

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU

School of Theology and Seminary Graduate
Papers/Theses

School of Theology and Seminary

1980

A Hitherto Unnoticed Connection between [eis] (Mk 1:10), [meno] (Jn 1:32) and [anapauo] (Apocrypha) in the Context of Jesus' Baptism

Benedict Neale Lundgren OSB
College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_papers

Recommended Citation

Lundgren, Benedict Neale OSB, "A Hitherto Unnoticed Connection between [eis] (Mk 1:10), [meno] (Jn 1:32) and [anapauo] (Apocrypha) in the Context of Jesus' Baptism" (1980). *School of Theology and Seminary Graduate Papers/Theses*. 1359.
https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_papers/1359

This Graduate Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Theology and Seminary at DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Theology and Seminary Graduate Papers/Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

A HITHERTO UNNOTICED CONNECTION
BETWEEN εἶς (MK 1:10), ἤένω (JN 1:32) AND ἀναπαύω
(APOCRYPHA) IN THE CONTEXT OF JESUS' BAPTISM

by

Benedict Neale Lundgren

Saint John's Abbey

A Paper Submitted to the Faculty of the School of
Theology of Saint John's University, Collegeville,
Minnesota in partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Theology.

July 7, 1980

Saint John's University

Collegeville, Minnesota

This paper was written under the direction of

S. M. in 44

(Signature of Director)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	p. 1
I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JORDAN FOR THE CANONICAL GOSPELS	p. 2
II. THE JOHANNINE EXPANSION INTO <i>ἔγω</i> OF THE MARKAN <i>εἰς</i> (1:10)	p. 6
III. JEWISH PRECEDENTS FOR THE LANGUAGE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL	p. 12
IV. THE APOCRYPHAL EXPANSION INTO <i>ἀναταύω</i> OF THE JOHANNINE <i>ἔγω</i> (1:32)	p. 16
CONCLUSION	p. 28
NOTES	p. 34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p. 44

INTRODUCTION

Ever since the work of scholars like W. Bauer, S. Sandmel, and H. Koester, the "definite" shape of early Christianity in the first centuries has become now even more difficult to determine. There are so many questions and fewer answers concerning the specific character of certain Christian groups during the gospel period that the novice of Religionsgeschichte is, to say the least, at a great disadvantage. For what often poses as "history" of religion is at most a Pandora's box of hypothetical constructs. When one is faced with such an abundance of lacunae as concerns sources and origins, and, on the other hand, just as much secondary material, the temptation is to close the box as enthusiastically as one opened it !

Having not sufficiently succumbed to this temptation, yet recognizing the inevitable hazards, I have had to limit myself to a basic inquiry into the usage of certain words in the early gospels. This method has enabled me to trace what I consider to be the development in the pneumatic character of the Jordan event, from its mode of expression revealed to us in the gospel of Mark to its particular mode of expression evident in certain non-canonical gospels.¹

If indeed such a development can be shown; that is, a line of continuity between the canonical gospels and the gospels termed "non-canonical" (both of which may very well have existed originally during a time before such distinctions were placed upon them) then some light will have been placed upon the query of the original character of the earliest Christian milieu, and the multi-dimensional expressions which issued forth from its foundation.

I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JORDAN FOR THE CANONICAL GOSPELS

The earliest canonical gospel introduces Jesus in the context of his baptism in the river Jordan: " In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan(Mk 1:9)."

For the first readers of the Markan gospel three decades have already passed since the death and resurrection of Jesus, in the period which could be called the "Pentecostal era".²

Presupposing a prior extensive initiation process into the community of believers, accessibility to the "gospel" meant accessibility to the risen Lord, to the who of Jesus the Christ. Only after being initiated into the "who"--that is, the living reality of the transformed Jesus--through the gospel message, could the neophyte be regarded as a "Christian" in the truest sense. It is most likely that the first gospel writers were moved to introduce the who of Jesus to a new generation of Christian initiates in the wake of the tidal wave of the Pentecost event. Yet, it is not without significance that the author of the Markan gospel introduces the who of Jesus in the context of his baptism, and furthermore, by way of contrast.

The author of the Markan gospel introduces the who of Jesus the Christ by means of contrast. Jesus is contrasted with John the Baptizer who professes that Jesus is greater than he. John the Baptizer baptizes in water, but Jesus is one who will come baptizing "in the Holy Spirit" [ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ] (Mk 1:8); Pentecost being the highpoint or fulfillment of baptism in the Holy Spirit.

This character contrast is then superceded by a language contrast; i.e. a literary juxtaposition between the language of narrative(Mk 1:4 ff)and the language of apocalyptic(Mk 1:10 ff). Immediately following a direct and non-descript

pronouncement of Jesus' baptism by John (Mk 1:9) the author shifts abruptly to a linguistic style highly expressive and elevated: "And when Jesus came up out of the water, immediately he saw the heavens being rent and the spirit as a dove coming down into him (Mk 1:10)".

Yet another contrast (although an implicit one) is brought forth in 1:11 in the context of Jesus' reception of the spirit. The reader is told that a voice "out of the heaven" says to Jesus "This is my beloved son". It is here in the context of the Jordan event that Jesus begins. He is inaugurated into sonship from a voice "out of the heavens".

It is also here at Jordan that the significance of John the Baptist ends. For when Jesus begins his mission in Galilee, John the Baptist is arrested by Herod (Mk 1:14).³

It is by way of contrast that we are introduced to the who of Jesus the Christ in the beginning of Mark's gospel. For the reader the beginning of the gospel marks the beginning of Jesus. The Jordan event is the context of this beginning.

The author of the Lukan gospel is also concerned with the "beginning" of Jesus. Unlike the author of the Markan gospel who is interested primarily in the "pneumatic" beginning of Jesus, Luke introduces Jesus in the context of his "physical" beginning (Lk 1:26). Like Mark, Luke deems it necessary to introduce Jesus by way of contrast. Yet here the "physical" beginning of John the Baptist and Jesus is juxtaposed (Lk 1:12).

It is only later in 3:21 that Luke will re-introduce Jesus in the context of his baptism at Jordan. R. Brown attempts to solve the query by suggesting the possibility of an earlier Lukan edition which very likely began with the beginning of Jesus at the Jordan. According to Brown "the solemn beginning of the ministry (Lk 3:1-2) has proved to be an almost insurmountable obstacle to an original joining of the infancy narrative with the beginning of Jesus' ministry".⁴

F.C. Coneybeare has noted that in a "medieval Armenian copy of Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron"⁵ a note was discovered; the contents therein speak of "Luke as beginning with the baptism of John". Coneybeare has suggested that perhaps Ephraem had access to an earlier manuscript which omitted the infancy narrative from Luke.

In addition to this external evidence there seems to be within the baptismal account of Luke an elaboration of the Markan account. Luke, similar to Mark, was interested in Jesus' "pneumatic" beginning. Like Mark, Luke writes that a voice "out of the heaven" (Lk 3:22) proclaims that Jesus is "the beloved son". But in a variant reading of Luke, appended to this proclamation of Jesus' sonship, the voice "out of the heaven" continues: "I this day have begotten you".⁶ Luke as well sees the beginning of Jesus in the context of the Jordan event; though, his "pneumatic" beginning. Jesus at the Jordan is "begotten"; that is, brought into a new existence through the Father's begetting of the Son.

The writer of the fourth gospel was no less interested in the question of the beginning of Jesus. For the author of the Johannine gospel Jesus begins primarily as the pre-existent logos (Jn 1:1 ff). Soon after, in 1:14, Jesus begins again as the "logos-become-flesh" at Bethlehem,⁷ which is closely knitted together with the Jordan event about to unfold from 1:24 onward. Unlike Mark and Luke, John has no heavenly voice proclaiming Jesus' sonship, but rather, puts the words into the mouth of John the Baptizer; moreover, Jesus as "divine" son is explicitly stated in the words "the son of God (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ Jn 1:34)".

It seems that John consciously wished not to omit the beginning proposed by the synoptic tradition before him in spite of the obvious precedence he gives to Jesus' "theological" beginning in the Prologue. Rather, he embellishes and alters Jesus' "pneumatic" beginning as it sought its expression in the synoptic tradition.⁸

This phenomenon is best exemplified in the expansion of the Markan "into" (εἰς) in 1:9 to the Johannine "to live" or "to abide" (μένω) in 1:32. In Mark's account of the baptism the "πνεῦμα" is said to come down "into" (εἰς) Jesus; whereas, in John's account the "πνεῦμα" is said to have come down and "lived"/"abided" (ἔμεινεν) upon him.⁹ This expansion I intend to discuss more fully in the section following.

I have tried to show thus far that for Mark, Luke, and John, the query over the "who" of Jesus was bound up with Jesus' "beginning". It is understandable that by the time of the fourth gospel the "beginning" of Jesus had been pushed backward in time from the Jordan event (Mk 1:9-11; Lk 3:21; Jn 1:34), to Jesus' "physical" beginning at Bethlehem (Jn 1:4; Lk 2:7), and finally to its logical extreme--before Time itself (Jn 1:1). Also I briefly touched upon the fact that there has been development in the expression of the "pneumatic" beginning of Jesus at the Jordan amongst the canonical writers Mark and John, with the Johannine expansion of the Markan εἰς (i.e. ἔμεινεν in Jn 1:32). Moreover, John seems to further specify Mark and Luke's "beloved son" by having John the Baptist proclaim Jesus to be "the son of God" (Jn 1:34). The fourth evangelist seems to be striving to make what is implicit in the synoptic tradition, explicit. Minimally, these observations tell us that the particular Christian milieu wherein the fourth gospel was composed must have regarded the baptism of Jesus an important event--important enough to warrant a deepening of its expression.

II. THE JOHANNINE EXPANSION INTO ~~HEW~~ OF THE MARKAN $\epsilon\lambda\zeta$ (1:10)

As a result of the scholarship of R. Brown, K. Lee, and C. Dodd, although it can no longer be held that John is decidedly dependent upon Mark, it is likely that both depend upon a common tradition.¹⁰ Questions as to why John's gospel is distinctive from the synoptics in general has been a concern for scholars such as Bultmann and Sandmel. Bultmann wishes to explain the "differences" by delegating "Hellenistic" gnosticism to be the milieu around which the fourth gospel was written in contrast to the Palestinian Jewish milieu of the Markan gospel.¹¹

Sandmel, who also agrees with the view that John and Mark drew upon a common tradition, explains the Johannine nuances by advocating that John himself was disinterested in the synoptics in general. The origin of this "disinterest" according to Sandmel can be traced to John's desire to write about the "significance" of the Christ rather than details about Jesus.¹² However, recent scholarship has shown that Mark's gospel is not so much interested in accurate details or a history of the life of Jesus as it is a "theological" treatise.¹³ Sandmel seems to imply that John's gospel is a theologically more developed gospel than Mark's, and is not concerned as much as Mark is in "historical" details. Recent archeological discoveries show the contrary. The geographical locations of Bethsaida and the Siloam Pool (for instance) as noted by John are accurate, revealing John to be more knowledgeable than Mark (in some details) of the Jerusalem of Jesus' day.¹⁴

The point is that it is much too simplistic to suggest that the distance between the Markan and Johannine gospels has to do with historical versus theological interest on the part of the gospel writers themselves, or that it be more feasible to contend that it has to do with the difference between "Hellenistic" gnostic and Judeo-Christian cultures.

The fact remains that the fourth gospel was accepted as canonical. The emerging orthodox tradition did not regard the gospel's distinctness "heretical".

I mentioned earlier the tendency in John to nuance specific passages which correspond to those of the synoptic tradition. As an example I gave John's use of μένω in the baptismal account (Jn 1:32). Perhaps the Johannine tradition deemed it necessary to re-interpret the pneumatic character of the Jordan event, thereby expanding the Markan expression εἰς (Mk 1:10).

At this point I think it advantageous to do brief contextual study of the fourth gospel's usage of μένω in order to search out what the Johannine tradition ultimately wished to convey by its use of the expression in the context of the Jordan event.

If we look at John's usage of μένω in the fourth gospel one finds that the word is most accurately translated "to live" or "to abide".¹⁵ Immediately following Jesus' baptism in the Holy Spirit (Jn 1:34) two disciples of John the Baptist hear their master proclaim "Behold the Lamb of God (1:36)". Seeing Jesus, John's disciples follow him. Jesus turns to them and asks them, "What do you seek? (1:38)" The disciples respond: "Where do you live?" (ποῦ μένεις) cf. W. Bauer's Deutsches Wörterbuch Göttingen, 1928, p.792 for a like rendering of 1:38)

Without hesitation the disciples go to where Jesus lives (μένει) and there lived or stayed (ἔμειναν) with him that day (1:39). This "living" with Jesus has a profound effect upon John the Baptist's disciple--enough of an effect to warrant from both of them the proclamation: "We have found the Messiah" (τὸν Μεσσία) (1:41).

In the fourth chapter (4:40) a group of Samaritans who have heard and believed (ἐπίστευσαν) in Jesus through a Samaritan's woman's testimony (4:39), ask him to live or stay (μεῖναι) with them, and he does for two days. Again, as in the first chapter of John's gospel, there is a proclamation on the part of the Samaritans. But this time Jesus is proclaimed not "Messiah" but "the Saviour of the world" (ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ

κόσμου 4:42).

The significance of the previous two passages is that in both instances where Jesus is said to stay, abide, or live with others, there has been knowledge given to these others as to who Jesus is--i.e. Messiah and Saviour. This knowledge in 4:39 has as its pre-condition "belief". There are other instances in John's gospel where forms of the verbs "to live" and "to believe" are used in close connection with one another.

In 8:31 Jesus is portrayed speaking to a group of Jews "who had believed in him" (πιστευσάσας αὐτῷ). Jesus says to the believers, "If you abide/live (ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μένητε ἐν...) in my word you are truly my disciples". To "believe" in Jesus is to "abide"/"live" in his word. To "abide"/"live" in Jesus' word is to be a disciple--to be a disciple (as we saw in 1:41) is to receive knowledge as to who Jesus is (cf also 4:42).

In 3:25-6 John the Baptist professes his subordination to Jesus in a series of "he" statements concerning Jesus and his relationship to the Father. Particularly, in 3:36 John the Baptist speaks: "The one believing (πιστεύων) in the Son has eternal life, but the one distrusting the Son will not see life but the wrath of God abides/lives upon him (μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν).

Again in 5:36-8 the topic is John the Baptizer's subordination to Jesus. But in verse 38 the author of the fourth gospel has Jesus himself profess it: "You do not have the Father's word abiding in you (ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα) because (ὅτι) you do not believe (οὐ πιστεύετε) that one whom the Father has sent".

In both passages note the causal connection between the forms of the verbs "to believe" and "to abide" (3:36; 5:38). It is most apparent in 5:38 where the conjunction ὅτι must be understood in a "causal" sense. Hence, it is "belief" which is pre-condition for the relationship of "living"/"abiding" between those who Jesus

meets and Jesus himself(1:41;4:42)or Jesus' word(8:31). Respectively, it is "un-belief" which effects an "abiding" or "living"--but one of God's wrath upon the un-believer(3:35)or the un-believer is said not to "abide" or "live" in the Father's word(5:38).

This close connection between μένω and πιστεύω in the fourth gospel is most striking in Jesus' discourse with Philip where Philip is taken to task for asking Jesus to show him the Father. Jesus asks Philip, "Do you not believe(οὐ πιστεύεις) that I am in the Father and the Father in me?...but the Father who lives/abides in me(ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων) does his works"(14:10).

If we look closer at verse 10 we see that in 10a the fact of Jesus' being in(ἐν)the Father and the Father's being in(ἐν)Jesus, seems to be re-iterated in 10b, though by the use of the participial form of μένω. Jesus is attempting to impart to Philip the truth about himself--that he and the Father are one(14:9). Philip does not comprehend that who Jesus is is bound up with his relationship with the Father. The relationship is merely stated in 14:9. But 14:10 it is unfolded by Jesus' use of the words ἐν and μένων. The relationship is one of intimate closeness. But Jesus makes it clear to Philip that he has not known(ἔγνωκας)him (14:9)because he does not believe(πιστεύεις) that Jesus is in the Father and that the Father is in him to such a degree that to see Jesus is to see the Father.¹⁶

Thus far we have found that μένω is an important word for the fourth gospel. It is used to express Jesus' relationship with the Father through the Holy Spirit who "lives"/"abides" in Jesus at his baptism(Jn 1:34). Secondly, it used to express Jesus' relationship to those who believe in him(1:42; 4:42; 8:31)and to those who do not believe in him(3:36). The principal effect of the Spirit's "living" or "abiding" in Jesus is "pneumatic" sonship. Likewise, the effect of Jesus' living with those who believe in him--with those who live and abide in him--in

his Father's word, is discipleship. Both sonship and discipleship are of a piece and imply an intimate closeness and cannot be understood (as we have seen from our study of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in John) apart from a pneumatic context.

Question: Is John's usage of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in these two contexts merely circumstantial, or are the later appearances of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ after the baptism in fact echoes of its initial appearance at the Jordan? In other words is the truth about Jesus himself that is expressed by the use of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in Jesus' discourse to Philip (14:10) meant to refer to the Jordan event where $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ makes its debut in John's gospel, and also to Jesus' relationship to his disciples?

An answer to this question may be found in the tenth chapter of the fourth gospel. In 10:33 Jesus is accused of blasphemy by a group of Jews.¹⁷ The blasphemy which Jesus is being accused of seems to have arisen from his own statement that "I and the Father are one (10:30)", and perhaps, the fact that Jesus had spoken that he was "the son of God (10:36)" was also cause for the indictment.

It is significant that John in his gospel has Jesus escape from his accusers across the Jordan to the place where John the Baptizer first baptized and "he [Jesus] lived ($\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\nu$) there...and many believed ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$) in him there (10:50,42)". Verse 40 appears to be the connective sentence between 10:38 wherein the Jews are said not to believe ($\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$) in Jesus and 10:42 wherein many are said to have believed ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$) in him.

Is it possible that the author of the fourth gospel consciously connected the blasphemy scene and Jesus' return to the Jordan, as a way of juxtaposing the statements of un-belief (10:38) with the statements of belief (10:42)? Did the author as well wish to counteract the blasphemy (Jesus' profession of identity with the Father) by linking it to the Jordan where Jesus and the Father experienced intimate connection through the Holy Spirit who "lived"/"abided" upon him

(ἔφησεν ἐπ' αὐτόν Jn 1:34) ?

Although there is not external evidence for specific conclusions to be reached concerning the author's intentions in juxtaposing the blasphemy scene (10:30-39)¹⁸ with Jesus' return "across the Jordan(10:40-42)", the fact of the juxtaposition itself tells us of the likelihood that the question of who Jesus is (for the fourth gospel) can only be answered through a knowledge of him which is given to those who "believe" in him "whom the Father has sent(5:38)". Not to "believe" in Jesus(10:38) is not to "know" him. Not to "know" Jesus is not to have the Father's word living/abiding in you(5:38).

III. JEWISH PRECEDENTS FOR THE LANGUAGE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

C. Dodd points out that scholars who hold that the language of the gospel of John has semitic roots are "far from agreement among themselves" as to the precise wording of the supposed Aramaic original.¹⁹ Yet there is unanimous agreement amongst them that there is an underlying semitic "idiom" to which the overall Johannine linguistic structure is said to correspond. It goes without saying that in fact we have still only a "Greek" gospel of John extant.

Whether one accepts the view of an Alexandrian origin (P. Kahle) or a Palestinian one (M. Gaster)²⁰ for the LXX, it is important that one face the question of the prime motivation which incited the birth of the LXX, which incidentally, came to light at the close of the studies of both P. Kahle and M. Gaster; i.e. that it was very likely to insure the survival of semitic religio-cultural sensibilities amidst a prevalent syncretism (a phenomenon shared both by Palestine and Alexandria in the third and second centuries B.C.E.) that inspired the translation of the Jewish scriptures from Hebrew to Greek.

The problem that need be dealt with here is the extent of the Jewish background to the Gospel of John. H. Thackeray has noted that the LXX "was freely used by Josephus as by the first converts to Christianity, Greek being the one language, apart from Hebrew, in which the Scriptures might be rendered" in spite of the consternation of Jewish "orthodoxy" whose principal instrument of survival was now subject to pollution from Christian and non-Christian gentiles and "fallen away" Jews who regarded themselves as Jewish Christians.²¹

Can we infer from this that such too was the case for the late first century community behind the fourth gospel? It has been noted by S. Jellicoe that already by the first centuries after the writing of the fourth gospel, the LXX was "the preacher's authority; and on its text, or its derivative the Old Latin, the early Fathers based their dogmatic and homiletic writings."²²

We discovered in the previous chapter that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ may very well have been understood in the sense of "to live" or "to abide" for the writer(s) of the fourth gospel. Question: Keeping in mind the grammatical developments which ensued during the Attic and Koine periods, is this meaning of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ shared by the LXX and its corresponding Hebrew equivalent in the Masoretic Text?

E. Hatch and H. Redpath, in a concordance study of the LXX have found that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in numerous passages throughout the book is to be understood in the sense of "to dwell" or "to live forever".²³

For $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ to be understood in the sense of "to dwell" or "to live forever", of which the Hebrew equivalent is יָשַׁב , see Gn 24:55 ($\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\varsigma$); Ps 9:8 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$); Ps 101(2):13 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$); and Zech 14:10 ($\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$). For $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$, of which the Hebrew equivalent is יָשַׁב see Num 30:5 ($\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\acute{\omega}\delta\lambda\upsilon$); Job 15:29 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$); Pr 15:22 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$); Is 14:24 ($\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$), 40:8 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$). For $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$, of which the Hebrew equivalent is יָשַׁב see Dan 6:26 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$), 4:23 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$).

Especially notable is the usage of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in Ps 101(2):12. The Psalmist, contrasting the length of man's days with the Lord's, proclaims, "Thou, Lord live forever" ($\Sigma\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\acute{\rho}\iota\epsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$). It is remarkable that in the fourth gospel, Jesus, speaking to those who would become his disciples, proclaims that "the son lives forever" ($\acute{\omicron}\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\alpha$). It is not impossible to imagine that John, wishing to exalt by written testimony, Jesus to the status of Lord, consciously wished his community to recall Ps 101(2) by substituting

κύριος for υἱός . This would have been a subtle (though no less powerful) way in which to bridge the gap between those Christians in his community who feared Jesus being too closely identified with the God of Moses, Abraham, and Isaac (those first Jewish Christians of the "low" christology), and those Christians in his community who were more pre-occupied with the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit in Jesus which effected his unification with the Father and their sonship as well with him (those Christian Jews of the developing "high" christology).²⁴

G. Johnston has found that "the preposition ἐπί appears in the LXX of Exodus 24:16 and has a corresponding equivalent in the Hebrew of the same text; i.e. על, and that ἐπί "is used also in Deuteronomy 28:24 and again significantly, of the Spirit, in Isaiah 61:1, πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ." ²⁵ Johnston makes a comparison between 4 Kings 2:15, the Spirit's resting upon Elijah (ἐπαναπέδανται), and ἐπαναπαύσθαι found in the story of Eldad and Medad in Numbers 11:26-9, ἀναπαύσεται in Isaiah 11:2, and John's ἐγένετο in 1:32. Johnston supposes that John purposely avoided using ἀναπαύω in view of its messianic associations, and from this supposition "assumes that ἠένηεν is a Johannine equivalent for Isaiah's ἀναπαύσθαι".²⁶

Although I would not disagree with comparison in meaning between ἠένηω and ἀναπαύω, I believe that the justification which Johnston uses for making the two words equivalent is questionable. One has only to look at John's term Μεσσίας -- a direct transliteration of the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ (Jn 1:41; 4:40). It is significant that the fourth gospel is the only canonical document which uses the term.²⁷

Although it is questionable to C. Dodd as to what precisely John intended to signify,²⁸ the fact that he did not avoid using the transliterated form of the Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ to my mind suggests a conscious effort on John's part to relate to a Greek speaking "Jewish" audience.

Hence, if John had wished to avoid any messianic associations that would have ensued from his use of ἀναπαύω it seems most unlikely that he would have used openly the word "Μεσσίας" in his gospel, a word which directly recalls the Davidic Messiah-King of the Jewish Scriptures. It is my opinion that John indeed avoided using ἀναπαύω but not for the reasons offered by G. Johnston.

The problem I believe is more feasibly to be connected with the conscious effort on John's part to disassociate himself and his community from the controversy which was rising up around ἀναπαύω, a word which we shall see in the next chapter, had deep theological significance for certain peripheral Christian groups who were eventually to be disengaged from the emerging orthodoxy of which John's gospel was to be a part.

IV. THE APOCRYPHAL EXPANSION INTO ἀναπαύω OF THE JOHANNINE ἡένω (1:32)

Although the fourth gospel seems to consciously substitute the Old Testament expression "to rest" (see 4 Kgs 2:15 ἔπαναπέπαυται; cf also Num 11:26-9; Is 11:2) for ἡένω which can be translated "to live" or "to abide", ἀναπαύω, used in connection with the coming of the Spirit, does appear with great frequency in certain non-canonical writings of peripheral Christian groups who flourished in the first centuries.²⁹

One among them, the Gospel of the Hebrews, in a fragment which has been preserved by St. Jerome,³⁰ uses the expression "to rest" in connection with the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus:

And when the Lord was come up out of the water...
the whole fount of the Holy Spirit ³¹
descended upon him and rested upon him.

The similarity between this phrase in the Gospel of the Hebrews and ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ in Is 11:2, and ἀπαναπέπαυται τὸ πνεῦμα ἡλιοῦ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίῃ in 4 Kgs 2:15 is recognizable. Yet we find more biblical allusions in the gospel fragment:

My son, in all the prophets
was I waiting for Thee
That Thou shouldst come ³²
and I might rest in Thee.

Vielhauer (in Hennecke-Schneemelcher) has noted that the context of this second appearance of the expression "to rest" in the gospel fragment is very likely to be connected with the wandering wisdom of Sirach 24:7 who "sought rest" (ἀνάπαυσιν ἐζητήσα) in the prophets of Israel and found its dwelling in Jacob and its inheritance in Israel (24:8).³³

"Rest" (perhaps ἀνάπαυσις or very likely κατάπαυσις) marks the third appearance of the expression within the fragment of the Gospel of the Hebrews: "For Thou art my Rest". It has been suggested that this portion of the fragment makes a direct allusion to Psalm 132:14: "This is my Rest..." (αὕτη ἡ κατάπαυσις σου)³⁴

The biblical passages to which the Gospel of the Hebrews seems to allude perhaps can tell us something of the background of the gospel. As the title of the gospel seems to indicate, its recipients were rooted in Semitic traditions. Yet just as richly does the Christian character of the gospel issue forth. The context of the fragment is the Jordan event. The expression of its pneumatic shape is central. The "whole fount of the Holy Spirit" descends and is said to have "rested upon him" ("the Lord"). The πένω of John's gospel has expanded--vivified.

For all the gospels we have studied thus far there seems to be evident an homogeneity of basic content and purpose. In each of the gospels the reader is told something of who Jesus is, and finds it important to reveal the "who" of Jesus primarily in the context of his baptism.

The consequence of Jesus' receiving the Holy Spirit is, firstly, "sonship". In Mark, after the Spirit comes down into Jesus he is proclaimed "the Son, the beloved" (1:11) by a heavenly voice. Similarly, in Luke, after the Spirit is said to come upon Jesus, a voice out of heaven proclaims him "the Son, the beloved" (3:21-22). In John, Jesus is proclaimed "Son of God" through the mouth of John the Baptist immediately after the Spirit came and lived/abided in Jesus (1:34). In the Gospel of the Hebrews fragment, after the "whole fount of the Holy Spirit descended upon him and rested upon him", the recipient of the Spirit who was formerly addressed as "the Lord" is now addressed as "my Son".³⁵

The pneumatic character of the baptism of Jesus finds expression in the notion of "rest" in many of the Apocryphal writings known as the Nag Hammadi Library .³⁶ Two tractates which are of particular importance for the present investigation are the Gospel of Philip³⁷ and the Gospel of Truth.³⁸

The Nag Hammadi Writings attest to the existence of peripheral Christian communities, communities who regarded themselves as "other Christs" :

It is not possible for anyone to see
anything of the things
which actually exist unless he becomes like them...
This is not the way with man in the world...
You saw Spirit, you became Spirit.
You saw Christ, you became Christ.³⁹

These communities of "seers"(as exemplified in the Gospel of Philip) who "became Christ" understood this becoming as a "birth" event, one which was effected through the movement of the Holy Spirit:

Through the Holy Spirit we are indeed begotten again...
We are anointed [Christed] through the Spirit.⁴⁰

Surely, we are now in the midst of "Christian" literature of a type that is "pentecostal" in the ultimate sense of the term. If we look back to the fourth gospel we hear Jesus imparting to his disciples that the "Comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you(Jn 14:25)".

One gets the strong impression when reading the Gospel of Philip that he is in the presence of a community, who in its own particular way, is permeated in the Holy Spirit--with the immediate repercussions of the Pentecost event(Acts 2) still fresh in their memory, still a vital part of their experiencing,

Yet the Jordan event is no less a part of the experience of the community behind the Gospel of Philip. The gospel expresses its pneumatic character in the notion of "rest", in the context of baptism:

...Those [who will be baptized go] down into the water...
nothing will be able to receive imperishability
if it does not become a son...

If you become one of those who belong above
it is those who belong above who will rest in you,⁴¹

We see that this pre-occupation with "rest" in the context of baptism and its primary effect (sonship) the Gospel of Philip shares with the previous gospels studied. Yet there is a nuance that is worthy of noting, and that is the community's understanding that the "sons" (those who belong above) are said to "rest" in the baptized believer.

This understanding evidently corresponds to the gospel's belief that those who live by it are to become "other Christs". Hence, it would seem to follow that the "Holy Spirit" which effects the "Christ"ening⁴² rests in the "sons", thus, enabling the "sons" to rest in the Divine and, secondly, in one another. For it is written that "those who have been united in the bridal chamber will no longer be separated."⁴³

Nonetheless, there seems to be present in the Gospel of Philip a conscious turning to "Jesus"--perhaps as the Son par excellence:

Jesus revealed [himself at the] Jordan:
It was the [fulness of the Kingdom] of heaven...
and it is fitting for each of the disciples to enter into his rest.⁴⁴

I mentioned earlier that the Apocryphal literature now under discussion, exemplifies the "pentecostal" life which must have pervaded early Christian experience. Question: Is the event at Pentecost an event which has its roots in

the waters of the the Jordan?

It is interesting to note that in Armenian baptismal hymn material, we find that the descent of the Holy Spirit into Jesus at the Jordan is indirectly linked to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles at Pentecost:

You who made yourself lowly,
poured-out oil [is your] Name: Anointed One of God,
You who came down to the holy upper-chamber,
upon the Apostles as anointing for the Anointed ones;

and with this anointing
you have re-created through them [i.e. the Anointed ones=Apostles]
the earthly beings [=the baptized] as Sons of God... 45

The previous excerpt suggests a conscious connection between Pentecost (when the "Anointed One of God...came down...upon the Apostles...the Anointed Ones") and the descent of the Holy Spirit into Jesus at the Jordan--for Jesus is the "Anointed One of God" at his baptism. It is only in the aftermath of Jesus' Sonship that the Apostles and those baptized after them can be truly called "Sons of God".

We see that the Holy Spirit undergirds the whole structure of the Jesus event from its inception at the Jordan to its culmination at Pentecost--which is none other than the baptism in fire and spirit promised by Jesus himself--for the canonical gospel of John(14:25), the Gospel of Philip(74), and the the Armenian evidence(cf above excerpt). Does the connection between the Gospel of Philip and the Armenian evidence suggest a Syrian origin for the Gospel of Philip. It is likely.

Hence, it is most probable that the earliest Christian communities depict an archaic form of Christianity that is Pneuma-Christic in character. We have seen that even for the community behind the earliest canonical gospel, the "beginning" of Jesus is bound up with the descent of the Holy Spirit "into" him. The consequence is Sonship by the Father's own testimony, brought about by the Holy Spirit(cf Mark 1:1

The primordiality of the Holy Spirit evident in the canonical and non-canonical gospels treated in this investigation lies in the fact of their semitic origins. We have noted that Isaiah 11:2(ἀναπαύσειται) and 4 Kgs 2:15(ἐπαναπένηται) very likely

pictures the vital background of the much later Johannine baptismal account (cf $\eta\epsilon\nu\omega$ in Jn 1:32). Previously, I also mentioned the high probability of Sir 24:12 ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\zeta\eta\eta\sigma\alpha$) forming the background of the Gospel of the Hebrews (cf my page 16,..."was I waiting for Thee that Thou shouldst come and I might rest in Thee."). Moreover, if we return to the very beginning of the Scriptures themselves we find the sole principle upon which the pneumatic character of the New Testament gospels (canonical and non-canonical) are based. It is in the first song of creation where it is said that the "Spirit of God moved over the water" ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \dots$ Gn 1:2).

For the Scriptures it is the Spirit whose prime activity is to beget life--from its primeval movements in creation of the world (Gn 1:2) and the creation of Adam (Gn 2:7) to its subsequent movements in the chosen people of Israel, exemplified in the Spirit's inhabitation in the prophets' Isaiah (see Is 61:1 $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}$) and Elijah (see 4 Kgs 2:15 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$), who are given a new life in the Godhead through the Holy Spirit.

In remarkable continuity with Jewish tradition the early gospels envisage the Holy Spirit as being pregnant--bringing forth the begotten Son by the Father. It is the Holy Spirit which effects the Son's divine life; that is, the relationship of unification between Jesus and the Father. Jesus is "beloved Son" of the Father; yet, in no less a fashion is he son of man (Adam) like Isaiah, Elijah, Jacob, Abraham, and Moses. These had the self-same Father and the self-same Spirit "living"/"abiding" within them. Thus, as the Holy Spirit begins creation hovering over primordial waters in the Scriptures (Gn 1:2 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$) and takes its dwelling in creation and in humankind ("tilled earth" i.e. $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$ "Adam"), it finds its dwelling place in later "chosen ones" of history as well--culminating with the effecting of Jesus' beginning of life in the Father at the Jordan, and

the Apostles' beginning as "sons" at Pentecost(Acts 2:4). In Jewish and Syriac tradit the Spirit is always "co-creator" with the Father. For the early Christian communities we see that Jesus exemplifies what is fundamental to the tradition--i.e. the primordality of the Holy Spirit.

Another exquisite piece of Apocryphal literature, the Gospel of Truth, although to be distinguished from the gospels we have heretofore discussed by way of its "form" and un-easy accessibility to the un-attuned ear, centers itself(in its own unique way)in a Christo-pneumatic theophany.⁴⁶

The tractate reveals a language that is highly exalted, and whose esoteric character is presumably intentioned. It is called a "gospel" because it wishes to pass on its "Good News" to all who desire to share in its message.

What is the message in se which the Gospel of Truth wishes to convey to its hearers ? Essentially, the message is the proclamation that sin(to be identified with ignorance $\alpha\gamma\omega\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon$) is vanquished through Knowledge($\gamma\omega\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon$).

The "Knowledge" which the Gospel of Truth imparts is one that is revealed and not self-attained.⁴⁷ It is a Knowledge that is given only by the Father.⁴⁸ The Knowledge that was revealed to this particular nexus of Christians who lived behind the Gospel of Truth seems to have been one which was "informative"(to be identified with "transformative")in character.⁴⁹ This "transformative" character expresses itself in the typology of "paradise",which suggests the movement from the old Adam of Genesis to the new Adam of the gospels. The old Adam is the "ignorant" one(the agnostic)who remains "in darkness"; that is, fallen from $\gamma\omega\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon$.⁵⁰ The new Adam,on the other hand, is the "knowing" one(the gnostic) who "rests in paradise".⁵¹ Ultimately, "Knowledge"($\gamma\omega\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon$)for the Gospel of Truth is life in the Father, whose "tongue" is the word and whose "bosom" is "the Holy Spirit".⁵²

The most distinctive characteristic of the Gospel of Truth as compared with all the gospels which have been discussed in this essay is that there is no explicit mention of Jesus' baptism in the context of Jordan. There is no overt mention of "water" or "the waters of the Jordan". Towards the close of the gospel there is the following allusion:

When therefore it pleased him the Father
 that his name which is uttered should be his son,
 he gave the name to him, 53
 that is him who came forth from the depth.

What seems evident in the Gospel of Truth is that its inhabitants are not so much concerned with Jesus' baptism as with the life in the Father--which experience they do believe to share with Jesus the Christ. 54

These "other" Christs--these new Adams understand themselves to be sons of the Father, as they believe Jesus to be the Son of the Father. Moreover, the pneumatic expression "to rest"(in the Gospel of Hebrews;and "to live" or "to abide" in the gospel of John)paradigmatically exemplifies Jesus' relationship with the Father through the Spirit and the "sons"(the other Christ)relationship with the Father through the self-same Spirit:

Now the name of the Father is the Son...
 For indeed the Father's name is not spoken
 but is apparent through a Son...
 who therefore will be able to utter a name for him, the great name,
 except him alone to whom the name belongs 55
 and the sons of the name in whom rested the name of the Father.

This relationship of rest between the new Adams--between the sons and their Father is a relationship of intimate closeness:

...they rest in him who is at rest,
 not striving or being involved in the search for truth...
 ...the Father is within them and they are in the Father. 56

The above excerpt has close connections with Jn 14:10: "Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me?"

Here one cannot but help recall Jesus' discourse with Philip in John's gospel, where we initially discovered the expression "to live"/"to abide" ($\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$) used explicitly in connection with Jesus' relationship of unification with the Father.⁵⁷

This significant parallel between the Gospel of Truth and John's gospel is only one instance of many. The most striking one is the primacy which each gives to the Father.⁵⁸ In the fourth gospel John portrays Jesus clearly telling his audience that he has come from the Father and is going to the Father.⁵⁹ Jesus "knows from where he has come and knows where he is going!"⁶⁰

What do these parallels between the gospels tell us? Does the Gospel of Truth perhaps emerge originally from Johannine communities?

Utilizing the letters of John and the anti-Jewish material in the fourth gospel as his basis of contrast, R. Brown builds a convincing theory of Johannine communities in various stages of growth, a growth which was not without its conflicts.⁶¹

According to R. Brown a conflict may very well have arisen between an originating group composed of Palestinian Jews--those Jews of a "low" christology who regarded Jesus as the Davidic Messiah--and a second group--namely, those Jews of a "high" christology who regarded Jesus as unified with the Father (to such a degree that it became a threat to the monotheist Jewish Christians of the originating group).⁶² In other words, within the later stages of the Johannine communities there were possibly conflicting christological views between Jewish-Christian believers and the later Gentile converts (and, perhaps also between them and "Christian Jews" who were caught up in the waves of Pentecost to such an extent

that it brought them into conflict with Jewish Christians who thought the "high" christology idolatrous and, therefore, dangerous to their rooted monotheist beliefs. There does seem to be at first sight a subtle line between "unification" and "identification". At any rate, eventually this quandary led to a schism within the Johannine community itself. Question: Is the Gospel of Truth finally to be traced to the "high" christology group who were forced to secede?

Both gospels use the phrase "eternal life".⁶³ Both agree that *ידוע* is revelational and can only be given by the Father.⁶⁴ In John's gospel the "power to become children of God" which the believer (in the name of Jesus) has been given, is very likely to be connected to the "children of the Father" in the Gospel of Truth who "are his fragrances for they are from the grace of his countenance".⁶⁵

The "believers" in John's gospel seem to be at the beginning of their life in Christ. The "knowers" in the Gospel of Truth seem to be flourishing in their life within the Father. In John's gospel, to "believe" in the one whom the Father sent (i.e. the Son) marked the beginning of Jesus' relationship of living/abiding with those whom he met (Jn 1:41; 4:42; 8:31) on his way toward the Father. The Gospel of Truth tells its inhabitants that to "know" marks the fulfillment of this relationship--"to know" in the sense of the Hebrew *יָדַע* which implies a sharing in the being of that which is "known";

Now the end is receiving knowledge
about the one who is hidden,
and this is the Father,
from whom the beginning came forth from him. 66

The similarity between the two texts is remarkable. Yet the expansion which the Gospel of Truth has undergone is no less evident. What John's gospel had delegated to be the exclusive experience of Jesus; i.e. a relationship of unification

within the Father through the Spirit has become normative for all the "sons" behind the Gospel of Truth,

It is not improbable that before each of the gospels achieved their final form there, perhaps, were even closer resemblances between them. It is not unlikely that during the birth pangs of emerging orthodoxy, the community behind John's gospel felt it prudent not to "identify" too closely with those peripheral Christian groups who seemed to be moving toward the "other side" of the cutting edge of canonicity.

Hence, is it too far-fetched to suggest that the final redactor of John's gospel substituted ἀναπαύω for ἔνω as a way of steering a line between the edge of emerging orthodoxy and the edge of those "gnostic" groups soon to be called "heretical" with whom John's disciples felt akin, though apparently not so much so to wish to be identified with them ?

The tragedy is that these "heretical" groups, so much imbued with the life of the Father and his Spirit that they, perhaps, became "other Christs", were forced eventually out of a Christian world which before that time enjoyed a richness and diversity yet to be equalled in our present day.

In spite of the "expulsion" of these peripheral Christian groups exemplified in the Gospel of Hebrews, the Gospel of Philip, and the Gospel of Truth, (which was in fact the historical outcome) the kernel of their message still rests at the ground of our Christian tradition, dynamic and very much alive. And it is preserved in the Syrian Church to this very day.

There undoubtedly is a continuity of movement which can be traced from the Gospel of Mark to John, to the Gospel of Philip and to the Gospel of Truth. The relationship of unification which is hinted at in Mark 1:9 by the εἰς is opened up and revealed in all its splendour in the Apocryphal gospels; the Gospel of

Hebrews, the Gospel of Philip, and the Gospel of Truth, in the pneumatic expression of ἀναπαύω .

CONCLUSION

The previous study shows that the Jordan event was of utmost significance for the canonical gospels, particularly of Mark, Luke, and John; that the query over the who of Jesus the Christ was principally directed to the context of the Jordan event--namely, to the "pneumatic" beginning of Jesus.

I hope to have demonstrated that John's $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ (1:34) is in meaning a theological expansion of the $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in Mark(1:9); that this expansion is based upon the connection in meaning between $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ and $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ and the development of expression indicated by $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ as it is specifically used in the baptismal context throughout John's gospel; that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in John's gospel exemplifies the most developed canonical expression of Jesus' relationship of intimate closeness with the Father through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and that $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ as used in the Gospel of Hebrews, the Gospel of Philip, and the Gospel of Truth exemplifies the final expression of the relationship of "unification", eventually to be claimed "heretical" by emerging orthodox groups who perhaps saw their mode of Spirituality(their Christo-pneumatic sensibility)--with its emphasis on the intimate closeness of son and Father via the Spirit--as a dangerous perception of Christ.

Finally, in this brief investigation I hope to have given support to the view that that the gospel of John and the non-canonical gospels heretofore discussed are to be traced, ultimately, to a semitic sub-stratum. The principal key to this notion lies in the word $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ and in the context which the word is to be found in the Apocryphal gospels. Because we do find $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ used in connection with the Spirit($\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in Is 11:2 and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in 4 Kgs 2:15) in the Scriptures, its re-appearance in the apocryphal Gospel of Philip and Gospel of Truth need be reckoned with.

The gnosticism proper to these gospels is one which grasps the first axiom of the Scriptures--namely, the primordially of the Holy Spirit(Gn 1:2)and the creation of Adam(Gn 2:7).

The "transformative"(informative) $\rho\nu\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma$ interior to the apocryphal gospels discussed is not purely a "Hellenistic" $\rho\nu\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma$ --but a $\rho\nu\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma$ understood as a new life "transforming" the "Christ"ened one--a new life effected by the movements of the Holy Spirit, proper to the new Adam who has been unified with the Father precisely through the movements of the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, $\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\upsilon\omega$, as it appears in the Gospel of Truth and the Gospel of Philip, is not only an expansion of the Johannine $\eta\epsilon\nu\omega$, but is as well a revival of the original semitic sensibility characteristic of the "pneumatic" genesis of creation as the story is told by the Jewish soul.

The Jewish people of God received their genesis through the movement of the Holy Spirit. They were only then said to belong to Yahweh their Father. Jesus received his genesis through the one and the same Spirit. Now, he "belongs" to the Father. Jesus is the "beloved Son". This is how the New Testament begins. It ends with Jesus' disciples receiving the Spirit at Pentecost--a "double portion" of the Spirit, re-calling not only the waters of Jesus' Jordan, but stretching backward into time, into the Jordan of Elijah(4 Kgs 2:7; 2:9)!

Perhaps the secessionist group of the Johannine communities were originally themselves Jews--but ones who came to believe in Jesus as the new life-giver--the one come to impart again to them the self-same Spirit of Genesis. Perhaps the Jewish Christians behind the apocryphal gospels were indeed gnostics, but in the tradition of the original Mosaic covenant, before the dynastic Judaism of the later centuries developed in Syro-Palestine; a Judaism which would center itself around place(i.e. Jerusalem and synagogue). In contrast to this legalistic kind of Judaism,

the new Adams of the Christo-pneumatic period decidedly centered themselves in the Holy Spirit rather than in "place" and rubric "law".

As exodus formed part of the initial character of the semite who followed the Mosaic covenant, and as Jesus himself (rooted in the same Spirit) was, thereupon, uprooted from his own Judaism (which was in his day law and place centered), so too, it is not fantastic to presume that the early community behind the gospel of John would have exemplified this tension between outer law/place and inner law/Spirit. Perhaps the communities behind the apocryphal gospels are finally to be traced to the Johannine secessionist group who were filled with the Spirit of Pentecost, to such a degree that they (like their Lord and Master Jesus Christ) "became spirit". And, as a result of continuing harassment from fellow Jewish-Christians who as a majority may have felt them to have gone too far, these pentecostals were impelled by the impossible situation to exodus--Jesus the Christ may have truly become for them the "New Moses".

This hypothesis is quite feasible only if the relationship of intimate closeness which we find in John's gospel has been brought to light, as well as the semitic sub-stratum of the fourth gospel. Hence, the pneumatic expression of the baptismal account of John's gospel ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ Jn 1:32) is most likely a derivative construction from the $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in Is 11:2 and the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in 4 Kgs 2:15. Although G. Johnston formulated the basic hypothesis, in my view he failed to give adequate reasoning and evidence for John's usage of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in the baptismal context. As we have seen through our contextual study of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in John's gospel, it became evident that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ could be translated "to live" or "to abide". It is not unlikely that the reason why John substituted $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omega$ with $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ was in order to tone down the relationship of intimate closeness which was beginning to become a divisive force,

polarizing groups within his own community.

This relationship of intimate closeness is most evident in John's gospel-- in Jesus' discourse with Philip in 14:10, and the blasphemy/Jordan scene in 10:30-42. In Jesus' discourse with Philip it is made clear to the reader that the who of Jesus is straining toward expression. In three successive verses (Jn 14: 9,10, and 11) Jesus attempts to impart to Philip the truth about himself:

He who has seen me has seen the Father...
Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me?...
Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me...

And in 10:30 Jesus is said to tell his enemies:

I and the Father are one.

And as if to preview the discourse with Philip, the author of the fourth gospel in 10:38 puts the following words into the mouth of Jesus:

...even though you do not believe me...
...that the Father is in me and I am in the Father.

I stated that the apocryphal gospels, particularly the Gospel of Philip and the Gospel of Truth, exemplify the final expression of the relationship of intimate closeness by their usage of ἀνατταίνω in the baptismal context. Moreover, it is very likely that the title of the apocryphal Gospel of Philip is finally to be linked up with Jesus' discourse with Philip in Jn 14:10 (i.e. "I am in the Father and the Father in me...")! But the leitmotif has now been expanded to include not only Jesus himself, but all "sons".

But the thought that a Jew could consider himself another Christ; that is, totally unified within the Father on earth, would have been for the "orthodox" Jew, un-thinkable. It is not hard to imagine these Jewish Christian gnostics were

to become a threat both to Jewish "orthodoxy" and Christian "orthodoxy". For they would have stood beyond the cutting edge of both.

It is no wonder then that these Jewish-Christians of profound depth eventually were forced to make a new home for themselves. It is very likely that many Jewish-Christians were driven from their cosmopolitan cities to outlying regions on the cusp of Syro-Palestine. For as we have seen in the Gospel of Hebrews, their high esteem for James can now possibly be made sense of. Question: Are they--the community behind the gospel--part of that exodus which Eusebius speaks about; those who were forced north-eastward due to the impending destruction of their homeland Jerusalem? And what about the Gospel of Philip and the Gospel of Truth? If we are to take their literary associations with Armenian hymn material seriously (i.e. the Wortspiel *mēšihā/mēšihuta* and the Baptism-Pentecost relation), not to speak of their semitic roots as expressed by their "pneumatic"-based Christianity, is it not unlikely that the apocryphal gospels represent a later generation of Jewish-Christians who made their exodus from Jerusalem in the first century, north-eastward to the regions of Syria? But how did the gospels turn up in Egypt?

Might there have been attraction to the Egyptian monasteries of the desert? For there in the desert, protection from those not amenable to their lifestyle could be sought. Surely the power of Syria's theology would have brought them to Egypt.

Nonetheless, however these questions are answered, we are still left with only a faint glimpse of a time in which there was a dynamic web of interrelated Christian milieus, some of whom, in the midst of their struggle for survival and peace, lived, abided, and rested in intimate closeness with the Father through the Spirit.

If we listen, perhaps a murmuring of the ancient hymn will be heard in its fullness once again--the hymn of the Spirit singing through the risen ones, the sons; the hymn of unification...the hymn of at-one-ment.

NOTES

¹ The following investigation will concern itself with three non-canonical gospels. The first text, the Gospel of the Hebrews, is cited by P. Vielhauer in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher's New Testament Apocrypha I, pp. 163 ff. The second text, The Gospel of Philip, is one of many tractates which form the Nag Hammadi Writings. The gospel has been translated by W.W. Isenberg in J.M. Robinson's The Nag Hammadi Library, pp. 131-151; (cf also W. Foerster's Gnosis. A Selection of Gnostic Texts). The third text, the Gospel of Truth is as well part of the "Nag Hammadi" family. I will be using G.W. MacRae's translation in J.M. Robinson's edition, as well as K. Grobel's which can be found in his edition entitled The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel Translation from the Coptic and Commentary. A few words need be said about the possible dating of these non-canonical gospels. According to A. Klijn and G. Reinink, the Gospel of the Hebrews is first mentioned in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies III, 20, 2, (date disputed) and by Origen in his Homily on Job, 11, 12. Hegesippus knows about the Gospel of the Hebrews. Hence, it must be dated in the first half of the second century (cf Hennecke-Schneemelcher I, the German edition, p. 107). A possible dating for the Gospel of Philip is the second half of the second century. W. Foerster has noted that the gospel does show affinities with the Valentinian teaching of the "bridal chamber" (cf Irenaeus' Against Heresies III, 121 [ed. by J.T. Nielson]). R. McL. Wilson also dates the gospel around the second century. Wilson bases his suggestion on the fact that the Gospel of Philip, despite its Valentinian influences, shows itself to be not adverse to water baptism--thus, being more akin to early Jewish-Christian practices. Therefore, the gospel would very likely have been written during a

syncretistic period when divisions between orthodoxy and heresy were not so clear cut. The probable dating for the Gospel of Truth is the middle of the second century. The gospel is mentioned and said to be of the Valentinian school in the writings of Irenaeus, Against Heresies II, 11, 9. K. Grobel, G.W. MacRae, and E. Hennecke suggest that Valentinus wrote the gospel himself (cf Pseudo-Tertullian's Against Heresies, IV). However, because Pseudo-Tertullian does not tell us explicitly which gospel Valentinus is the author of, this evidence cannot be conclusive.

² It is generally accepted today that Mark's gospel is the oldest gospel by such scholars as R. Brown, N. Perrin, R. Bultmann, and W. Marxsen, to name but a few. The general date that is supposed is between 65 and 75. Many events of war seem to be reflected in the eschatological chapter 13, wherein the author emphasizes the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. This would necessarily put the gospel around the year 70.

³ In G. Vermes' book Jesus the Jew it is suggested that the principal reason why John the Baptizer is mentioned in the synoptics is out of a conscious effort on the part of the evangelists to subordinate John to Jesus as a polemic against John's disciples who may have been looked upon as a possible threat by the disciples of Jesus. Vermes postulates that "sentiments of rivalry between the two groups of disciples were not absent" (p. 31). It is interesting to note that Luke has John the Baptist introducing himself as the one who baptizes in water in contradistinction to the one who will baptize with the "Holy Spirit and fire" (Lk 3:20).

⁴ R. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, p. 240.

⁵ F.C. Conybeare, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, III, (1902) pp. 192-7 (cf Brown, Ibid., pp. 240-7).

⁶ This "new" existence bespeaks the nature of Jesus' Sonship (cf 1 Sam 10:6 :

" And the spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee [=David]...and thou shalt be turned into another man.").

⁷ cf bibliography in R. Brown's "The Gospel of John", p. 6, for the relationship between the Johannine and Lukan gospels, Also the Anchor Bible, p. 44 by the same author.

⁸ Ibid., cf relationship with Mark (also E. K. Lee, NTS, III-V, 1956-9, p.51.

⁹ A. Marshall translates $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ in John's gospel almost without exception "to remain" (cf the 1977 publication of the RSV- Interlinear). However, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ could also be translated "to live" or "to abide" in many instances throughout the gospel. I intend to discuss this issue at greater length in the following chapters.

¹⁰ see note #7 and #8.

¹¹ R. Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, pp. 178, 196.

¹² S. Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, p. 182.

¹³ W. Marxsen, W. Wrede, and T. Weeden are among many who have supported the view that Mark's gospel is principally a theological treatise and not an historically accurate work, and that Mark never meant his gospel to be such.

¹⁴ J. Wilkinson, Jerusalem As Jesus Knew It, pp. 96, 102, 106.

¹⁵ W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, in a concordance to the Greek N.T. list more than twenty-five appearances of forms of the verb $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$, all in a "to remain", "to live", and "to abide" context (cf also W. Bauer, Griechisch=Deutsches Wörterbuch, p. 792. There he notes that Jn 1:38 [$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nuει$] has the meaning "to live". And Jn 8:31 [$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nuητε$], 15:9 [$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\νατε$], and 14:10 [$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\νων$] have the meaning "to abide").

¹⁶ In G. Kittel's Wörterbuch, p. 580, the author makes a connection between $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ and the noun form of $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ in John: "... Die Gläubigen bleiben in Christus 6, 56; 15, 4-7;... und Christus bleibt in den Gläubigen Jn 15, 4-7,...". In Bauer's Wörterbuch, p. 792, he notes that "the phrase $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\iota$ is a favorite of John's

to mean: an inward, enduring, personal communion. So of God in his relationship (Verhältnis) to Christ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων "the Father who abides in me" (Jn 14:10). Of the Christians, in their relationship (Verhältnis) to Christ Jn 6:56; ... of Christ in his relationship (Verhältnis) to Christians Jn 15:4-5. Of the Christians in their relationship (Verhältnis) to God 1 Jn 2:24, 3:6, 4:13...". Also note in Jn 1:34 John the Baptist proclaims "I have seen (ἑώρακα) and witnessed that this one is the Son of God". (cf also ὁ ἑώρακώς ἐγὼ ἑώρακέν τόν πατέρα "the one who has seen me has seen the Father" Jn 14:9).

¹⁷ The "blasphemy" consists in the fact that Jesus' identification with the Father strikes at the very ground root of Jewish monotheism (cf Jn 5:18 "This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God"). R. Brown, in his book The Community of the Beloved Disciple suggests that the blasphemy scenes as described by the Johannine gospel points to an inner conflict to reconcile two Christologies. According to Brown, in the early period the Johannine community consisted of Jews whose belief in Jesus involved a relatively "low" christology (p. 25); that is, a christology which gave Jesus titles corresponding to OT expectations; for example, "Son of God" appears in II Sam 7:14. The later titles of "Lord" and "God" in John's gospel would indicate the presence of a "high" christology which would have brought the later generations of the Johannine community in conflict with the Jews who would have regarded titles of divinity as blasphemous.

¹⁸ This is not the first time Jesus has been threatened with stoning in the gospel. In Jn 8:59 it is said that Jesus "hid himself" and "went forth out of the temple" to escape stoning.

- 19 For discussion of views in detail see C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 74 ff.
- 20 S. Jellicoe, The LXX and Modern Study, pp. 59-64.
- 21 Ibid., p. 75.
- 22 Ibid., p. 342.
- 23 E. Hatch and H. Redpath, Concordance to the LXX, II, K-Q, 1954, pp. 910 ff.
- (cf also G. Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV, Stuttgart, p. 575.)
- 24 cf Brown, The Community of the Beloved Disciple, pp. 37-8 and see above #17.
- 25 G. Johnston, The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John, p. 19.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Dodd, Fourth Gospel, p. 87.
- 28 I doubt that the writer of the fourth gospel is speaking to an audience that is generally composed of what R. Bultmann has termed "Hellenist" gnostics. The view does not adequately take into account the multivarious streams of gnosticism prevalent during the first centuries.
- 29 cf Hennecke-Schneemelcher New Testament Apocrypha and Robinson's Nag Hammadi Library, pp. 34-5 and see above #1.
- 30 cf Hennecke-Schneemelcher Apocrypha, p. 34 and see above #1.
- 31 Ibid., pp. 163 ff. (cf also H.J. Schoeps, Jewish Christianity, p. 137.)
- 32 Ibid., Hennecke-Schneemelcher.
- 33 op. cit., Schoeps; (Note that the context of "rest" is present in Ps 132:14. David is depicted in this psalm traditionally as the one who is "seeking a place for the Lord, a tabernacle for the God of Jacob (verse 5). Note also the connection here with Sirach 24:7-8; cf also Ps 132:13.)
- 34 Hennecke-Schneemelcher I, p. 164.

35 An answer to what precisely "sonship" means is proportionate to the mode of spirituality of the gospel writer and the community behind the gospel for which "sonship" is particularly significant. Although classical biblical notions (OT) of "son" (i.e. Dan 7:14; Ps 2:7; and Is 42:1) have been considered by some scholars such as O. Cullman to be reflected in the naming of Jesus in the canonical gospels, it should be kept in mind that the gospels cannot be expected to have an unequivocal understanding of "son". The rich diversity which typified the earliest Christian milieus and the consequent divisions which arose between them attest to this high probability. I am suggesting that "sonship", being itself a consequence of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in Jesus, is to connected with the terms $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$, and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ respectively, where they appear in a baptismal context; that is, to those terms which are seeking to express what it meant for the Holy Spirit to share its life with the earliest Christian communities who referred to themselves as "sons" (cf 1 Pet 1:14; Heb 2:10; 12:15).

36 cf Robinson's edition The Nag Hammadi Library and Foerster's Gnostic Texts, p. 34 and above #1.

37 Ibid., Robinson's edition.

38 Ibid.

39 cf Gospel of Philip, 61b; Robinson, p. 137.

40 cf Gospel of Philip, 69; Robinson, p. 141 (cf also 74b, p. 144: "For it is from the anointing Syr. :m^ešihūtā we were called 'Christians' Syr. :m^ešihāyē... and 'the Christ' Syr. :m^ešihā has his name because of the anointing Syr. :mešhā. For the Father anointed the Son...". G. Winkler notes in "Zur frühchristlichen Tauftradition in Syrien und Armenien" numerous "word-plays" which appear in early Syrian and Armenian baptismal hymns. The Wortspiel most often found is the one which plays on the words the "anointed one" or "the Christ" Syr. :m^ešihā, and "the anointing" or "the chrism" Syr. :m^ešihūtā (cf pp. 288-9 in Winkler's article)

Hence, it is likely that the Gospel of Philip, which entertains the same Wortspiel, has its roots in the theology proper to this early Syrian literature. Consequently, it would be in the regions in and around Syria, rather than Egypt, where the Gospel of Philip would have its origins. In light of this Wortspiel we can perhaps better understand what the anointing (the "chrism") symbolizes for the Gospel of Philip. What the Wortspiel suggests is that to be given the anointing (the "chrism") was in fact to be given symbolically the anointed one (the "Christ") for the community initiates behind the Gospel of Philip. Question: Did these Christians (these "Christ"-ened ones) see the "Christ" and the "Holy Spirit" interchangeably? Although the passage is very difficult because of the Coptic, perhaps it is in this light that one can begin to make sense of the following passage in the Gospel of Philip: "Through the Holy Spirit we are begotten again, but we are begotten through Christ in the two [the light (the chrism) and the water]" (cf Robinson, p. 141.).

⁴¹ Gospel of Philip, 72, 75, and 79; Robinson, pp.143, 145, and 147.

⁴² cf Winkler's "Zur frühchristlichen Tauftradition", and see above pp.39-40, #1.

⁴³ Gospel of Philip, 70; Robinson, p. 142. The important thing to remember is not so much the possible Valentinian characteristics, but rather the reality that is seeking expression in the image "bridal chamber"; i.e. the place of rest (note that the connection between "rest" and "bridal chamber" appear in a number of Syrian and gnostic sources [cf Gospel of Thomas; Gospel of Philip; hymns of Ephrem]). It would be interesting to look into the origins of "bride" ($\nu\mu\eta\rho\eta$) and "bridegroom" ($\nu\mu\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$) in Jn 3:28. It is here that John the Baptist is speaking of Jesus as "he who has the bride ($\nu\mu\eta\rho\eta$) is the bridegroom ($\nu\mu\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$)". Who is this "bride" which Jesus is said to have by John? Perhaps, it is the Spirit who unifies the Father with the Son (=humankind with God) on the one hand, and on the other hand, the Son with humankind (=the second Adam with the first Adam).

⁴⁴ Gospel of Philip, 70-71; Robinson, pp. 142-3 (emphasis mine). Note the allusion as well to Jn 1:36.

⁴⁵ cf Winkler "Zur frühchristlichen Tauftradition", p. 291 and see above pp.39-40 #40. In the Armenian hymn there is very likely an allusion to Cant. 1:3 : "...your anointing oils are fragrant, your name is oil poured out...".

⁴⁶ cf Brown The Community of the Beloved Disciple, pp. 25 ff and p. 37, #17. But the word "Christology" for this study is too inaccurate. Christology deals with Christ as "logos"; i.e. an incarnation-centered spirituality. As is evidenced by the late addition of the Prologue in John's gospel and the logos tradition which was to develop out of it, this tradition is to be contrasted with the earlier tradition which is the subject of this study--that is, with the Christo-pneumatics of the apocryphal gospels mentioned and, possibly, the secessionist group in John as Brown has developed the notion. Hence, these groups, rather than being incarnation-centered, are most definitely baptism-centered.

⁴⁷ to be distinguished from "Hellenistic" gnosticism which is self-attainable; Gospel of Truth, 27, 31; Robinson, pp. 42 and 44 (cf also Grobel's versing, Gospel of Truth 22:31; 27:5; 37:5; and 37:23, pp. 80, 108, 172, and 174.).

⁴⁸ Note that the "Father" is the origin and end for the Christian in the Gospel of Truth and forms the central axis point around which the whole gospel revolves. "Father" appears seventy-two times in the gospel. It is highly significant that for the gospel of John, "Father" is also the origin and end for Jesus (Jn 20:21; 16:28) and his disciples (Jn 14:20; 15:15; 17:26; and 20:21). The "Father" like in the Gospel of Truth, forms the central axis point of the gospel of John. In John's gospel "Father" appears more than thirty-eight times.

⁴⁹ Gospel of Truth 18, 27; Robinson, pp. 38 and 42 (cf also Grobel, 38:6; 38:11, 240:24; and 41:1, pp. 178-80, 98, and 190, for passages which speak of the transformative (that is, informative) character of ϩϯϩϩϩ).

⁵⁰ Gospel of Truth 17, 18; Robinson, p. 38; I realize that there is no "explicit mention of "Adam" in the Gospel of Truth. But since the gospel does make much ado over the ancient biblical symbol of "paradise" in connection with $\gamma\omega\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$, I believe the Adam typology is suggested. It is worth noting that in early Syrian liturgy Christ descends into the Jordan to recover the lost Adam. The 5th century poet Jacob of Sarugh, explaining why he wishes to be baptized, has been quoted as saying " I am looking for the lost Adam ". Hence, a connection between "Adam" (Jacob of Sarugh) and "paradise"(the Gospel of Truth) pending, I would opt for a Syrian origin for the Gospel of Truth.

⁵¹ Gospel of Truth 36; Robinson, p. 46.

⁵² The Father's "bosom" symbolizing the Holy Spirit appears in the Gospel of Truth 24; Robinson, p. 41 : "The Father reveals his bosom--now his bosom is the Holy Spirit". The Father's "tongue" symbolizing the Word appears in the same gospel 26; Robinson, p. 42 : "For everyone loves the truth because the truth is the mouth of the Father; his tongue is the Holy Spirit."

⁵³ The emphasis which the Gospel of Truth places on "naming" is semitic in character. For the semitic mind, to know a name is to share in the being which that name signifies (Ex 3:13, 15; 20:7; Deut 10:20; 2 Sam 22:50; Ps 45:18; and 99:6). Perhaps it is in this sense that we are to understand verse 40; Robinson, p. 48.

⁵⁴ cf the Gospel of Truth 42; Robinson, p. 48 : "...the Father is within them and they are in the Father...".

⁵⁵ Gospel of Truth 38; Robinson, p. 47 (cf also Jn 17:12 : "While I was with them, I kept them in thy Name, which thou hast given me".),

⁵⁶ Gospel of Truth 42; Robinson, p. 48 (cf also Jn 14:11 : "Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me"; and Jn 17:21 : "...that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us...").

⁵⁷ see note #17, p. 37.

⁵⁸ see note #48, p. 41.

⁵⁹ Jn 16:28

⁶⁰ Jn 8:14

⁶¹ R. Brown, The Community of the Beloved Disciple, pp. 151 ff.

⁶² see note #17, p. 37.

⁶³ Gospel of Truth 43; Robinson, p. 49: "They are the ones who appear in truth since they exist in true and eternal life..."; and Jn 3:36: "The one believing in the son has life eternal."

⁶⁴ Gospel of Truth 27; Robinson, p. 42: "But the Father is perfect, knowing every space within him. If he wishes, he manifests whomever he wishes by...giving him a name..." and Jn 6:65: "This is why I told you that no one can come to me unless it is granted him by the Father."

⁶⁵ Gospel of Truth 33, 34; Robinson, p. 45(cf also 19,p. 39: "After all these, there came the little children also, those to whom the knowledge of the Father belongs."); and Jn 1:12: "But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave the power to become children of God..."

⁶⁶ Gospel of Truth 37, 38; Robinson, p. 46(cf also Jn 16:28 : "I came from the Father...I am leaving the world and going to the Father.").

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. The Gospel of John and Judaism.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975, trans. by D.M. Smith.
- Bauer, Walter. Orthodoxy and Heresy. Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
1971, trans. by a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christ-
ian Origins, and edited by G. Krodel.
- Bauer, Walter. Griechisch=Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des
Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur.
Göttingen, 1928.
- Brown, Raymond. The Birth of the Messiah. Garden City, New York:
Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1977.
- Brown, Raymond. The Community of the Beloved Disciple. New York:
Paulist Press, 1979.
- Brown, Raymond. "The Gospel of John". N.T. Reading Guide.
Collegeville, Mn: Liturgical Press, 1960.
- Brown, Raymond. The Gospel According to John, I-XII.
New York: Doubleday & Co., 1966.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Primitive Christianity. London: Thames and Hudson, 1956.
- Cullman, Oscar. Christ and Time: The Primitive Conception of Time
and History. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. The Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Foerster, Werner. Gnosis, A Selection of Gnostic Texts, II.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974, trans. by R.McL Wilson.
- Grobel, Kendrick. The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the
Gospel Translation from the Coptic and Commentary.
New York: Abingdon Press, 1969.

- Hennecke, Edgar and Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. New Testament Apocrypha: Volume I, Gospels and Related Writings. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963, trans. by A.J.B. Higgins and others.
- Johnston, George. The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart, 1933.
- Lee, Kenneth. "St. Mark and the Fourth Gospel". New Testament Studies, III-V. London: Cambridge University Press, 1956-9, pp. 53-8.
- Marshall, Alfred. The Revised Standard Version Interlinear Greek-English New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977.
- Marxsen, Willi. Introduction to the New Testament. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968, trans. by G. Buswell.
- Moulton, Harold Keeling. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.
- Robinson, James. The Nag Hammadi Library In English, ed. by Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Robinson, James and Koester, Helmut. Trajectories Through Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Sandmel, Samuel. The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Jewish Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969, trans by D. Hare.
- Vermes, Geza. Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. London: Fontana Collins, 1973.

Weeden, Theodore. Mark: Tradition in Conflict.

Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Wilkinson, John. Jerusalem As Jesus Knew It: Archeology as Evidence.

London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 1978.

Williamson, Geoffrey Arthur, trans. Eusebius: The History of the Church.

Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.

Wilson, Robert McLachlan. The Gospel of Philip.

London: AR. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1962.

Winkler, Gabriele. "Zur frühchristlichen Tauftradition in Syria und Armenien unter Einbezug der Taufe Jesu", Ostkirchliche Studien, 27.

Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1978, pp. 281-306.

Wrede, William. The Messianic Secret. Cambridge: J. Clarke, 1971.