

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Problem

It has always been recognized that no other Gospel narrates as impressively as John the confrontation of the world and of the believers with the glory of Jesus¹

The glory of the Incarnate Word presented in the Fourth Gospel and the impressive way in which John² has related it have been widely acknowledged. However, although John's Gospel not only proclaims the glory of Christ but also declares the *glory of his followers*, relatively little attention has been given to John's statements about the glory Jesus has given to his people. John's declaration that "the Word became flesh and dwelt *among us*" and that his glory has been witnessed by his disciples has had a notable impact on readers of the Gospel, but relatively few have given proper recognition to the Fourth Evangelist's assertion that the Word, when received by believers, also becomes incarnate *in them* and *dwells in them*³ and that God's plan for the revelation of the divine glory in Jesus was meant to be continued *in his followers*.

Some Johannine interpreters apparently view the Fourth Gospel (FG) as only a Christological writing, but others have seen that while the primary objective of the FG is Christological, the author was concerned with *soteriology*, *ecclesiology*, and *missiology* as well. Barrett writes:

¹ Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*, trans. Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968; First paperback edition, 1978), 6.

² In referring to the author of the Fourth Gospel, the name *John* is sometimes used in this study for the sake of convenience. It is not within the scope of this thesis to address the issues of authorship, date, sources, or methods or layers of composition. In order to understand the Fourth Gospel, one must endeavor to enter into its thought world, and I approach this Gospel as it has come to us, as a finished work and a unified whole. More and more contemporary Johannine interpreters have come to recognize the narrative unity of this Gospel and to appreciate it as a work of art. I share this acknowledgment and appreciation.

³ Hoskyns and Bultmann both point this out in commenting on 1.14. See Edwyn C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. Francis Noel Davy (London: Faber & Faber, 1947), 148; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 69.

... John does not use the word ἐκκλησία [He] does, however, show more clearly than any other evangelist, an awareness of the existence of the church Moreover, a universal mission is implied....⁴

Jesus in the FG came not only to make God known to a group of close followers, so that they might have eternal life, but also to pass on to them and future disciples some of *his glory* (δόξα), as Moses did for Joshua (Num 27.20), so that they could continue to do the work he was doing after he departed, in order that *the world* might come to believe in him (John 17.23). But what is the nature of the *glory* (δόξα) that Jesus gives to his followers? Among the answers given by interpreters to this question are *faith, love, the fullness of divine life, the presence of God, knowledge of the Father, the “manifestation of the divine nature in man”*.

Jesus declares in John 17 that he has given his followers the δόξα the Father has given him (17.22). Only here in John is it stated explicitly that Jesus has given δόξα to his followers. Jesus’ declaration in 17.24 that he wishes his followers to be with him to *see* his δόξα implies that believers will *participate* in it, but no definition or description of this δόξα is given. If one knows the nature of the δόξα that the Father has given to the Son, then one would know the nature of the δόξα that the Son passes on to his people, but the nature of the Son’s δόξα is also unclear.

Neither in the Prologue nor in Chap 17 is a definition given of δόξα, except for 1.14, where δόξα or the Word is described as “full of grace and truth.” John speaks about two kinds of δόξα available to people: human δόξα and δόξα from God (5.44, 12.43). It is obvious from the context in these passages what is meant by human δόξα, but it is unclear what δόξα from God is. Much literature has been devoted to the topic of the glory of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, but scant attention has been given to the glory of the followers of Jesus. And although John 17.21-23 has been frequently cited to promote various causes based on the assumption this text refers to church unity, the theme of the glory that Christ has given to his people to enable their unity has scarcely been noted. *What is the glory that Christ has given to believers? If Christ’s purpose in giving his glory to his followers was so that they might be one, as John 17.22 declares, what is meant by this “oneness”?*

Various answers have been offered to the above questions by Johannine interpreters, and there is no consensus. “Exactly what is meant by these clauses is much disputed.”⁵ Amidst the wide diversity of solutions suggested for this conundrum, no clear, convincing answers have been offered by contemporary interpreters. This study seeks to make a contribution to the understanding of the meaning of δόξα and *oneness* in John 17.22-23 by a methodical analysis of John 17, with special attention to vv. 22-23. It will be seen that answers to the questions regarding the nature of the δόξα in 17.22-23 are found primarily in Chap 17 and in the Farewell Discourses, although there are relevant passages in other sections of

⁴ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 92, 93.

⁵ Donald Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 568.

the FG that will be studied as well. This is also true of the questions regarding the nature of *oneness* in 17.22-23, a theme closely linked with δόξα. It is not within the scope of this study to discuss every text in the FG that speaks of δόξα or δοξάζω, but those that are most closely associated with the passage under study will be included.

1.2 Current Understandings of the Gift of Δόξα Given to Believers

Very few recent Johannine interpreters appear to have delved to any extent into the subject of the δόξα given to Jesus' followers, although most have commented on it briefly, and a few, more at length. Some Johannine commentators show little interest in the gift of δόξα in 17.22, e.g. Beasley-Murray and J. Ramsey Michaels, who do not offer a definition of δόξα even where the word first occurs (1.14), and none at 17.22. In fact, Michaels completely overlooks 17.22a and comments only on 17.22b.^{6,7} F. F. Bruce makes no mention of glory in commenting on 17.22, but he does give a definition of glory in his comments on 1.14.⁸ Raymond Brown has focused his attention on unity in 17.22-23 in the "Comments" section of his commentary, and makes no mention of δόξα there.⁹ In the "Notes" section, he comments only on the perfect tense of both verbs in 17.22, and suggests that the glory will be given after Jesus' resurrection, but he does not offer a definition of that glory.¹⁰ Dirk van der Merwe has written an article on 17.20-23 but also focuses totally on unity and makes no comment at all on the gift of glory.¹¹ Dodd, in his book *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*,¹² writes profusely about the glory of Christ but says nothing about the glory given to believers in discussing the Farewell Prayer.

Bultmann gives several answers, which only confuses the issue.¹³ He writes:

... what else does the sentence mean than that he revealed to them the name of God (v. 6), which God has given him (v. 11)? Or that he imparted to them the words of God which he had received from God (v. 8)? He has bestowed his δόξα on them, in that he is acknowledged among them as the Revealer and by this means is himself glorified (v. 10)...[T]he faith of the community can be called its δόξα, a gift bestowed on it by him,

⁶ George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987), 14, 302.

⁷ J. Ramsey Michaels, *John* (NIBCNT 4; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 23, 24, 26, 298-299

⁸ F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 41, 335-6.

⁹ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; AB 29-29A; New York: Doubleday, 1966-1970), 2:774-9.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 770-1.

¹¹ D. van der Merwe, "The Character of Unity Expected among the Disciples of Jesus, according to John 17:20-23," *Acta Patristica Et Byzantina* 13 (2002): 222-252.

¹² C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953; reprint, 1995), 417-23.

¹³ Bultmann, 515-516.

and it too can be said to be glorified in the same way as he ...it receives a share in his work of revelation.... [A]fter his departure they are to represent him in the world.¹⁴

Bultmann is right in suggesting that all of the above is related to the giving of δόξα, but he does not explain *how* the revelation of God's name or the giving of God's words relates to glory, or *how* Jesus' being acknowledged by the disciples as the Revealer imparts glory to them. It is also unclear why the community's faith can be called its δόξα. It is true that the believers will have a part in Jesus' work of revealing the Father after he is gone. Does this mean, then, that participation in the work of revelation is an *honor* that God gives them? Or is there more than that? Again, he does not make his point clear. These statements are suggestive but are not helpful or convincing. They need to be explained and expanded. They not only need clarification but also substantiation.

The views of Johannine commentators on this gift are divergent, partly because they have asked and answered different questions. Some have asked and answered the question: "*What* is the gift of δόξα?" while others have answered the question: "*How* was the δόξα given?" Still others have answered the question: "What does the gift of δόξα *entail*, in terms of the disciples' mission?" The answers are wide-ranging, although some overlap or are closely related.

The first group of answers (to the question "What is the gift of δόξα?") may be categorized under eleven headings: life, the divine presence, love, the divine nature, knowledge of the Father, oneness with God, the life-giving revelation, faith, divine acceptance, function as the revealer of God, the glory of God, which has been bestowed on Christ in his return to the Father.

1. *Life*: Rudolf Schnackenburg suggests that the gift of δόξα in 17.22 is life. He begins by pointing out that "Jesus himself possesses the Father's glory and has possessed it from eternity, but he also regains it after his exaltation on the cross (see v. 5)." By communicating divine life to his disciples, he gives them a share in this glory, the glory for which Jesus petitioned in v. 2 and which he "has always had with the Father." He considers Jesus' statement about this gift as "anticipatory language," since it "makes present what will only be fully realized in the heavenly or future world."¹⁵ Schnackenburg begins with a statement implying that the gift given to disciples is *a share in Jesus' glory*, which is the Father's glory, but changes his focus to *divine life*. Then he defines the divine life as *love*, the "splendour and power of divine love," using the words of W. Thüsing. This is rather confusing, since he changes from *glory* to *divine life* to *divine love*. Of course, these are closely related, but he does not explain the relationship among them, nor does he give any explanation as to how or why δόξα "points to the fulness of divine life." He also does not explain the relationship between divine life and divine love.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, vol. 3, trans. David Smith and G. A. Kon (HTKNT; New York: Crossroad, 1987), 192.

2. *The divine presence (and life)*: David K. Rensberger,¹⁶ D. Moody Smith,¹⁷ Ben Witherington, III¹⁸, Rudolf Bultmann, and Rodney Whitacre posit that the gift Jesus has given the believers is the divine presence. Witherington thinks it is “the divine presence and life.” Whitacre has the same thought. Whitacre begins by stating that “*glory* refers to the revelation of God in all his beauty of being and character. But, also ...*glory* is a manifestation of God himself -- not just a revelation about him, but his actual presence (cf. Exod 33.18-23). Jesus shares in this glory as the eternal Son (vv. 5, 24), and he has now given ... this glory to his disciples.”¹⁹ He adds that Jesus’ revelation of the Father to the disciples “brings them the knowledge that is a participation in God’s own eternal life (v. 3).” So he and Witherington both maintain that the δόξα consists of God’s presence and life, while Rensberger simply states that “glory implies the presence of God,” and refers to 17.5 and 24. Smith declares that the glory which Jesus receives from God and passes on to his disciples is “God’s reality, his real presence, as it is manifest to humankind.”²⁰ It is true, as Whitacre points out, that Jesus by revealing the Father to them has brought them into a life-giving relationship with the Father, for eternal life is to know the Father (17.3). He makes a meaningful connection between 17.6 and 17.3, and has commented slightly more in detail on the subject of δόξα in 17.22 than most commentators have done. More can be said, however. Whitacre’s comments have only scratched the surface.

Bultmann maintains that v. 23 is parallel to v. 22. He writes: “‘I am in them, and Thou art in me’ (v. 23) says the same thing. For he is not ‘in them’ in the sense of being an image in their historical recollection,...but precisely as the Revealer, as the one in whom God is. And...his being is made real in them in the witness they bear to him through the word which proclaims him.”²¹ One needs to ask how Bultmann can be sure that v. 23 is saying “the same thing” as v. 22, since the words “I in them and you in me” may explain the way in which the Father and the Son are one (v. 22c) rather than being equivalent to the δόξα that has been given, as he maintains. Moreover, the statement that Christ’s “being is made real in them in the witness they bear to him through the word which proclaims him” is unclear. Bultmann’s thought is probably based on his understanding that “the community’s task for the world,” viz. the task of proclaiming Christ to the world, is the ultimate goal (vv. 21, 23), for he is sending them into the world as the Father has sent him.²² Elsewhere, Bultmann states that Jesus’ δόξα “is not something already existent” but “is brought about in his work as Revealer and in men’s response to that work *within history*. His δόξα consists in the fact that history has received the possibility of faith (and unbelief), and thus of life (and death) through

¹⁶ David K. Rensberger, “The Gospel according to John,” *HCSB* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 2047.

¹⁷ D. Moody Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John. New Testament Theology*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 122.

¹⁸ Ben Witherington, III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 271.

¹⁹ Rodney A. Whitacre, *John* (IVPNTC; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 417.

²⁰ Smith, 122.

²¹ Bultmann, 516.

²² *Ibid.*

his work.”²³ Does this mean that neither Jesus nor the believers have δόξα unless and until they do the work of being revealers? Is he saying that before he began his work as Revealer, Jesus did not have δόξα?

3. *Love*: A. M. Ramsey, H. Hegermann and F. Moloney believe that the gift of δόξα is love. To Hegermann it is Jesus’ love, manifested in his “loving sacrifice in death” and given to his people.²⁴ He probably means it is the *Father’s* love, given to Jesus, which then becomes *Jesus’* love, which he gives to his people. To Ramsey, it is “the glory of self-giving love which is the glory of the Father and the Son.”²⁵ Moloney declares that the δόξα, “which is the love bestowed upon the Son by the Father . . . , is present . . . in the *doxa* that Jesus has given to the believers”²⁶ It is true that in Johannine theology God is love, and the self-giving love of the Father and the Son is a glorious gift that has been given to the people of God. However, v. 24 declares that the Father has given glory to the Son because he loved him before the foundation of the world. Now if this statement is related to v. 22, which also states that the Father has given glory to the Son, then it would be strange for Jesus to say that the gift the Father gave him out of love was *love*, unless the glory in v. 22 is a different glory from that in v. 24. But this is unlikely. V. 24 indicates that love was the *motivation* for the giving of glory, not the gift itself.

4. *The divine nature*: B. F. Westcott and J. H. Bernard both say that the gift of glory is the revelation of the divine nature in human beings. Westcott writes: “This glory comes from the perfect apprehension of the Father as fulfilling His work of love (comp. v. 3). Viewed from another point of sight it is the revelation of the divine in man realised in and through Christ. . . . The fulness of this glory is to be made known hereafter in the Lord’s presence; but meanwhile it is partially presented in the different manifestations of Christ’s action in believers through the power and beauty and truth of the Christian life.”²⁷ Bernard writes similarly that this glory is “the manifestation of the Divine Nature in man.”²⁸ This is in accord with the definition of δόξα that is suggested in this study (p. 158). Various aspects and meanings of the divine δόξα are summed up in the expression *the divine nature* or *the character of God*, so that when the FG states that Jesus’ disciples have seen his *glory* (1.14), it means that they have seen the *divine nature* that was manifested in Jesus through the Father who dwelt in him. Likewise, Jesus has imparted this same δόξα of God’s nature or character to his disciples by giving them the ἐξουσία to become children of God (1.12-13).

5. *Knowledge of the Father*: Ernst Haenchen comments very briefly on the δόξα that Jesus has given to his people. He writes: “Jesus has not retained the

²³ Ibid., 492.

²⁴ H. Hegermann, “Δόξα” in *EDNT* 1:348.

²⁵ A. M. Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ* (London: Longmans, Green, 1949), 83.

²⁶ F. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 474.

²⁷ B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St John (The Speaker’s Commentary, 1881; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 246.*

²⁸ J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ed. A. H. McNeile, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), 2:578.

glory that the Father has given him, but has passed it on to his own: the knowledge of his Father, so that they may be unified in faith.”²⁹ Knowledge of the Father is a gift that Jesus has given to his followers, but it is nowhere said that the Father gave knowledge of himself to the Son. The Son already knows the Father, since he is “in the bosom of the Father” (1.18; cf. 10.15), and the Father is always with him (16.32).

6. *Oneness with God*: G. B. Caird thinks δόξα is oneness with God. “Jesus ...contrast[s] the δόξα (recognition) which men seek from one another, and which blinds them to the reality of the true δόξα (oneness with God) which he himself is content to receive as a gift at the hands of his Father (5.41-44).”³⁰ In 17.22 oneness with God is the *purpose* for giving the gift; thus it cannot be the gift itself.

7. *The life-giving revelation*: Wilhelm Thüsing considers all the gifts the Father has given the Son: his name, his words, the Spirit without measure, all things in his hands, and he concludes that the gift of the Father to the Son that he passes on to the disciples is “the whole life-giving revelation through the Spirit.”³¹ This is a possible answer, since Jesus did receive from the Father the words of God, the Spirit, all things, and the revelation of the Father’s name, and has passed all these on to his people.

8. *Faith*: Rudolf Bultmann’s suggestion of “the faith of the community”³² has already received a comment above.

9. *Divine acceptance*: J. C. Fenton’s thought that the gift is “the Father’s acceptance of the Son ... Jesus has given this to the faithful...”³³ is incorrect, since nowhere is it stated in John that the Father accepted the Son, nor is it ever said that God “accepts” the believers. Rather, it is the believers who accept Jesus (1.12). The Father loves the Son, and he loves the Son’s followers with the same love. Acceptance of the Son by the Father is not a Johannine concept.

10. *Function as the revealer of God*: Lindars points out that Jesus has passed on to the disciples “his function as the revealer of God (1.14), displayed through every facet of his life and teaching.” He gave this to them “not only by entrusting to them the message of salvation, but also by creating in them a form of life which bears witness to it...John thinks of the glory of Jesus as primarily a matter of relationship. As the revealer of God he reflects God’s glory, and this is only possible because of the special relationship between them.”³⁴ At 1.14, Lindars implies that *glory* is “the revelation of the divine mercy.”³⁵ At 17.5 he states that it is “a matter of intimate personal relationship, rather than splendid robes and royal state. In the final reckoning, it can only be expressed in terms of love (verse

²⁹ Ernst Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, ed. Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse, trans. Robert W. Funk, 2 vols. (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 2:155.

³⁰ G. B. Caird, “The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics,” *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 265-277.

³¹ Wilhelm Thüsing, *Herrlichkeit und Einheit: Eine Auslegung des Hohepriesterlichen Gebetes Jesu (Joh 17)* (Leipzig: St. Benno, 1961), 110-111.

³² Bultmann, 515.

³³ J. C. Fenton, *The Gospel according to John* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), 177.

³⁴ Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 530.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 95.

24).³⁶ *Lindars* is right in saying that Jesus has given his followers his function as the Revealer, and that the revealer of God “reflects God’s glory,” but these statements lack clarity and preciseness. The implication seems to be that *glory* is expressed as love rather than as impressive splendor and kingly power.

11. *The glory of God, which has been bestowed on Christ in his return to the Father*: C. K. Barrett connects δόξα in v. 22 with Jesus’ petition for glorification in vv. 1 and 5. The ascended, glorified Christ “has communicated his glory to the church, which, being in God, could not fail to share in the glory of God. This does not however teach a crude *theologia gloriae*. The glory is the glory of Christ, and the glory of Christ is acquired through, and is most completely expressed in, the crucifixion. The church receives glory on precisely the same terms, by unity in faith with the death and resurrection of Jesus, and expresses it in obedience, and pre-eminently in humiliation, poverty, and suffering.”³⁷ The reader already knows that the glory that God has given to his Son is his own glory, since the Father and the Son are one, and their glory is one, and the glory that Jesus has given to his followers is of course the divine glory. However, 1.14, 2.11, and 11.40 have indicated that this glory has already been seen in the incarnate Son. Why then does Barrett seem to think that the glory that Christ gives to believers is different from that which he had on earth? This interpretation also seems to suggest that the glory of the Church is not a gift of grace but a reward for suffering, since Jesus “acquired [it] through the crucifixion,” and the Church will receive it “by unity in faith with the death and resurrection of Jesus, and expresses it in obedience, and pre-eminently in humiliation, poverty, and suffering.” In saying that Jesus acquired it through the cross, he seems to be contradicting 17.5 and 24, which state that Jesus already had glory before the world existed and was returning to the same glory. Of course, there are those who believe that on account of Jesus’ suffering on the cross he was elevated to a greater height of glory, but the FG does not tell of a *kenosis* or of God’s exalting Jesus to a higher status than before the incarnation; nor does Phil 2.5-11, which speaks of the deity of the Son before his incarnation. Certainly there is no higher position than that of God to which he could have been exalted.

The second group has answered the question “How was the glory given?”

1. *By Jesus’ completion of his revelatory task*: D. A. Carson equates Jesus’ giving his glory to his followers with his having “brought to completion his revelatory task,” which was to manifest God’s character or person “in a revelatory context.”³⁸ He states that “Jesus has mediated the glory of God” to them,³⁹ but Carson’s statements do not reveal what that gift of glory comprises. He only states that it is not the glory for which Jesus asks in vv. 1, 5, for “this makes v. 22 necessarily anachronistic.”⁴⁰ The following statements from Bultmann also connect the gift to the revelatory work of Jesus and also omit any definition of the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 520-1.

³⁷ Barrett, 513.

³⁸ Carson, 569.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 568-9.

gift of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$: “he revealed to them the name of God;”⁴¹ “he imparted to them the words of God.”⁴²

2. *In that he is acknowledged among them as the Revealer and by this means is himself glorified*: This also comes from Bultmann. Again this is vague and without explanation or substantiation.⁴³

A third group has apparently answered the question: “What does the gift of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ entail?”

1. *Identification with Jesus’ death and resurrection* and following him in the way of the cross, which means suffering, defeat, and death (John Marsh).⁴⁴
2. *Work*: “doing the work appointed for them” (Sanders and Mastin);⁴⁵ “the true glory lay in the path of lowly service wherever it might lead them....For them ... the way of the cross is the way to true glory” (Leon Morris);⁴⁶ “[the community] receives a share in his work of revelation,” and “after his departure they are to represent him in the world” (Bultmann).⁴⁷

The second and third groups of commentators have failed to answer the question about the nature of the $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ given to believers.

Along with the wide-ranging interpretations of the $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ given to believers, one finds various understandings of the oneness concept in 17.20-23. Many authors have used this passage to argue for or against ecumenism and church union, to call for certain types of church organization, to promote unity in the missionary endeavor and message of the church, to encourage mystical union, to accentuate the importance of miracles, and so forth.⁴⁸ There is an obvious need for clarification on the questions regarding both $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ and oneness in John 17.

1.3 Method

The method used in this study is based on the principles and approaches set forth by Eugene A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw in their *Greek-English Lexicon of the*

⁴¹ Bultmann, 515.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ John Marsh, *The Gospel of St. John* (SCM Pelican Commentaries; London: SCM Press, 1968), 571.

⁴⁵ J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968), 377.

⁴⁶ Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, rev. ed. (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 650.

⁴⁷ Bultmann, 515, 516.

⁴⁸ See Brown (2:774-779) for an excellent discussion of the many understandings and misinterpretations of *oneness* in 17.22-23, and of what he considers a correct interpretation of this concept. See also J. F. Randall’s article “The Theme of Unity in John 17:20-23” in *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 41 (1965): 373-394. See Dodd, *Interpretation*, 187-200 for his enlightening chapter on “Union with God.”

New Testament Based on Semantic Domains,⁴⁹ in Louw’s *Semantics of New Testament Greek*,⁵⁰ and in Nida and Louw’s *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*.⁵¹

1.3.1 The Meaning of “Meaning”

Nida states that meaning is not something a word possesses, but “a set of relations for which a verbal symbol is a sign.”⁵² Since words are only “symbols or tokens to signify an entity,”⁵³ one’s starting point should be meaning, not the word.⁵⁴ A word does not have meaning but is used to communicate meaning. Rather than offer another definition for meaning, Louw proceeds to “show how different features of meaning illustrate basic principles, and from these principles to try to understand how meaning operates in linguistic semantics.”⁵⁵ He considers the above statement by Nida a “workable principle if ‘verbal symbol’ is extended to include not only single words, but also discourses.”⁵⁶

A word outside a context does not have a meaning but only “possibilities of meaning.”⁵⁷ In order to determine the meaning of any word, it is necessary to look at the context in which it is used. The context will indicate the particular potential of the word to be realized in that particular case from the list of possible meanings.

Meaning ...depends on the relations among words (or their combinations), and their grammatical structure. It is also dependent on the situation of the utterance. Semantics is therefore concerned with more than simply the meanings of words.... *all* the things that contribute to meaning must be explored All language units... – words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and so forth, even the total document or narrative.⁵⁸

Louw lists several types of meaning; these include cognitive, figurative, and grammatical.⁵⁹ Cognitive meanings are generally the “objects or events signified, that is, the referents in the practical world.”⁶⁰ A figurative meaning is based on a cognitive meaning but “constitutes a separate meaning usually belonging to a quite

⁴⁹ J. P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988, 1989).

⁵⁰ Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (SemeiaSt; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982).

⁵¹ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament: A Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. (SBLRBS 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

⁵² Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures* (Munich: Fink, 1975), 14.

⁵³ Louw, *Semantics*, 20.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

different semantic domain....”⁶¹ When someone refers to a person as “a fox,” the meaning does not belong to the domain of animals but to that of (wicked) people.⁶² Grammatical meaning depends on: 1) “the relationship between agents, instruments, locations, affected, etc., and the event or state; 2) the grouping of constituents within a sentence; 3) the qualifications added to entities.”⁶³ Semantic theory must be seen against the background of a syntactic theory, since there would be no utterance to interpret unless there is a syntactic structure.⁶⁴

Louw also speaks of two approaches to the problem of meaning. One involves considering the different meanings of the same lexeme, and the other involves consideration of the related meanings of different lexemes. The first approach looks at how the meaning of a given word or phrase may be understood in the light of its syntactic and contextual settings. The second approach deals with the way a meaning may be presented by different lexemes each of which focuses on the same set of features of that meaning. The “*related* meanings of different lexical units are much closer in semantic space than the *different* meanings of the same lexical unit.”⁶⁵

1.3.2 Some Basic Principles of Semantic Analysis⁶⁶

1.3.2.1 There are no synonyms.

There are no two lexemes that have exactly the same meanings in every context in which they are found. There are words whose semantic ranges overlap to some extent, and “in some contexts they may represent ...the same referent,” but not in all contexts.⁶⁷

... no two closely related meanings ever occur with exactly the same range of referents, much less the same set of connotative or associative features.⁶⁸

Examples of lexemes which are semantically close and are interchangeable in some but not all contexts are: φιλέω/ἀγαπάω, λέγω/λαλέω, ὁράω/βλέπω, γινώσκω/οἶδα. In these semantically related pairs, there appears to be almost no difference in designative meaning, but there is probably “some subtle distinctions in associative meaning.”⁶⁹ For instance, although φιλέω and ἀγαπάω seem to have the same or almost the same semantic range, in some NT passages there seems to

⁶¹ Ibid., 55.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 58.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 60.

⁶⁶ For the complete list of basic principles of semantic analysis, see the introduction to Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*.

⁶⁷ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 5.

⁶⁸ LNLEX, xvi.

⁶⁹ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 85.

be some semantic distinction between them, because there are contexts in which ἀγαπάω is used in commanding believers to love, while φιλέω is never used in the imperative. The difference may lie in the fact that ἀγαπάω has to do with one's appreciation of the worth of a person or object, while φιλέω is used when speaking of one's attachment to someone or something.⁷⁰ It may be presumed that a person is more likely to be commanded to appreciate someone than to be told to be attached to a person or thing.⁷¹

1.3.2.2 The context marks the differences in meaning.

Either the textual or extra-textual context points to the meaning of a term.⁷² The immediate sentence or paragraph, a larger section, the entire discourse, other documents by the same writer, other writings of the same or similar genre, and any documents that deal with a similar subject make up the textual context.⁷³

Extratextual context may be from historical documents or from archaeology.⁷⁴ The meaning that fits the context best is the correct meaning of any term.⁷⁵

In addition to designative or denotative meanings, there are also connotative or associative meanings of lexemes. Designative or denotative meanings are a lexeme's explicit or lexical meanings, acquired when they are used in referring to objects or events. Associative or connotative meanings are the meanings acquired when a lexeme is used by certain people, in certain ways, in certain settings, and under certain circumstances. Thus, associative meanings depend on the persons who usually use these expressions, the contexts in which they are used (time, place, institutions), the literary contexts from which they proceed, and the nature of the referent.⁷⁶

1.3.2.3 Different meanings of the same lexeme and related meanings of different lexemes are usually multidimensional.

The sets of meanings are not neatly organized structures.⁷⁷ Some sets may be neatly organized, but these are the exceptions.⁷⁸ This will become relevant in the case of δόξα, since δόξα is indeed used for different meanings. That will be taken into account.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² LNLEX, xvi.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid., xvii.

⁷⁷ Ibid., xviii.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

1.3.3 Some Basic Assumptions about Methodology in Analyzing Lexical Meaning

Nida and Louw suggest a number of basic assumptions about methodology in analyzing lexical meaning. Only a few relevant aspects are mentioned here.⁷⁹

1. Many lexemes have more than one meaning. The lexemes in NT Gr. do not have only one meaning in all the contexts in which they occur, unlike terms in a mathematical language. They sometimes resemble jellyfish or putty, in that they are squashy and elastic.⁸⁰

2. Languages are open systems, and lexemes may be added or dropped, and ranges of meanings may increase or decrease.⁸¹

3. It is impossible to give an absolute definition for any word, because the meanings of words are determined by other words.⁸² One can, however, be relatively certain about the meaning of a word, and arrive at a satisfactory result.⁸³

4. In analyzing the meaning of a combination of lexemes, it is important to consider not only the lexical meanings of the individual words, but also their syntactic and rhetorical relations. The meaning of a combination of words is “not merely the sum of the meanings of individual words, because any combination of words also involves the meaning of the grammatical constructions, and ... one must also consider various rhetorical features (e.g. parallelism, contrast, hyperbole, etc.)”⁸⁴ Furthermore, one must consider the setting of the passage within the discourse.⁸⁵ “Discourses ... communicate by organization of linguistic elements presented in relation to a given context or contexts ... [S]trategic organization of linguistic elements and context are vital for communication.... Thus a key to understanding an act of communication ... is to understand the organization of material as related to a given context.”⁸⁶

5. In the NT, allusions and echoes must be considered in the semantic analysis of some texts, e.g. the Gospel of John, where ἐγώ εἰμὶ must reflect the OT statement “I am that I am.”⁸⁷ Associative meanings require looking to the cultural setting. Expressions such as δοῦλος θεοῦ (Tit 1.1 and elsewhere) should not be understood with the same associative meaning that “slave” has in English, since in the OT a “Servant/Slave of the King” was a person of high position. “An important aspect of this associative meaning of the Heb. expression undoubtedly

⁷⁹ For more on basic assumptions about methodology in lexical analysis, see Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 17-18.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 18.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ George H. Guthrie, “Discourse Analysis,” in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2001), 254-255.

⁸⁷ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 20.

carries over into the New Testament usage.”⁸⁸ Δόξα might also have roots in the OT.

1.3.4 Methodology Used in This Study

Semantics is a complicated field of study. The purpose of this dissertation is not to develop, expand, or enter into discussion on a methodological level, but to use appropriate categories of analysis of words. These categories will be formulated on a functional level, so that they will be characterized by both functionality and accessibility.

The theory that I am following is that words and ideas are structurally interrelated, and one should read the detailed remarks in the light of the larger whole and vice versa. Meaning is developed not only in the immediate context but also within the larger framework of the book which consists of paragraphs, chapters, and larger sections like Chaps 13-17, and the book as a whole. This interrelatedness will be taken seriously in this study. This is in line with the semantic theory as it is presented *inter alia* by Louw and Nida.

Lexemes acquire both *designative* meanings and *associative* meanings. As explained above, *designative* meanings come from their use in denoting real and linguistic phenomena, and *associative* meanings are acquired from the people who usually use them, from the settings in which they normally occur, from their associations with a well-known literary discourse, and from the nature of the referents.⁸⁹ The associative meanings in the FG are derived primarily from the Heb. and Gr. OT. Both the designative meanings and the associative meanings of δόξα will be carefully considered in this study. We will look for the range of lexical meanings of the word and we will also consider the contexts, both within the FG and in related writings. The objective is to find the potential of the word, not to write a tradition history of δόξα or to analyze the different documents individually. Therefore I will look at each of the various collections as a whole (e.g. the NT, the OT, the Apocrypha, etc.), rather than consider individual authors or specific historical development within each collection.

In the study of any NT writing, one must keep in mind the nature of the Gr. NT, which should be approached in the same way as any other language, while at the same time recognizing that the vocabulary is restricted,⁹⁰ especially the vocabulary of the FG.⁹¹ As has been mentioned above, many of the lexemes in the Gr. NT have multiple meanings. Any given lexeme may not have the same meaning in all its contexts, and lexemes do not have rigid boundaries but are sometimes quite elastic.⁹² Since the meanings of words often overlap with one

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 31-32.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 18.

⁹¹ Barrett, 5; Carson, 23.

⁹² Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 18.

another,⁹³ an author may use two or more terms or expressions interchangeably. This will be kept in mind in studying the meaning of δόξα.

In order to understand a text one must discover the way in which the author structured the text.⁹⁴ For this purpose, Louw's method of analyzing the structure of a text will be followed.⁹⁵ The purpose of Louw's method is to map the syntactic form of the passage being studied and move from this form to the semantic content, since the outward, syntactic structure is the form in which the author expresses the semantic content that is in his/her mind.⁹⁶ The ultimate goal is a semantic one, but it is based on the overt structure, which is basically syntactic.⁹⁷ One begins by analyzing the internal structure of each thought unit (sentence or clause),⁹⁸ which normally will consist of a subject and a predicate along with "extended features" or "additions."⁹⁹ Next, one determines the relationships between the thought units. These relationships will indicate the manner in which the units are grouped or clustered together, giving a basis for interpreting the text semantically.¹⁰⁰ Sentences cluster together to form paragraphs. Paragraphs cluster together to form a section or chapter.¹⁰¹ The paragraph is the "largest unit possessing a single unitary semantic scope," since it usually presents only one concept.¹⁰² When the relationships between the basic thought units in a paragraph have been determined and mapped in such a way that the syntactic relationships are easily seen, these syntactic relations will indicate the semantic content.¹⁰³ The relationships between thought units "represent the line of argument in a text."¹⁰⁴ In the same manner, the relationships between the paragraphs can be analyzed. "The basic thrust of a text can be determined through the use of linguistically motivated methods."¹⁰⁵ This method of analysis enables a "schematization of thought in order to promote a better understanding of the text."¹⁰⁶ A key feature in this method is the correct analysis of the relationships between elements, e.g. repetition, contrast, purpose, result, source, continuation, motivation, definition, effect, summary, range, elaboration, particularization, etc.¹⁰⁷

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Louw, *Semantics*, 94.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 91-158.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 95.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Louw gives these basic units the name "colon," but it is probably simpler to speak of them as "clauses" or "sentences." See *ibid.*, 102.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 99, 106, 107, 113. Additions comprise *qualifying words or phrases*, such as direct objects, indirect objects, expressions of time, place, purpose, reason, result, etc. that are linked to either of the two basic elements or to other additions (*ibid.*, 110).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 96.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 98.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 95-96.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 126-7. See p. 126 for a schematization of Col 3.1-4, showing the line of argument. See Section 3.4 below for my structural analysis of John 17.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 127.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Louw, *Semantics*, 142, 148-9.

Words that have a close semantic relationship to the word being studied are very important as one seeks to determine the meaning of a lexeme. Contrasts or oppositions can also be valuable in determining meaning.¹⁰⁸ Opposites help one to see more clearly what the constitutive features of a particular word are. Where it is relevant, attention will be given to these aspects.¹⁰⁹

A key feature of the FG is the use of repetitions, parallelism, and antithesis.¹¹⁰ The author also employs ring structure and chiasmic structure. The use of these various literary devices is very evident in Chap 17 and use will be made of them in exegeting this text. Individual words, phrases, and sentences are repeated, and sometimes when an idea is repeated, with each subsequent recurrence the statement is expanded in content and intensity, finally reaching a peak. For example, the petition for oneness begins quietly in v. 12, is expanded in v. 21, and expanded further in v. 22-23 until it reaches a climax.¹¹¹ The oneness motif is built up not only within Chap 17, but also in other chapters. Jesus speaks of *μία ποιμνή*, *εἰς ποιμήν* in 10.16 and of gathering the children of God *εἰς ἓν* in 11.52. The phrase *εἰς ἓν* is repeated in 17.23, and the word *ἓν* recurs with *ὧσιν* in 17.21 and 22. The word “one” links these passages together, and the first two sayings, about the *one* flock and the gathering of the children into *one*, help to clarify what is meant by *one* in Chap 17. Seeing these connections and using the preceding passages to illuminate the petitions for *oneness* in Chap 17 will aid in understanding the concept of *oneness*.

Likewise, with the *δόξα* motif, it is helpful to view various texts together to be able to see a complete picture, whether or not the word *δόξα* actually occurs in those texts. Not all passages that are relevant to *δόξα* contain the word *δόξα*. The theme of *δόξα* may be present even though the word *δόξα* is absent. For example, John uses *τιμάω*, a semantically related word (interchangeable in some contexts), to say the same thing as *δοξάζω* in 12.26, and in that verse the expression *ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ* is one that recurs in 14.3 and 17.24, tying these three passages together, so that even though the word *δόξα* does not occur in 14.3 and 12.26, the fact that *δόξα* is present in 17.24 and *ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ* is present in all three, provides a basis for linking these texts together and relating them all to *δόξα*. Seeing these texts next to each other provides another window through which to view and understand *δόξα*.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ Nida and Louw make use of this also. Just as there are no synonyms (see p. 11), there are no exact opposites, but only what Nida and Louw (86) call “complementary pairs of meanings” which contrast in one of three ways: (1) as positive and negative, e.g. *ἀληθής/ψευδής* ‘true/false,’ (2) as reversives, e.g. *δέω/λύω* ‘bind/loose,’ and (3) as shifts in roles, e.g. *ἀγοράζω/πωλέω* ‘buy/sell.’ In these “sets of complementary meanings,” “distinctions in values, procedures, and roles” may be seen.

¹⁰⁹ There are various lexemes in John which express, in some respects, the opposite of *δόξα*, (e.g. *κρίσις* [5.24], *θάνατος* [11.4]), and of *δοξάζειν*, (e.g. *ἀτιμάζω* [8.49], *ἐκβάλλω* [6.37], *ἀπόλλυμι* [17.12; 3.16], *ἀποθνήσκω* [8.21], *κρίνω* [3.17]).

¹¹⁰ C. Clifton Black, “The Grandeur of Johannine Rhetoric” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 224-6.

¹¹¹ Black (224-5) suggests the technical term *amplification* for this technique, defining it as a “heightening effect.”

¹¹² Westcott (201) sees a connection between 7.34, 36; 8.21f.; 12.26; 14.3, and 17.24.

Another important link is the expression ὁ πατήρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν, which occurs in 3.35, while a similar statement is found in 5.20 with φιλέω instead of ἀγαπάω. The same fact, expressed in a different way, is stated in 17.24: ἡγάπησάς με. In each case, the statement declares that *the Father loves the Son*, and in each case, the Father has *given* something to the Son because of this love. The common expression about the Father's love ties these three passages together and presumably gives us information about δόξα that would be unavailable if we did not make this connection. This seems to be a device that the author of this Gospel uses, a *Leitmotiv*, as it were, to link passages together that are relatively remote in terms of their placement within the Gospel but related by a common theme. J. Du Rand has written about this literary device:

A very interesting feature in music is when the composer creates a sense of unity and variety by returning from time to time to the opening musical material. The opening section then functions as a unifying factor in bringing about a coherent structure.... In such a way the narrative starts with a comparable musical theme or *Leitmotiv*, which may consist of a succession of notes to be varied in different metamorphoses of rhythm, melody, harmony, and tone color. Even symmetrical or developmental repetition is to be foundin his discussions with the crowds about his Father.¹¹³

The Fourth Evangelist apparently has done this intentionally, not by accident, and by recognizing the *Leitmotiv* in those passages where it is found, we can use it to advantage to gain insight into the facts about δόξα in the FG.

1.4 Overview

The search for the meaning of δόξα in John 17 necessitates a survey of its use in the Gr. OT, since NT usage usually follows that of the Gr. OT. However, the meaning of the word in the Gr. OT is dependent partly on its meaning in non-biblical Gr. and partly on the meanings of the Heb. words that δόξα represents in the Septuagint. Chap 2 will therefore begin with a brief study of δόξα in Classical Gr. (non-biblical Gr., Philo and Josephus), followed by an examination of the meanings of כְּבוֹד and closely related nouns in the Heb. OT (Section 2.2). Section 2.3 will be a study of δόξα in the Gr. OT. The following two sections will look into intertestamental literature, since these writings form an important transition between the OT and the NT. Section 2.4 will cover glory in the OT Apocrypha and the OT Pseudepigrapha. Section 2.5 will be a discussion of *Memra*, *Yeqara*, and *Shekinah* in the Targums. The NT is the immediate cultural setting for the FG. Therefore Section 2.6 will be a study of δόξα in the NT. Chapter 3 is a study of δόξα in John 17.

¹¹³ Jan A. Du Rand, "Reading the Fourth Gospel Like a Literary Symphony," in "What Is John?" Vol II, *Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*, (SBLSymS 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 12.

The focus of this dissertation will be on 17.20-23, and also on the immediate context, i.e. the other paragraphs of the Farewell Prayer. Relevant passages of the Farewell Discourse(s) will be viewed and also pertinent texts in the rest of the Gospel. Although the letters of John are closely related to the FG, this study has not depended to any extent on any of the letters since it is not known whether the same author wrote both the Gospel and the letters. In analyzing the text of 17.20-23, the following questions will be addressed: (1) Who are the people for whom Jesus is praying in vv. 20-23, those to whom he has given $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$? (2) What is the $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ that Jesus has given to his followers? (3) What is meant by *oneness* of the believers in vv. 20-23? Descriptions of these believers are found in 17.6-10 and 17.20, the original disciples and later converts, respectively. A careful exegesis of vv. 6-10 will show that by revealing God's name and giving God's words, Jesus has given the disciples his $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$. The faith of the second group of followers will be shown to be equivalent to that of the first group, so that they have also been included in the gift.

The theme of *oneness* will be explored by seeing 10.16, 11.51-52, and 17.20 together, and also by considering the passages within Chap 17 that deal with *oneness*, viz. 17.11-16, 21, and 22-23, as a coordinated whole.¹¹⁴ A study of the first three passages will show that Jesus' concern is that the second generation of believers will be united with the first group of believers. A study of the three passages in Chap 17 (seen against the background of the sheep and shepherd imagery in Chap 10 and the vine metaphor in Chap 15) will show that Jesus' concern is that his people remain united with the Father and himself (and protected from Satan) like sheep who hear the shepherd's voice and continually follow him, and like fruit-bearing branches that remain constantly connected to the vine, so that, by being in union with God and Christ, they might speak God's words and do his works in the world, as Jesus did, and thus be revealers of God to the world, as Jesus was.

We will look for the clues about the gift of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ given to Jesus and his followers first in Chap 17 and then in other sections of John. We will argue that the giving of God's name to Jesus (17.11-12) is equivalent to giving him God's character, which means that God has revealed his glory in Jesus. This gift also includes $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ to do all that the Father does (17.2; cf. 3.35; 5.20), especially the authority to give life (17.2), which includes his mission to the world to save the world (17.18; 10.36; 20.21). The glory of exaltation and honor in heaven (17.5, 24), a glory to which he returns, is also a part of the $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ the Father has given him. Jesus in turn has given his followers the same $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$: He has revealed the Father's name/character to his followers by giving them God's words (17.6-8), which results in their having God's nature of love in them, and Jesus' own presence in them (17.26), since he has given to these who believe in him $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ to become children of God (1.12-13) and to do all the works that the Father has shown him

¹¹⁴ Schnackenburg, (3:180) views the entire prayer in Chap 17 as "a single unit," suggesting that the petitions for the protection, sanctification, and oneness of the disciples are united in the "one great intention" for the continuation of Jesus' followers in the sphere of God and their growth in the divine nature which Jesus has implanted in them.

(14.12; 15.15), viz. authority to forgive and retain sins (20.23). They are authorized and empowered with the Holy Spirit for mission to the world, sent into the world to do the work of God and speak the truth of God (17.18; 20.21; 14.12), and after they have served Christ, following in his steps, they will be with him to share his heavenly glory (17.24).

The final chapter will be a summary and discussion of the results of this investigation and will suggest possibilities for future research on δόξα.