the disciples. It will only make sense from within. Between times the word "God" means, as it does in the rest of the New Testament, the one whom Jesus calls his Father. It is this ordinary meaning of the word from which we must start. Until the community of the Spirit is brought to birth Jesus is, as he was for Paul, the name-bearer, the one who has been given the name which is above every other name. The Jews accuse him of making himself equal to God (5:18, cf 10:33), but this is not claimed by Jesus himself or his disciples until the context is constituted in which it can have meaning. It is only after the Resurrection that Jesus calls the disciples his brothers, and it is only when they are called his brothers that they can call him God.

I hope that it may now be apparent how a sociology of the early church might actually help theologians to understand each other. Thomas' claim that this man is God is undoubtedly odd, but its oddness is only properly understood if the claim is doubly located. It could only make sense within the Johannine church and not the Pauline, and it could only make sense at the end of the gospel and not half-way through. The ordinary meaning of the word "God" for John, as for us, is the one whom the gospel calls the Father of Jesus. Theology is not a discrete discourse, a "language game", set apart for the exploration of our faith. Theology simply adopts and transforms whatever languages are illuminating in our attempts to make sense of our experience, and so most theological language does not immediately reflect our identity as those who abide in the love of the Father and the Son. The theological language that was at hand for John was the language of Judaism, whose God was the Father of Jesus. Our talk of God will derive from a variety of sources. If, for example, we wish to attain some sense of God as the unoriginated source, the ground of beginning, then what we will mean by "God" is, I believe, the Father. Karl Rahner says, "When natural theology acquires knowledge of a simple and absolute first principle of all reality (not just creaturely reality), what is so known is the Father."²⁶ So whenever we start to do theology we always start from the God who is the Father. But we do not stop there. Theology alone belongs to the never-ending and always to be repeated process of constructing a community in which we may attain some sense of what it means to be those who abide in the love of the Father and the Son in the Spirit, the identity that is given to us sacramentally. John's gospel offers a fruitful model of the theological endeavour, a mediation between different contexts, the building of bridges, the exploration of continuities and discontinuities, as his gospel mediates between the apostolic churches and his own. The theological task of transforming the meaning of the word "God" is in

separable from that of the transformation of the world so that “God will be all in all.”(Eph.1:23).

- 1 R.E.Brown, *Jesus, God and Man*, London and Dublin, 1968.
- 2 e.g. John Robinson in “Christology—The Debate continues”, *Theology* Vol. LXXXV, Sept. 1982 pp 324—338.
- 3 I accept the arguments of James Dunn that we should not accept Romans 9:5 as a confession of Christ’s divinity. See *Christology in the Making*, London, 1980, page 45.
- 4 *ibid.*, page 34.
- 5 *Studia Biblica*, Vol III, ed. E.A. Livingstone, Martin Hengel, “Hymn and Christology”, pp 173—197.
- 6 *ibid.*, p.194
- 7 *loc.cit.*
- 8 Nicholas Lash, “How Large is a ‘Language Game?’”, in *Theology* Vol. LXXXVII, January, 1984 pp19—28, and also Fergus Kerr O.P., “Wittgenstein and Theological studies”, *New Blackfiars*, Vol 63, 1982, pp. 500—508.
- 9 Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, New Haven and London, 1983, page 74.
- 10 I owe the phrase to Dr. Robert Morgan.
- 11 *ibid.*, page 91.
- 12 Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, London, 1980, page 104.
- 13 J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, Edinburgh, 1980, p.332.
- 14 N.A.Dahl, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*, Minneapolis, 1977.
- 15 cited from Kasemann, *op.cit.*, p.103.
- 16 G. Howard, “The Tetragram and the New Testament”, in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol 96, 1977, pp.63—83.
- 17 For Raymond Brown’s discussion of the evidence, cf. *The Gospel according to John*, London, 1971, Vol.1, page 17.
- 18 R.A. Culpepper, “The Pivot of John’s Prologue”. *New Testament Studies*, Vol. 27, 1980, pp 1—31.
- 19 J.L. Martin, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, New York, 1968,p.33.
- 20 M.D. Hooker, “The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret”, *New Testament Studies*, Vol 21, 1974 pp.40—58.
- 21 *ibid.*, page 55.
- 22 Wayne A. Meeks, “The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism”, in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 91, 1972, p. 70.
- 23 *ibid.*, page 69.
- 24 Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, London, 1979.
- 25 *ibid.*, page 35.
- 26 “Theos in the New Testament”, *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 1., London, 1961, page 133.