INTIMATING DEITY IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN: THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE AND "FATHER" IN "PRAYERS OF JESUS"

Mary Rose D'Angelo
University of Notre Dame

ABSTRACT

This essay examines several disparate but not unrelated issues in John's theology: it locates "father" in the gospel's discourse as an intimation of deity, describes the distributions of this divine designation in the Johannine tradition and the Gospel, and discusses the ways its appearances in "prayers of Jesus" both articulate the Gospel's theology and are drawn from traditional prayer strategies that surface in Mark, Q, *Thomas,* and Jewish materials of the period.

My contribution to this volume is very much *un essai:* an attempt, specifically an attempt at ground-clearing, it seeks to dislodge readings of "father" in the Gospel of John from theories about Jesus' "abba-experience." Both preliminary and supplementary to investigations that explore new contexts for illuminating "father" as divine language in John, this essay examines several disparate but not unrelated questions: What sort of language is "father"? How is this divine designation distributed in the Johannine tradition and the Gospel? How are its appearances in "prayers of Jesus" related to traditions that surface in Mark, Q, *Thomas,* and Jewish materials of the period? Investigating these areas makes clear that the Johannine use of "father" is not a unique and mysterious revelation explicable only by the special teaching and mission of Jesus, radically revising Jewish conceptions of God and free from patriarchal cultural formation, but rather it is the literary and theological product of communal reflection, cultural meaning, and authorial creativity.

Admittedly, claims about the uniqueness of Jesus' use of "father" as an address to and designation for God have been based primarily on uses of "father" in the Synoptics. Joachim Jeremias, following Gerhard Kittel, popularized the idea that the Aramaic word ἀββά was Jesus' universal and unique term of address to God, representing something "wholly new" in Jewish practice (Jeremias, 1967:55–57; Kittel: 6). He read "father" (πατήρ) in most of these sayings as a translation for ἀββά (which occurs in the sayings of Jesus only in Mark 14:36) and constructed a special meaning for it, as the expression of the unique intimacy of Jesus' relation to God.

The role John's Gospel has played in theories of "Jesus' abba-experience" is an ambiguous one. Mark and Q use "father" rarely and in very limited settings; in early Jewish literature the use of "father" for God is hardly more frequent. By contrast, the Fourth Gospel uses the designation constantly and in ways that are not only integrated with, but actually central to, its christology. Thus, Jeremias himself readily drew the conclusion that John represents the increasing tendency of early Christian texts to introduce the title "father" into the sayings of Jesus (1967:29–30, 36). But the supposition of "unparalleled content" for Jesus' use of this address implied a high christology and frequent use of "father," both of which are actually to be found in John. Thus Gottlob Schrenk and Gottfried Quell insisted that the Gospel's use of "father" was an outgrowth of Jesus' practice, though transformed through the treatment of Jesus as revealer (980, 997).

While ideas about Jesus' "abba-experience" remain extremely influential, the anti-Jewish character and problematic methodological aspects of the original arguments have increasingly been recognized. At the same time feminist critical rereading of both the theological language and imagery for the divine has inspired reevaluation of absolute claims based upon this idea. The linguistic theories about ἀββά have been reexamined and significantly revised (Barr: 1988a, 1988b; Fitzmyer; Charlesworth). Other scholars have undertaken reassessments of the role of the title in Jewish piety (Gnadt; Strotmann). New evidence also became available; with the publication of 4Q372 1 it became clear that addressing God as "my father" was not impossible in "Palestinian" Judaism (Schuller, 1990, 1992). In 1992, I published two essays attempting to relocate the question of Jesus' use of this term in the context of other early Jewish uses. The first essay argued that if the Gospels reflect the use of this address in the preaching of God's reign, they do so because of the deeply traditional resonances it had for Jesus and was capable of evoking for his Jewish hearers. Addressing God as "father" may have served to distinguish God's reign from Caesar's by expressing resistance to the imperial title *pater patriae* (1992a). The second article examined the occurrences of "father" in Mark and Q and delineated both the continuities with Jewish practice and the theological function of "father" in these earliest Christian gospels (1992b).

In extending those investigations to the Gospel of John, I draw heavily on the recent article by Paul Meyer (1996). Responding to Nils Dahl's identification of *theo*-logy—the doctrine of God—as "the neglected factor in New Testament theology" (Dahl, 1991), Meyer examined "father" as the primary means of the presentation of the deity in John. His study focused upon the corollary of John's depiction of Jesus as God's agent: the Johannine deity as the sender of Jesus, the guarantor of his person, and the vindicator of his mission. Meyer's suggestion that there is in John not so much a *Gesandtenchristologie* as a *Sendertheologie* makes a major contribution to the demystification of "father" in John (264). In what follows I rely on his careful

survey of the Gospel at many points, as also I do on the massive review of the evidence from the ancient world in the article on πατήρ by Gottlob Schrenk and Gottfried Quell in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.

Juxtaposing these two articles requires some comment on the issue of the relation of πατήρ and patriarchy. Schrenk's insistence on the "purely patriarchal" character of the title in the Jewish and Christian traditions strikes a strange note in contemporary ears; in his lexicon, patriarchy is an entirely positive term, descriptive of the organization of ancient Indo-European societies and strikingly manifest in the Roman concept of *patria potestas* (948–50). Its value for him seems to derive from the nineteenth-century theory of J. J. Bachofen, who posited a development in European society from a lower matriarchal stage of social organization to a higher patriarchal stage. This latter stage was characterized by the control of women's sexuality within the male-headed family and most fully realized in the "Roman imperium." Schrenk read "father" as expressing an idealized patriarchal principle through the image of the *Hausvater* (the Roman *paterfamilias*) and in the unquestioning obedience and total submission of the son (950–51, 984, 997). Schrenk had no difficulty in absorbing Jeremias's and Kittel's insistence on the "unparalleled intimacy" of Jesus' address to God into his patriarchal ideal or in extending it to John. By contrast, feminist critiques of "father" as a divine title inspired Hamerton-Kelly to defend the title by using Jeremias's theories as evidence that Jesus' use was "non-patriarchal" (1979, 1981). Meyer rejects Schrenk's narrowing of the image to paternal power and filial obedience (257–58) as well as "the almost obsessive desire, running through the literature, to trace the Johannine use of the term 'father' for God to the personal piety and religious intimacy of the historical Jesus" (258). At the same time, he views the problematic character of the language as a product of "the brokenness of human relationships" in "our times" (266 n. 8).

I share Schrenk's understanding of patriarchy as a social system, and one that is particularly well illustrated in Roman society, but not his regard for it as a higher principle. Like many feminists, I use the term to refer to social systems in which power is held by "fathers": that is, by a limited number of privileged males; access to power is apportioned to women, children, and less privileged males (slaves, clients, unemancipated sons) through their relationships to the family head (D'Angelo, 1994:315, 323 n. 3; 1998:26). Given this definition, ancient (as well as contemporary) uses of "father" as a title for the deity cannot really evade patriarchal ideology, even though they can be and sometimes are deployed for antipatriarchal or anti-imperial purposes (1992a:628–30; 1992b:174). But neither is it appropriate to measure the Gospel imagery against some idealized (or vilified) essence of patriarchy. Rather, social arrangements of ancient patriarchy are refracted through the complex imagery of John in ways that are diffuse and diverse, contested in antiquity and contestable in later interpretation. Adele Reinhartz's essay in this volume

provides a glimpse into one aspect of this process, the way that social power informed and gendered ancient medical constructions of human reproduction.

"Father" As Theological Language: Substitution and Metaphor in Language for the Divine

In the past, I have generally referred to "father" as a divine title (1992a; 1992b; 1992c). "Father" can and does function as a title in apposition to "God" or "Lord" in the texts of early Christianity. But it also names the deity and thereby functions as a synonym and an evocative euphemism for God, as a pious substitution like "heaven," the circumlocution "reign of God," or combinations of these like "reign of heaven" and "heavenly father." Thus while Schrenk saw early Christian worship's preference for "πατήρ over Yahweh, *adonai, kyrios* or *theos*" as an "astonishing novelty" explicable only by the community's experience of Jesus (996), it would be more accurate to say that "father" functions in early Christianity much as *adonai* and κύριος functioned in early Jewish contexts: as one of a number of substitutes that could either imply a reverential circumspection, supply an image for a less evocative term, or both. One very early factor in this preference may have been the appropriation of κύριος as a title for Jesus (Phil 2:11). God the (our) father and the (our) lord Jesus are frequently linked in texts that appear to have a petitionary, doxological, or creedal function (Rom 1:7; 15:6; 1 Cor 1:3; 8:6; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:1, 3; Phil 1:2; 1 Thess 1:1, 3; 3:11, 13; Phlm 3; cf. 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31).

The *Gospel of Thomas* offers a particularly striking example of early Christian use of such substitutes. "God" is used only twice in *Thomas,* both times in contexts that raise questions about its function.[1] The Gospel shows a marked preference for "father" or "heaven," either of which can be combined with "reign." The most frequent designation for the deity is "the (your) father" (sayings 3, 15, 27, 40, 44, 50, 61, 64, 69, 79, 83, 101, 105; "father's reign" also appears in 57, 76, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 113). "The reign," used absolutely (22, 27, 46, 49, 82, 107, 109, 113), and "heavens' reign" (20, 54, 114) may likewise refer to the deity as active in the world. "The living one" (37, 59 [?], 111), "the light" (50, 83), and "the whole" (61) are other references to the deity as source of life and being. The ambiguity of the Gospel's use of "god" and its preference for "father" suggest that the function of "father" in *Thomas* is continuous with its function in those gnostic and Valentinian texts that use "father" (sometimes

---

[1] The Coptic version of saying 30 uses the word "god" but appears to refer not to the deity but to sages ("where there are three gods they are gods"). Saying 100 ("Give Caesar what is Caesar's, give God what is God's, give me what is mine") may be a revision of Mark 12:17 added to *Thomas* in its later stages; alternatively, "god" may not actually refer to the deity even here, but to a lesser deity or to the deity inadequately understood.

translated "parent")[2] to distinguish the ultimate deity from lesser, defective or fallen divine offspring, while also expressing human kinship to the divine. It is not necessary to read *Thomas* as gnostic or to posit its acknowledgement of a demiurge to recognize that in this Gospel "father" points to and protects divine transcendence and unknowability while also asserting the kinship between the sages/gnostics and their source of being.

It should be noted that the term θεός was not always or simply treated as a generic term for the divine in antiquity. Philo, for example, supplied an etymology that derived θεός from τίθημι:

> … the central place is held by the father of the all, who in the sacred scriptures is called 'the being one' (ὁ ὤν) as a proper name, while on either side are the eldest powers, and nearest to being, the creative and the ruling (royal). The title of the creative [power] is God (θεός), by which [the deity] made (ἔθηκε) and ordered the all; the title of the ruling [power] is Lord, for it is for the one who created to rule and control what came into being. (*Abraham* 121)[3]

Here Philo treats "father" as an overarching and widely intelligible metaphor and ὁ ὤν as the "proper" name for true deity. "God" and "Lord" describe divine powers or functions that are hypostatized in Philo's thought. The derivation of θεός from τίθημι is frequent and consistent in Philo's work (*Mut.* 29, which also uses father; *Conf.* 137; *Fug.* 97; *Mos.* 2.99; *Spec. Leg.* 1.307). Segal has described rabbinic reflection upon these "powers," pointing out that their ascription to the divine names is the reverse of Philo's (175). The difference in language may explain this; Hebrew does not offer the connection between "God" and "create."[4] Paul too may be aware of this etymology for θεός; 1 Corinthians 12 uses θεός/ἔθετο for the creation of functions in the body (12:18; cf. 24) and the church (12:28). The point is not that either Paul or John depends on Philo, or even that John shared the etymology, but that the meanings and character of designations for the divine were the subject of investigation in ancient theology and that metaphoric content, where it was not evident, could be assigned. Thus for the ancient theologian (as indeed for many theologians today), it is not so much the case that "father" is a substitute or metaphor for "God" as it is that "father" and "god" are both metaphoric and circumlocutory, expedients in the attempt to name the ineffable.

---

2 Layton uses this translation throughout; for a more nuanced reading of gender in language for the divine in the Nag Hammadi Library see Good; other positions, Williams, Sieber.

3 My translation; brackets supply implied words; parentheses alternate translations or the Greek original. All translations in the text are mine unless otherwise noted.

4 It is possible to produce an etymology for the Tetragrammaton that ties it to creation. Segal suggests that the difference is due to the points at which the LXX chooses to translate YHWH with θεός.

The four canonical gospels and Q all use a range of designations for the deity: "God" (θεός), "father" (πατήρ), "heaven" (οὐρανός) and "reign" (βασιλεία). In Q, Mark, Matthew, and Luke, θεός remains the most frequent designator of the divine. John fits between the Synoptics and *Thomas;* the Gospel prefers "father" to "God"—about 118 to 76 uses.[5] "Reign of God" appears twice only (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, 3:3, 5). John also uses "heaven" (οὐρανός), "from above" (ἄνωθεν) and "above" (ἄνω) more or less interchangeably as references to the divine: authority is given from heaven (3:27) or (more ambiguously) from above (19:11); one is born of God (1:13) or "from above" (3:3, 7); the "bread of God" (6:33) is "the bread from heaven" (6:31, 32); "who/what comes down from heaven" (6:33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58) is also what "my father gives you" (6:32). If "father" seems to be what Philo would call the proper name of God in John, it is clear that all these designations apply to the same divine being. There is no suggestion that θεός refers to an inferior or defective power, as it does in the gnostic materials.

Distribution of Designations for the Deity in the Johannine Texts

On the whole, the Gospel of John seems to use "father" (πατήρ) and "God" (θεός) interchangeably and in the same contexts. Both appear most frequently in direct discourse and in the speeches of Jesus. There is some evidence that the differences correspond to redactional or developmental layers in the Johannine tradition and Gospel. The letters use θεός far more frequently than πατήρ; the prologue also prefers θεός (using πατήρ only at 1:14 and 1:18); so does 1:19–51 use θεός exclusively; John 2 never uses θεός and uses πατήρ only once. "Father" is never used in John 21, though "God" likewise appears only once (21:19). Meyer observes that "father" for the deity occurs only twice in the material Fortna assigned to the "signs source" (Meyer: 272 n. 61); it should be noted that both of these occurrences have analogues in the Synoptics (John 2:16//Luke 2:49; John 18:11//Mark 14:36). Meyer also regards the use of "father" in the dialogues of the Gospel as linked to specific literary layers and motifs; most important for his study, the language of sending is linked always to "father," never to θεός (264).

Given the pervasiveness of "father" in the Gospel and my observations on the character of divine language above, it is worth reversing Meyer's question (the usual question) and asking why the Gospel sometimes prefers θεός over πατήρ. I suggest that in the Gospel as a whole, the single biggest factor in the choice of θεός rather than πατήρ seems to be case: when the genitive is required,

---

5 This count is based on Meyer's count of 118 uses of "father" and 45 uses of God, plus 31 more uses of God as an adjectival genitive (269, n. 27); Schrenk counted 115 uses of father to 73 uses of God (996); Jeremias counted 109 uses of father (1967:19).

the Gospel prefers θεοῦ; 44 occurrences of θεός out of 76 are in the genitive. "Of God" appears as a modifier in a number of phrases that are so conventional that Meyer excluded this formulation from his count (269 n. 27). Most of these could be translated by the adjective "divine": "angels of God" (divine messengers; 1:51), "lamb of God" (1:29, 36), "reign of God" (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, 3:3, 5); "words of God" (τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ, 3:34; 8:47), "wrath of God" (3:36), "gift of God" (δωρεάν, 4:10), "love of God" (5:42), "work(s) of God" (6:28, 29; 9:3, but "works of the father" in 10:32, 37), "word of God" (λόγος, 10:35), "bread of God" (6:33), "holy one of God" (6:69), "glory of God" (δόξα, 5:44; 11:4, 40; 12:43; "of the one who sent" him, 7:18), perhaps most importantly "son of God" (1:34, 49; 3:18; 5:25; 10:36; 11:4; 27; 19:7; 20:31). A few traditional phrases prefer "father": "my father's house" (2:16, τὸν οἶκον; 14:2, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ; cf. Luke 2:49, ἐν τοῖ τοῦ πατρός); "my father's name" (5:43; 10:25), and "my father's will" (6:40; see also Matt 7:21; 12:50; 18:14; 21:31; cf. 6:10//26:42 and *m. Roš Haš.* 3:8).[6] All three of these draw heavily on familial imagery.

In addition to these traditional phrases, θεός is more frequent than πατήρ in the constructions "to be from, come from, or be born from (ἐκ, παρά, ἀπό) God"—all of which are quintessentially Johannine (Keck). These are expressed with the genitive, whether they use πατήρ (6:45, 65; 8:3; 15:15, 26 [2x]; 16:27, 28) or θεός (1:6, 13; 3:2; 6:46; 7:17; 8:40, 42, 47 [2x]; 9:16, 33; 16:27, 30). One example in which the designation appears to change with the case is John 13:3, which begins by using "father" but shifts to θεός when the prepositional phrase intervenes: "Jesus, knowing that the father [ὁ πατήρ] had given all things into his hands, and that he came from God [ἀπὸ θεοῦ] and was going to God. . . ."[7]

Several of Meyer's other observations deserve attention here. He points out that commentators generally expect or assume that "son" as christological title and "father" as divine designation are inevitably joined. But the Gospel, like the letters of Paul, does not regularly pair "father" as a designation for the deity and "son of God" or "the son" (absolute; Meyer: 263). While "father" is noticeably more frequent in chapters 14–17 than in other parts of the Gospel, "son" as a title for Jesus appears only twice in this section, in 14:13 and 17:1. Other passages in which "father" and "son" are closely linked are 3:35; 5:20–23; 6:40. Observing that "son of man" and references to God as father are rarely paired in John (as they are in Mark 8:38) suggests that the two concepts constitute quite distinct strands in Johannine christological language (Meyer: 259).

These observations underline Meyer's warnings against absorbing "father" into the gospel's christology and help to nuance his claim that: "'My

6 Usually the Gospel prefers "the will of the one who sent me" (John 4:34; 5:30; 6:38, 39; 7:17).

7 All translations are my own.

Father' in the mouth of Jesus (ὁ πατήρ μου, 25 times) makes it clear that God is *his* Father as no one else's" (Meyer: 260). This approaches Schrenk's problematic deduction that since Jesus speaks to the disciples of "your father" only in 20:17, God is not to be seen as also the disciples' father until after the resurrection (996). The majority of occurrences refer to "the father" as absolute (74 times by Meyer's count; 269 n. 27).

Much of the drama and irony of the dialogues is elided unless it is emphasized that the deity is the father of Jesus precisely as he is the father of certain others in the Gospel, most importantly of "the Jews."

In 2:16, one of the two uses from the supposed sign source, "my father's house" refers to the temple in a fashion that differs little from Luke 2:49. The phrase may make a messianic claim through the terms of the Nathan oracle's promise to David of a son to whom God will be father and who will build God's house (2 Sam 7:12–16; 2 Chron 17:14–16, cf. Mark 14:58). In the brief succeeding dialogue, the Jews ask for a sign, perhaps because they see Jesus' deed as messianic (2:18). The response predicts the resurrection as the building of the temple. Notably, "the Jews" make no protest against his claim of divine paternity (2:18–22).

It is quite otherwise in chapter 5. There "the Jews" protest precisely because "he called God his own father" (5:18). But it is noteworthy that in the long succeeding discourse, the metaphorical character of the terms "father" and "son" remain to the fore, and there is some sense that the Jews ought to be able to claim divine paternity as well. Jesus' claim to the example of his father initiates a long development of the analogy: "the father loves the son and shows him everything he does" (5:20)—work/creation (5:17), resurrection (5:21–26), judgment (5:27–30). At the close of the discourse, Jesus faults his hearers for not receiving him, although he comes "in my father's name," but they in their own (5:43). He warns them that not he but Moses will accuse them to "the father" (5:45). The impact of the warning derives from the recognition that it is to "the father" (theirs also) that they must answer.

The contexts of chapters 6 and 8 are similarly controversial. In John 6 Jesus uses "my father" in contrast to "your fathers" (the Israelites of the generation of the desert); in John 8, in contrast to "your father" (Abraham or the devil?). Meyer argues that the christological concepts of sonship and mission should be distinguished, at least in the sources of John. He cites Ashton's observation that John 7 does not use πατήρ at all and that there is in this chapter "not the slightest hint that Jesus regarded himself as the Son of God" (Meyer: 262). But caution must be used in drawing conclusions from the absence of πατήρ in John 7. John 7–8, or at least John 7:1–8:30, is a single dramatic and literary unit, a suite of scenes set at Succoth and developing a single question, and it is far from clear that the chapter division represents a redactional layer of the writing process. John 7:1–8:30 uses θεός only once, to articulate the question that controls the succeeding dialogues in both chapters

7 and 8, that is, "whether [Jesus] is from God" (7:17). As Meyer notes, the designation of choice in John 7 is "the one who sent me" (7:16, 18, 28, 33). Only oblique references to the divine appear elsewhere in John 7, in the questions "where [is he] coming from?" (7:27, 28; cf. 7:15, 41–42, 52) and "where [is he] going to?" (7:35). In 8:12–59, the "one who sent" Jesus is consistently identified as "the father" (8:18, 19, 28, 29, 35, 38, 49, 54).

Three of the sparse pairings of "son" with "father" appear in John 8. John 8:28 promises the crowd that when they lift up the son of man, they will know that "as the father sent me so I speak." The context of judgment (8:21–29) suggests that the promise derives from interpretation of Daniel 7 in which the "ancient one" has been identified as the father of the son of man. In 8:31–59, "son" absolute appears twice in an exegesis of the Nathan oracle that also functions as a metaphor: "the slave does not remain in the house forever; the son remains forever; therefore if the son frees you, you will be truly free" (8:35–36; see Aalen: 237). Then debate turns to the paternity of "the Jews," who insist on their descent from Abraham (8:39) and, in a revision of the Shema ("Hear, O Israel," Deut 6:4), from the deity: "we have one father, God" (8:41).

Irony pervades this conflict, because the Jews can and should claim God as their father also (8:41). By refusing to recognize the father of Jesus they reject their own: their deeds show that their father is neither God nor Abraham. The use of "son of God" and "father" in ways that are and are not the same as Jewish uses seems to be a deliberate ploy of the dialogues. The text thus appears to accuse the Jews of disingenuousness in charging Jesus with blasphemy for "making God his own father" (5:19) and "though human, making [him]self God" (10:33). To this charge, Jesus replies that the very scripture applied the term "god" to "those to whom the word of God came"; that is to other humans, Israelites like his accusers (10:34–35, citing Ps 82:6).[8] Twentieth-century interpreters have tended to see this as a specious riposte, claiming to use the same words while actually saying something quite different (Bultmann attributes it to the ecclesiastical redactor, suggesting as an alternative that it parodies Jewish legal argument: 389, 282; see differently Brown, 1966:409–11). But in fact it poses the central dilemma of John's christological enterprise: the words and scriptural texts the author appropriates are both the same and different at all times, they both draw upon and transform the language of Jewish piety. This is because that language, or rather all language for the divine (even the most direct like "god" and "father"), is ambiguous, human language that can speak of human and earthly things (3:12).

---

8 Bultmann identifies the "those to whom the word of God came" as the addressees in the psalm. The more common view (based on rabbinic exegesis) is that it applies to the ancients at Sinai (Brown, 1996). The phrase in itself could designate the prophets in general or Moses and Aaron in particular.

For this reason, claims that the address expresses unparalleled intimacy and distinguishes Jesus' teaching from Jewish piety in his time run aground on John's use of the title in the very conflicts between Jesus and the Jews of the Gospel over the announcement that God is his father. While it is clear that these controversies are constructed precisely to articulate and defend the Gospel's christology, the point at which Jesus forces them to proclaim "we have one father, God" (8:41) may be the point at which the straw Jews of John's Gospel come closest to the real Jews of the Gospel's context.

The absolute "father" also occurs in Jesus' encounter with the Samaritan woman, who challenges his offer of living water by comparing him to their shared father Jacob (4:12). Answering the theological problem she poses for him (where one must worship, 4:19–20), Jesus accuses her people of worshiping what they do not know (4:22) but also proclaims that "the father" seeks those who worship in spirit and truth (4:23–25). The woman appears to grasp this response without difficulty. However imperfect their knowledge of the deity, there is no suggestion that she and the Samaritans might not recognize "the father" as a reference to the deity that they share with Jews and Jesus, as they do Abraham and Jacob.

Similarly, while Jesus speaks of "my father" to the disciples in chapters 14–15, should that really be read as "my father and not yours"? The absolute "father" is frequent not only in 14–15 but also in 16–17, and in the latter the term "my father" never appears. If John 14–15 stresses the identity between Jesus and the father, chapters 16–17 stress the identity between the disciples and Jesus. Pronouncements like "the father himself loves you" (16:27) and "you have loved them as you have loved me" (17:23) suggest that when the risen Jesus sends Mary Magdalene to tell the disciples, "I ascend to my father and your father" (20:17), he does not award them a new status but rather reminds them of the destination they share with him. If "father" presents the deity as Jesus' sender and vindicator, it also functions both anthropologically and soteriologically in the vindication of the community. "Born of God," "from above," "from the spirit" (1:13; 3:3, 7; 3:6), Jesus' followers suffer opposition from those who come from below, are born from the flesh, are from their father the devil.

"Father" thus functions in the dialogues to express origin, but also alliance, commitment, and destiny, revealing the true being of the participants. But like all the other designations for the divine, it also points beyond the exchange, both naming and not naming, underlining the numinous reality by the common, even banal character of the image.

"Father" in "Prayers of Jesus" in John

In attempts to argue for the uniqueness of Jesus' use of "father," considerable attention has been focused on so-called "prayers of Jesus" that use

this address, that is, on those points at which the gospels depict Jesus as speaking directly to God. Regarding these speeches as uniquely significant is problematic in a number of ways; it ignores the degree to which they are likely to reflect both Christian practice and the theological and literary concerns of the text. Thus any focus on such prayers should attend to both traditional practice and redactional interests.

Like Mark and Q, the Fourth Gospel attributes the address to Jesus. But unlike the former, John does very nearly present a Jesus who always and everywhere uses "father" as his address to God, though this observation must be balanced with the acknowledgement that "prayers of Jesus" are not frequent in either the Synoptics or John.[9] The three instances in which the Fourth Gospel places a prayer on Jesus' lips come late in the Gospel and offer highly dramatic interpretations of their context: a thanksgiving that precedes the raising of Lazarus (11:41), a prayer that expresses his attitude to his own death (12:27–28), and the lengthy prayer that closes the testament of Jesus (17:1, 5, 21, 24, 25). In John 17, θεόν is used in an oblique address ("that they may know you, the only true God" or perhaps "that they may know that you are the only true God," 17:3). Otherwise, John does not depict Jesus as addressing the deity as "God" (as does Mark 15:34) or "Lord" (Matt 11:25//Luke 10:21). The narrator does use the euphemisms "to heaven" (17:1) and "above" (11:41) to describe Jesus' prayerful gaze; the response to Jesus' prayer in 12:27–28 comes "from heaven." In all, the Johannine presentation of the deity as the sender and vindicator of Jesus is strikingly manifest.

At the same time, these three prayers present certain traditional features. In 1963, C. H. Dodd discussed them in his attempt to undermine the Synoptics' historical monopoly and establish the Fourth Gospel's access to a precanonical stage of the tradition and therefore to the earliest communities, including the career of Jesus (1963:423–32). In contrast, the comparisons below set the use of "father" in these prayers into the context of traditional prayer strategies in early Judaism and Christianity as well as into the Gospel's theological program.

In Mark and Q, "father" is especially important in prayers or references to prayer in three contexts that are continuous with its uses in early Jewish texts. First, "father" is important in the prayers of the afflicted and persecuted, especially of the righteous Jew (or proselyte) who is threatened by the wicked and haughty oppressor (especially the Gentile oppressor: 4Q372 16–20; *Jos. Asen.* 12:8–15; 3 Macc 6:3–4, 7–8; Sir 23:1; Wis 2:16–20; Mark 14:36; Matt 6:9,

---

[9] *Pace* Käsemann, who opines that "the prayer of Jesus does not play the same important role in John as in the synoptics" (5).

13//Luke 11:2, 4). Second, the title occurs in recourse to the deity as wise and provident in caring for the petitioners or directing history (1QH[a] IX, 35; 4Q372 I, 17–19, 24; *Jos. Asen.* 12:15; Wis 14:1–4; 3 Macc 6:3; *Jub.* 19:29; Mark 8:38; 13:31; 14:36; consistently in Q: Matt 5:48//Luke 6:36; Matt 11:25–27//Luke 10:21–22; Matt 6:9–13//Luke 11:2–4; Matt 7:11//Luke 11:13; Matt 6:32//Luke 12:30). Third, appeals to God's mercy and forgiveness (4Q372 I, 19; 1QH IX, 30–35; *Jos. Asen.* 12:14–15; *Apocr. Ezek.* Fragment 2; Tob 13:4–6; *Ant.* 2.152; Mark 11:25; Matt 6:9, 12//Luke 11:2, 4) or references to God as correcting the sinner (Sir 23:1–6; cf. Wis 11:10) also call upon God as father (D'Angelo, 1992b:153–56). In both Mark and Q the title not only draws upon tradition but also reflects and contributes to the ethos and practice of the gospels' users. In Q, special knowledge (Matt 11:27//Luke 10:22) and practice (Matt 5:48//Luke 6:36; Matt 6:32//Luke 12:30) make the practitioners "sons of the [heavenly] father" (D'Angelo, 1992b:162–73). In Mark, "father" is embedded in the Gospel's theology of apocalyptic expectation (8:38; 13:32) and spiritual power (11:25; 14:36; cf. Gal 4:7; Rom 8:15; D'Angelo, 1992b:156–62).

None of the prayers or references to prayer in the Gospel of John makes or commends petitions for forgiveness or divine mercy for the sinner (although 1 John 2:1 represents Jesus as the advocate to the father for any sin within the community). But early Jewish and Christian uses of "father" in appeals to divine providence and in the cry of the suffering just one are reflected in Johannine use of the designation. As in Mark,"father" functions in John to name the source and the guarantor of spiritual and prophetic power and knowledge, first that of Jesus, but also that of all who believe; as in Q, the prayers to God as father not only invoke the wise director of history, but also warrant the unique knowledge of God enjoyed by the sons. The overlap among the lists provided above makes clear that these contexts are not so much distinct as distinguishable; in the Fourth Gospel they are even more deeply intertwined than in the Synoptics.

John 11:41: "Father" in a Prayer of Spiritual Power

The first occasion on which the Fourth Gospel cites a prayer of Jesus is at the raising of Lazarus: "Father, I thank you because you heard me: I knew you always hear me, but I spoke on account of the crowd standing around, that they may believe that you have sent me" (11:41). This prayer has the form of a thanksgiving or blessing, rather like the Q prayer that begins "I praise you father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have revealed these things to babes" (Matt 11:25//Luke 10:21). John 11:41 implies that the resurrection that is about to take place is the result of Jesus' request, and perhaps also of Martha's conviction that "whatever you ask, God will give you" (11:23). But the request is never made, presumably because, since God grants whatever Jesus asks, he does not even need to ask.

In 11:41, "you always hear me" identifies the raising of Lazarus as a manifestation of the deity as sender of Jesus (11:42). But it also serves an exemplary function: the believers too expect that their prayers will work wonders. Martyn's theory that the cure of the blind man in chapter 9 represents not only a traditional story about Jesus but also the exercise of the gift of healing in the community might be reconsidered here (26–30). In the testament of Jesus, the power to ask and receive from "the father" is passed on to the disciples; Jesus will not have to ask on their behalf, because the father loves them (14:13–14; 15:7; 16:23, 26). A variety of similar promises appears in contexts that assure believers of their own spiritual and prophetic power. In Mark the withering of the fig tree warrants the faith that moves mountains: "therefore I say to you, everything you pray and ask for ... will come to you. When you are praying ... forgive, that your heavenly father may forgive you..." (Mark 11:24–25//Matt 21:22; 6:14). Matt 18:19 proclaims: "Amen I say to you if two of you agree about whatever you ask from my father in heaven, it will come to you." Other versions do not refer to the divine father ("ask and you shall receive," Matt 7:7//Luke 11:9; Herm. *Mand.* 9.4, Herm. *Sim.* 3.6, *Gos. Thom.* 92; see also Dodd, 1963:349–52).

In Mark, the prayer of the believer is the source of spiritual power in the community (9:29; 11:24–25) and the prayer "abba, father" has particular spiritual force (14:36; cf. Gal 4:6, Rom 8:15; see D'Angelo, 1992b:159–62). This spiritual power must be understood in the prophetic and apocalyptic context of the Gospel and the community. The Markan sayings that link "father" and "son [of man]" belong to the apocalyptic context of Mark, announcing the terms of judgment (8:38: "the son of man will be ashamed of you when he comes in the glory of his father with the holy angels ...") or considering the time of the reckoning (13:32: "no one knows the hour, not the angels, not even the son, but only the father"; see D'Angelo, 1992b:157–58). In John the two sayings Meyer notes as linking "father" with "son of man" are notable manifestations of a sort of de-eschatologized apocalypticism (268 n. 26). John 5:27 announces and explains Jesus' status as judge through the imagery of Dan 7:12–14:[10] "[The father] has given authority to him to do judgment, because he is the son of man." The same image promises a vindication of Jesus' revelation in 8:38: "When you lift up the son of man, then you will know that I am, and that from myself I do nothing, but as the father taught me, I speak" (cf. 8:38: "... as I have heard from the father, I speak").

---

10 "As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him. To him was given dominion and glory and kingship, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed" (NRSV).

"Father" in the Prayer of the Suffering Just One

The second time the Gospel depicts Jesus as praying is John 12:27–28, where he proposes two alternative prayers: "What shall I say? Father save me from this hour … father glorify your name." The first of these ("father save me from this hour") is reminiscent of Mark 14:35–36: "He prayed that if possible the hour might pass away: 'father, take this cup away but not what I will but what you do.'" The cup given by the father appears in John 18:11 as an image for Jesus' death: "the cup my father gave me to drink, shall I not drink it?" With Mark 14:36, John 12:27 and 18:11 probably attest an earlier prayer that dramatized the interpretation of Jesus' death through the Psalter's image of "cup" for a lot given by God (Pss 75:8; 11:6; 15:6; cf. Mark 10:38–39; see differently Dodd 1963:68–69). Both versions of this prayer use the address "father" to locate Jesus as the persecuted just one, the son of God faced with death at the hands of the wicked. In doing so, they draw on a tradition manifest in early Jewish literature like 4Q372 1, 3 Macc 6:3–4, Wis 2:16–20; cf. 11:10 (D'Angelo 1992a, 1992b).

The prayer Jesus chooses, "father glorify your name," may also derive from traditional language, providing a very Johannine version (or inversion?) of the submission expressed in Mark 14:36: "father … not what I will but what you do." Matthew's garden narrative translates this concession into the traditional petition: "your will be done" (Matt 26:42), perhaps on the model of the Q prayer (Matt 6:9–13). Matthew appears to regard this prayer as an example of very simple standard Jewish prayer (6:7–8), and probably rightly so. The Kaddish, known from the end of the talmudic period, offers significant parallels to its first three petitions: "Exalted and hallowed be his great name in the world which he created according to his will. May he establish his reign in your lifetime and in your days and in the days of all the household of Israel."[11] A string of synonyms open the praise that follows in the prayer book: "Blessed and honored and crowned and magnified and lifted up and glorified and elevated and praised be the name of the holy, blessed be he." The point here is not the influence of these prayers upon the gospels, but their style as analogous to certain features of early Christian prayers. First, both the early Jewish and the early Christian prayers prefer synonyms and euphemisms for God: "the great name," "the holy one" in the synagogue prayers; "father" or "father in heaven" in the early Christian ones. Second, the use of synonymous praises in the synagogue prayers suggests the synonymous character of the first three petitions in Matt 6:9–10:

---

11 No claim of dependence is made here; the earliest datable forms of the Kaddish are talmudic. See Heinemann, 1970:24; Friedlander: 134–35, 137; Wener: 350–53; Hoffman: 56; Petuchowski and Brocke: 54; also D'Angelo, 1992b:164.

"may your name be sanctified, may your reign come, may your will be done in heaven and earth." So also "father … your will be done" (6:10//26:42) can be expressed equally well as "father, glorify your name" (John 12:28). In John, this prayer receives an immediate affirmation from the divine (heavenly) voice, which comes for the crowd, but is apparently understood only by Jesus, the readers, and perhaps the disciples (12:28–29).

Looking at John 12:27–28 in the context of prayers of the persecuted just one raises the question of whether in John "father" might function in resistance to or critique of the imperial theology exhibited in the use of the title *pater patriae* for the emperor (D'Angelo, 1992a:623–30). If this is the case, then the point is made by the absence of the title from the passion narrative. As I argued above, John's Jesus uses "father" in dialogue with those who do, can, or ought to claim the same divine paternity as he does: the Jews, those other Israelites the Samaritans, the disciples and friends before whom he speaks with παρρησία (16:29). He does not use it with those who do not worship this deity, who cannot know the truth (18:37–38). Similarly, Mark's Jesus appeals to his father in private (14:36); in public, at his death, he cries to God, though the pagan soldiers apparently cannot understand him (Mark 15:34–36). In John when Jesus displays his παρρησία before Pilate, he speaks only obliquely of the deity as the one above who has allowed Pilate this moment of seeming authority over him (19:11), who is "not of this world" (18:36), unlike Pilate and the one above him. Their puny might tempts the Jews to repudiate their one father God (8:41) with the terrible confession: "We have no king but Caesar" (19:15). This last word of the Jews in the trial scene carries a perverse echo of the Shema. It cannot be established that the *Abinu Malkenu*—a central prayer in the Jewish New Year liturgy—played a role in the construction of this dialogue, for it is not attested before the sixth century. But its earliest form presents a striking contrast to John 19:15: "Our father, our king, we have no king but you" (*b. Taʿan.* 25b; see D'Angelo, 1992a:626–27).

"Father" in John 17

John 17 is the passage most readily evoked by references to the prayer of the Johannine Jesus; both its position and its content manifest its importance in the drama and theology of the Gospel. This prayer is so deeply imbued with Johannine thought that Käsemann used it as the entrée into his radicalized description of the theological idiosyncracies of the Gospel. Even so, the chapter both draws upon the style and traditions of Jewish prayer and shares certain features of two sayings from Q. Dodd treated John 17 as a witness to the so-called "Johannine Logion" (Matt 27:25–27//Luke 10:21–22; Dodd, 1963:359–63) and to the Lord's prayer (Matt 6:7–13//Luke 11:2–4; Dodd, 1963:333–34). The location of these two sayings in Luke suggests that they

formed part of a single unit of the version of Q used by Luke (D'Angelo, 1992b:171). Between the missionary sermon (Luke 10:1–20) and the Beelzebul controversy (Luke 11:14–28) lie four sets of Q sayings that are usually treated as separate (Kloppenborg: 92, 190–206; Koester: 141) but that have significant thematic connections. They consist of a blessing of (thanksgiving to) the father and revealer, beginning "I praise you father, lord of heaven and earth..." (Luke 10:21–22), a blessing (beatitude) on those who see and hear (Luke 10:23–24), the "Lord's prayer" (Luke 11:2–4), and sayings urging confidence in prayer (Luke 11:9–13). If these four passages are seen as comprising a unit, all but two of the nine uses of "father" as a divine designation clearly attributable to Q occur within it (D'Angelo, 1992b:162).[12]

Two brief sayings that follow the Q thanksgiving find echoes not only in John 17 but throughout the Gospel:

1. all things have been given over to me by my father
2. and no one knows the son except the father
   and no one knows the father except the son
   and anyone to whom the son wishes to reveal him.
   (Matt 11:27//Luke 10:22).

The first of these sayings appears in a slightly different formulation among the final (but not valedictory) words of Matthew's risen Jesus: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me" (Matt 28:18). In Matthew, "all things" (πάντα) and "all authority" (πᾶσα ἐξουσία) given to Jesus apply especially in the realm of teaching, specifically in teaching how to observe and do God's will (7:21). Another version appears in the *Gospel of Thomas;* to Salome's challenge, "who are you, o man?" Jesus responds: "it is I who have come from the whole; I have been given from the things of my father" (saying 61). Here too the saying vindicates Jesus' authoritative teaching: for the *Gospel of Thomas,* finding the true meaning of the words of the living Jesus offers salvation through the apprehension of the whole.

At its first appearance in John 17, the saying appears closest to Matt 28:18: "Father ... as you have given him [your son] authority over all flesh..." (17:2; cf. 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 24). The explicit mention of ἐξουσία underlines the presentation of the deity as the authorizer of Jesus' mission. A version of the same proclamation that uses "all" (πάντα) appears in John 3:35: "the father ... has given all things into his hand." Both the prayer of 17 and the dialogues and discourses throughout the Gospel specify the meaning of the "all things" the father gives: it includes "all judgment" (5:22), "to

[12] The exceptions are Matt 5:48//Luke 6:36 and Matt 6:32//Luke 12:30.

have life in himself" (5:26), "to do judgment" (5:27), "the works" that testify to Jesus (5:36), "the work" the father gave him to do (17:4), the words (17:8), perhaps the name (17:11), the glory (17:22, 24). But in John "everything the father gave" most frequently refers to those who come to Jesus and believe. The Baptizer concedes the divine mission of Jesus: "no one can take anything that has not been given to him" (3:27); and Jesus repeats: "no one can come to me unless it is given to him from the father" (6:65). The divine gift is the guarantee of his followers: "This is the will of the one who sent me, that everything he gave me I shall not lose from it, but I shall raise it up on the last day—this is the will of my father (6:39; cf. 6:37; 10:29; 17:4, 6, 7, 9–10; 17:22, 24).

The second part of the Q saying explains the wisdom and divine revelation that is celebrated in the blessing: "No one knows the son except the father, no one knows the father except the son, and those to whom he chooses to reveal him" (Matt 11:26//Luke 10:21). The Johannine version of this claim that is closest in formulation is 10:15: "the father knows me and I know the father" (Dodd, 1963:359–60). This claim to divine recognition validates the "teaching" of Jesus which causes his own (like the blind man) to follow him. It becomes an accusation to the crowds at Succoth: "If you knew me, you would know the father also" (8:19). So too the knowledge of God is both what Jesus claims and what he offers in 17:1–3: "Father … this is eternal life that they know you the only true God. … righteous father, the world did not know you, but I knew you and these knew that you sent me, and I have made known your name to them. … " (17:24–26).

Dodd's endeavor to find in John independent witness to sayings from the synoptic tradition most nearly succeeds in regard to the two sayings in Matt 11:27//Luke 10:22. The case of the Q prayer is different. The following table aligns the petitions of Matthew's version of the Q prayer with similar petitions or phrases that use the same language from John 17. Its point is not to argue that John 17 is a revision of the Q prayer or to claim a kernel of tradition that goes back to Jesus. Rather, the different versions of that prayer in Matthew, Luke, and *Didache*, the similar petitions in John 17, and the blessings that become the various versions of the Kaddish all reflect the raw materials of Jewish prayer in the first few centuries of the Common Era.[13]

---

13 See also Graubard (62): "the habit, widely known to us from ancient times, of adapting and adjusting existing forms and formulae to different purposes, makes it unlikely that one prayer should be clearly dependent on another. However, this fact shows all the more clearly that the essence of the kaddish, its first sentence, and the Lord's Prayer, spring from the same source and are at home in one and the same world of belief."

Matt 6:7–15 (Luke 11:2–4)	*John 17*
our father in heaven	father (17:1, 5, 24), holy father (17:11), just father (17:25)
sanctified be your name	glorify your son (17:1, 5; cf. 12:28, name; and 18:11)
your reign come	the hour is come (17:1)
your will be done	sanctify them in the truth (17:17)
give us bread	you have given (17:2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 22, 24)
forgive	————
do not bring us to the test; rescue us from the evil one	keep them in the truth (17:11); keep them from the evil one (17:15)
(yours are the reign and power and glory)	my glory which you gave me (17:24)

In John 17, traditional petitions (or imperatives) of praise are refocused around the fate of Jesus and of his hearers, John's audience explicitly included ("not only these, but also all those who believe on account of their word," 17:20). Thus "sanctified be your name" appears in John as "glorify your son that your son may glorify you … father holy, keep them in your name … sanctify them in the truth" (17:1, 5, 11, 17).

The first of the second-person petitions of the Q prayer ("give us today our daily bread" Matt 6:11//Luke 11:3) does not appear explicitly in John 17, though Jesus' opponents articulate a version of it in 6:34: "Lord give us always this bread." But John 17 offers Johannine versions of this plea: "that he give them eternal life … that they know you the only true God" (17:2, 3). John 6 interprets the gift of bread with eternal life: "My father gives you true bread from heaven. God's bread is what comes down from heaven and gives life to the world" (6:32–33). The ensuing dialogue identifies the true bread from heaven as the knowledge of God (6:44–47). The *Didache* eucharist similarly identifies the bread with "life and knowledge" (*Did.* 9.2). The beatitude on the hungry in *Gos. Thom.* 59 also treats hunger and its satisfaction as spiritual, motions of the search for knowledge (D'Angelo, 1995:78–79).

The final petition from Matthew also appears in a Johannine version. "Keep them from the evil one" (17:15) is virtually identical with the petition "deliver us from the evil one" (Matt 6:13; see differently Dodd, 1963:333). Conspicuously lacking is the plea for forgiveness of debts or sins (Matt 6:12//Luke 11:4). The petitions "that all be one" (John 17:21, 22, 23) do not so much substitute for this plea as cast into high relief the perspective that excludes it. John 17 is the prayer of and for the community of the elect, those who are not from the world, as Jesus is not from the world (17:11). These petitions in particular were the inspiration for Käsemann's analysis of a radical dualism in the Gospel (56–73). Brown reads 1 John as addressing a conflict over boasts of perfect communion and sinlessness that the writer's opponents derived from the Gospel (1979:122–28).

Whether John's communal vision led to gnostic positions (Käsemann: 65–66; Brown, 1979:93–144), responded to them (Bornkamm: 111–12), or instead expressed the spiritual stance of a single community at a specific point in its existence, its highly individual self-understanding is interwoven with traditional functions in the prayer's setting and content. John 17 locates Jesus and "his own" among the persecuted and suffering just; at the same time, it insists upon the spiritual power at their disposition.

Conclusions

"Father" in John is the preferred designation of the deity and very nearly what Philo might have called the proper name for God. As such, it is a theological strategy of the Gospel, pointing toward, intimating the deity as the origin and destiny of Jesus and of all believers, the guarantee of their authority. The impulse behind the Gospel's preference for "father" is similar both to early Jewish substitutions for the Tetragrammaton and to the use of "father" in the *Gospel of Thomas* and in some Valentinian and gnostic texts. This does not suggest that "father" has no metaphoric content. On the contrary, it everywhere calls familial imagery into play. Such imagery cannot but be patriarchal, but the refractions of patriarchy that inhabit both theology and christology are by no means reducible to simple propositions, nor are they expunged by the substitution of new and more inclusive language.

To be effective, the strategy requires that the audience (the first readers and hearers) of the Gospel find its referents immediately comprehensible and meaning-filled. Further, the function of "father" in the dialogues requires that "the Jews" of the Gospel also be seen to understand it. Indeed, "the Jews" claim the deity as their father also and in this they may well come closest to representing the real Jews of the Gospel's context. Thus, in a sense, the Gospel of John can be added to the list of evidence for early Jewish use of "father," although at several removes. The "prayers of Jesus" in John bear this out, illustrating the transformation of traditions common to early Jewish and Christian prayer by the dramatic exigencies and theological concerns of the Gospel.

These observations, while they controvert claims that the Gospel's specialized use of "father" was based upon the unique and revelatory practice of Jesus, are not without some consequence for the picture of Jesus and the movement within which he preached. For the less "unparalleled" the content of "father," the more current in the common vocabulary of early Jewish piety and resistance, the more likely it is to have functioned in proclaiming God's reign.

WORKS CONSULTED

Aalen, Sverre
1962 "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels." *NTS* 8:215–40.

Ashton, John, ed.
1997 *The Interpretation of John.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bachofen, Johann Jakob
1967 *Myth, Religion and Motherright: Selected writings of J.J. Bachofen.* Trans. Ralph Manheim. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Barr, James
1988a "Abba Isn't Daddy." *JTS* n. s. 39:28–47.

1988b "'Abba and the Familiarity of Jesus' Speech." *Theology* 91:173–79.

Bassler, Jouette
1992 "God in the New Testament." *ABD* 2:1049–55.

Bornkamm, Gunther
1997 "Towards the Interpretation of John's Gospel." Pp. 97–120 in *The Interpretation of John.* Ed. John Ashton. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Brown, Raymond E.
1966–70 *The Gospel according to John.* 2 vols. AB 29 and 29A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

1979 *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times.* New York: Paulist.

Bultmann, Rudolf
1971 *The Gospel of John.* Trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Charlesworth, James H.
1994 "A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of Abba: The Meaning of the Lord's Prayer." Pp. 1–14 in *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era.* Ed. James H. Charlesworth with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International.

Culpepper, R. Alan
1998 *The Gospel and Letters of John.* Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon.

Culpepper, R. Alan, and C. Clifton Black, eds.
1996 *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith.* Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup
1976 "The Johannine Church and History." Pp. 99–119 in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church.* Minneapolis: Augsburg.

1991 "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology." Pp. 153–64 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose

1990 "A Critical Note: John 20:17 and Apocalypse of Moses 31." *JTS* n. s. 41:529–36.

1992a "*Abba* and 'Father': Imperial Theology and the Jesus Traditions." *JBL* 111:611–30.

1992b "Theology in Mark and Q: *Abba* and 'Father' in Context." *HTR* 85:149–74.

1992c "Re-membering Jesus: Women, Prophecy and Resistance in the Memory of the Early Churches." *Horizons: Journal of the College Theology Society* 19:199–218.

1994 "Colossians." Pp. 313–24 in *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary.* Vol. 2. Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. New York: Crossroad.

1995 "Blessed the One Who Reads and They That Hear: The Beatitudes in Their Biblical Contexts." Pp. 45–92 in *The Beatitudes: New Perspectives.* Ed. F. A. Eigo. Proceedings of the Villanova Theology Institute. Villanova, Pa.: Villanova University Press.

1998 "Gender in the Origins of Christianity: Jewish Hopes and Imperial Exigencies." Pp. 25–49 in *Equal at the Creation: Sexism, Society and the Christian Tradition.* Ed. Joseph Martos and Pierre Hégy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dodd, Charles Harold

1953 *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1963 *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fitzmyer, Joseph

1985 "Abba and Jesus' Relation to God." Pp. 1–38 in *A Cause de l'Evangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et Actes offertes à Jacques Dupont O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire.* LD 123. Cerf: Publications de Saint-André.

Friedlander, Gerald

1911 *The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount.* London: Routledge.

Gnadt, Martina.

1996 "'Abba Isn't Daddy': Aspekte einer feministisch-befreiungstheologische Revision des 'Abba Jesu.'" Pp. 115–31 in *Von der Wurzel getragen: Christlich-feministische Exegese in Auseinandersetzung mit Antijudaismus.* Ed. Luise Schottroff and Marie-Theres Wacker. Leiden: Brill.

Good, Deirdre
1988 "Gender and Generation: Observations on the Coptic Terminology, with Particular Attention to the Valentinian Texts." Pp. 23–40 in *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism.* Ed. Karen L. King. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Graubard, Baruch
1978 "The Kaddish Prayer." Pp. 59–72 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy.* Ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. New York: Seabury.

Hamerton-Kelly, Robert
1979 *God the Father: Theology and Patriarchy in the Teaching of Jesus.* OBT 4. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1981 "God the Father in the Bible." Pp. 95–102 in *God As Father?* Ed. Johannes-Baptist Metz and Edward Schillebeeckx. English ed. Marcus Lefébure. Concilium 143: Dogma. Edinburgh: T&T Clark; New York: Seabury.

Heinemann, Joseph
1970 *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns.* Trans. Richard S. Sarason. Berlin: de Gruyter.

1978 "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition." Pp. 81–89 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy.* Ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. New York: Seabury.

Hoffman, Lawrence A.
1979 *The Canonization of the Synagogue Service.* University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 4. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Jeremias, Joachim
1966 *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

1967 "Abba." Pp. 11–65 in *The Prayers of Jesus.* Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM.

Juel, Donald
1987 *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Käsemann, Ernst
1968 *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17.* Trans. Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Keck, Leander
1996 "Derivation As Destiny: 'Of-ness' in Johannine Christology, Anthropology, and Soteriology." Pp. 274–88 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith.* Ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. CLifton Black. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

King, Karen, ed.
1988 *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism.* Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kittel, Gerhard,
1964 "ἀββά." *TDNT* 1:5–6.

Kloppenborg, John S.
1987 *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections.* Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Koester, Helmut
1990 *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development.* Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.

Lauer, Simon
1978 "*ʾAbinu Malkenu:* Our Father, Our King!'" Pp. 73–80 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy.* Ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke. New York: Seabury.

Layton, Bentley
1987 *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions.* New York: Doubleday.

Martyn, J. Louis
1979 *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel.* 2d rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon.

Meeks, Wayne A.
1971 "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *JBL* 91:44–72.

Meyer, Paul W.
1996 "'The Father': The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel." Pp. 255–73 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith.* Ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

Petuchowski, Jakob J., ed.
1970 *Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy.* New York: KTAV.

Petuchowski, Jakob J., and Michael Brocke, eds.
1978 *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy.* New York: Seabury.

Schelbert, G.
1981 "Sprachgeschichtliches zu 'Abba.'" Pp. 395–447 in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire.* Ed. P. Casetti et al. OBO 38. Fribourg: Editions Universaires.

Schillebeeckx, Eduard
1974 *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology.* Trans. Hubert Hoskyns. New York: Seabury.

Schrenk, Gottlob, and Gottfried Quell
1964 "πατήρ, πατρῷος, πατρία, ἀπάτωρ, πατρικός." *TDNT* 5:945–1022.

Schuller, Eileen
1990 "4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph," *RQ* 14:343–70.

1992 "The Psalm of Joseph (4Q372 1) within the Context of Second Temple Prayer." *CBQ* 54:67–79.

Segal, Alan F.
1977 *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism.* SJLA 25. Leiden: Brill.

Sieber, John H.
1988 "A Response to Gender and Generation." Pp. 41–46 in *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism.* Ed. Karen L. King. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Strotmann, Angelika
1991 *"Mein Vater Bist Du!" (Sir 51,10): Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonishcen frühjüdischen Schriften.* Frankfurt am Main: Knecht.

Trible, Phyllis
1980 "God the Father." *ThTo* 37:118.

Wener, Eric
1970 "The Doxology in Synagogue and Church." Pp. 350–53 in *Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy.* Ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski. New York: KTAV.

Williams, Michael
1988 "Variety in Gnostic Perspectives on Gender." Pp. 2–22 in *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism.* Ed. Karen L. King. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress.