

Johannes Beutler SJ

## **From the nature of Jesus to the way of Jesus<sup>1</sup>**

### **Did the Christian message pass necessarily by Greek language and thought?**

Lately I had occasionally taken over Sunday services in a workers' parish. The Creed is always recited after the sermon. In this parish it was customary to recite the Creed of Nicaea and Constantinople from the 4th century AD. There it says after the confession to the Father: "We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father, through him all things were made..." I always wondered what my automobile workers understood about such statements of faith. They arose in the language and thought of Greek communities in the 4th century. So, it made sense to choose the shorter and more understandable version of the Apostles' Creed, which simply says: "and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord, conceived by the Holy Spirit..." In this way, too, the faith is obviously expressed in an unabbreviated manner.

From here the more fundamental question arises as to the extent to which the confession of faith is necessary for salvation in the formulation of the great councils of the 4th and 5th centuries. Behind this lies the even more fundamental question of how statements about the nature of God or Christ and those about Christian behaviour relate to one another. You then come across a text like Mark 8,27-38.

#### *Nature of Jesus and way of Jesus according to Mk 8,27-38*

In the short section Mark 8,27-30 the climax and turning point of the Gospel of Mark is obviously reached. Jesus has revealed himself in word and deed, and so he can take stock. What do people think he is? There are various answers to this that see Jesus in the light of great figures of Israel such as John the Baptist, Elijah or one of the prophets. That is obviously not enough, and so Jesus asks the disciples: "But you, who do you think I am?" Peter, as spokesman for the group of disciples, gives the correct answer in the sense of the evangelist: "You are the Christ". The story could end there. The readers of Mark receive from Peter the interpretation of Jesus, which they can and should accept in faith. That could be enough to find salvation. But the story doesn't end there.

Jesus now speaks of himself with a new self-designation as the Son of Man. He must be rejected and killed by the elders, chief priests and scribes, but must be resurrected after three days. The same Peter who had just answered the question about the nature of Jesus correctly now

completely fails and wants to turn Jesus away from this path. He must accept the label “Satan” and accept the invitation to go after Jesus again. It is therefore not enough to have correctly answered the question about the nature of Jesus. His path must also be affirmed, even at the risk of one's own life. Jesus also calls on the crowd that has gathered after the scene of the disciples to do this.

*Following Jesus on the way (Mk 8,27 – 10,52 par.)*

For the first evangelist, Mark, Jesus' announcement of his future suffering and resurrection is fundamental. The entire section Mk 8,27 – 10,52 is held together by the theme “Following Jesus on the way”.<sup>2</sup> The “way” is already encountered in the introduction Mk 8,27, the “following” is introduced in v. 34. At the end of the whole section, before the chapters leading up to the Passion, it says of the blind Bartimaeus, who came to believe in Jesus: “and he followed Jesus on the way” (Mk 10,52). In this section from Mark 8,27, Jesus announces his coming suffering three times, three times the disciples do not understand him and three times they are instructed to follow him on his path. You can see from this structure how important this topic was to the First Evangelist.

The other two synoptic evangelists, Matthew and Luke, adopted this sequence of themes from Mark, although they no longer gave it the same importance in the structure of their gospels. In Matthew, Peter's Confession and the First Announcement of the Passion can be found in Mt 16,13-29. Matthew maintains Peter's rebuke, but balances it with Jesus' promise that Peter would be the rock of the church because of his confession. Luke brings Peter's confession with the subsequent announcement of suffering in Lk 9,18-26. He omits Peter's reproach and rebuke. The second announcement of suffering follows in Luke 9,43-45, the third only when the material from Mark is resumed in Luke 18,31-34. The structural importance of Mark 8,27 – 10,52 is no longer preserved in these two evangelists, but they at least retained the threefold theme. In John, the three announcements of suffering correspond to the three texts in which Jesus speaks of his future “exaltation” (on the cross and to the Father) (John 3,14; 8,28; 12,32). Here, of course, the announcement is no longer associated with the call to follow Jesus. Rather, it occurs elsewhere (cf. 12,23-26; 21,19).

*The “Way” in Acts*

The fact that Christianity is not simply a “doctrine” but also and primarily a “way” is shown in the book of Acts.<sup>3</sup> Luke likes to use this expression to describe the new way of life of Christians. According to Acts 9,2, Saul requests letters to the synagogues in Damascus “in order to bind

the followers of the way of Jesus, men and women, whom he finds there and bring them to Jerusalem.” He returns to this in Acts 22,4. Of Paul in Ephesus it is said: “But since some were hardened, resisted, and mocked the way of Jesus before all the people, he and his disciples separated from them and instructed them daily in the school of Tyrannus” (Acts 19,9; cf. 23). In Acts 24,14 (cf. v. 22), Paul says in a defence speech in Jerusalem: “According to the path that they call a sect, I serve the God of my fathers.” So, Paul does not see Christianity as a new doctrinal structure alongside that of Judaism, but a way of life that gives Judaism a special character. This corresponds to the self-image of Judaism, which sees itself more as a way of life according to the Torah than as a systematic doctrine.

*Focus on the death and resurrection of Jesus in Acts and Paul*

The memory of Jesus’ suffering, death and resurrection is also central in the book of Acts and in Paul. Almost all mission speeches in Acts lead to the kerygma of the resurrection of Jesus.<sup>4</sup> This is how Peter’s missionary speeches and then Paul’s are structured (cf. Acts 13,23-37; 17,31; the speech in Acts 14,15-17 breaks off beforehand). Of course, these speeches do not lead to the imitation of suffering, but as a rule to a Christological confession. The willingness to suffer is only demonstrated by the leading figures of the community such as Stephen or Paul, who willingly die for Jesus.

As is well known, the public life of Jesus and his teaching are hardly mentioned in Paul. At best there is a ban on divorce (1 Cor 7,10f.). Paul also knows Jesus’ celebration of the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor 11,23-26). Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God is replaced by justification through faith (but cf. Rom 14,17). And yet Jesus’ suffering, death and resurrection are central themes of Paul’s preaching. Of course, they are not associated with the call to imitate suffering, as in the Synoptics, but are proclaimed as a central saving event that is to be accepted in faith. This is what it says of Jesus at the end of Chapter. 4 of Romans: “who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification” (Rom 4,25). Paul’s willingness to suffer imprisonment and ultimately death for the sake of Jesus is expressed primarily in Paul’s later letters (cf. Phil 1,12-26).

*Beginnings of the Christological confession with the Synoptics*

The Gospel of Mark begins with the words “The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God” (Mk 1,1). This means that the decisive names of Jesus are mentioned in Mark. The voice from heaven announces that Jesus is God’s beloved son at his baptism (Mk 1,11). The phrase (“My beloved son, I am well pleased with you”) brings to mind the Servant of God in

Isaiah 42,1. The same voice from heaven resounds at the transfiguration of Jesus Mark 9,7: “This is my beloved Son, listen to him”. At the moment of Jesus’ death, the pagan centurion who witnessed Jesus’ death confesses: “Truly this man was the Son of God” (Mk 15,39). In doing so, he makes himself the spokesman for the future community of Jews and Gentiles. Of course, it is not clear in Mark and the references that follow him what is meant by this designation of Jesus as the Son of God. Some interpreters interpret it from the Old Testament, others more from the background of Hellenism and the Roman state religion. In any case, we are still a long way from the metaphysical statements of later centuries.

In Matthew there is a wealth of names for Jesus. Jesus usually speaks of himself as the “Son of Man.” The title “Son of David” is problematized, as in Mark (Mt 22,41-45; Mk 12,35-37). Jesus is just the Son of God. What points most to the future direction of statements of faith is the so-called “Johannean Logion” in Mt 11,25-27 (= Lk 10,21,f. ) from the “saying source” shared by Luke and Matthew: “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes. Yes, father, for such was your gracious will. All things have been delivered to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.” Once again, you won’t want to find any statements about the nature of Jesus from later times here. These are based on texts like the ones mentioned, but will be developed later in the language and ideas of Greek thought.<sup>5</sup>

The same applies to the “Trinitarian” baptismal formula of Matthew 28,19: “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you.” The text certainly influenced Christological and Trinitarian discussions and statements for centuries to come, but one cannot yet require the level of reflection of these later centuries.<sup>6</sup>

In Luke’s infancy narrative, the twelve-year-old Jesus justifies his stay in the temple with the words: “Did you not know that I must be in my Father’s house?” (Lk 2,49).<sup>7</sup> Before his suffering, Jesus prayed to this same father: “Father, if you are willing, remove this cup from me! But not my will, but yours, shall be done” (Lk 22,42). It is precisely this Father whom Jesus teaches the disciples to call upon in prayer in the “Our Father” (Mt 6,9; Lk 11,2). But Jesus calls him his father in a special way, as the twelve-year-old’s prayer shows.

*Full Christological confession in John and since then in the New Testament*

The Gospel of John is of crucial importance for the later development of theology. No other writing influenced the development of dogma in the first centuries as much as this text. Within the Fourth Gospel, which was probably written after the synoptic gospels and using them towards the end of the first century<sup>8</sup>, the prologue (Jn 1,1-18) once again has a special meaning. What should be emphasized here is the designation of Jesus as Logos, his participation in creation and his designation as “God”, all of this in the first three verses. The Logos title will give rise to Platonic speculations about the nature of Christ, including his role in creation. The designation of Christ as “God”, which is found in v. 1 and later in v. 18 and will be taken up by Thomas (Jn 20,28), heralds the later development. Faith in Jesus as Christ and Son of God is the goal of the entire Gospel (Jn 20,31). Here it no longer appears as an introduction to a path like in Markus, but stands within itself. In him there is salvation, of course as lived faith in the sense of Jesus’ commandments, not least the commandment of love.

In the Pauline school, similar to John, the pre-existence of Jesus and his mediation in creation are assumed or sung in hymns (cf. Col 1,15-17; Heb 1,1f.). This prepares for later developments.

At the beginning of the second century, the first disputes about the understanding of Jesus Christ emerged. The three letters of John probably belong to this time. They are concerned (especially in 1 and 2 John) with, among other things, the right Christological understanding. While the Gospel of John still deals with Judaism and emphasizes the divinity of Jesus, the letters of John see Jesus’ true humanity threatened by a charismatic group. There is still no real Docetism here, according to which Jesus only had an illusory body, but at least the salvation significance of Jesus, the incarnated man, is in doubt.<sup>9</sup>

*The Apostolic Fathers, early Christian apologists, Irenaeus*

In the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, the most important of the Apostolic Fathers, the first confrontation with genuine Docetism can be seen and conducted.<sup>10</sup> In the letter to the Ephesians at least the true incarnation of Christ is emphasized and recorded (IgnEph 18-19). Docetism is explicitly mentioned in the letter to the Trallians (9,1 – 11,2). Jesus was truly human, from his birth to his bloody death on the cross. This is also emphasized in the letter to the Smyrnaeans (4,1 – 7,2). If Jesus had not died bloody on the cross, Ignatius would not have had to endure the death of martyrdom. As the century progresses, the full humanity of Jesus will have to be defended above all against the emerging Gnosis.

The early Christian apologists face a twofold conflict. Justinus, himself originally committed to Hellenism, tries to demonstrate the superiority of the Christian faith over the Greco-Roman religions in his apology, but also deals with Judaism in his dialogue with the Jew Tryphon.<sup>11</sup> What both disputes have in common is the question: who is Jesus? For his faithful answer, Justinus is also prepared to die in Rome.

The dominant figure in early Christian theology at the end of the 2nd century was Bishop Irenaeus of Lyon.<sup>12</sup> Coming from the East, he can bring Eastern and Western theology to a synthesis. At the centre of his theology is Christ as the climax of salvation history. The heyday of Gnosis has now begun. It cannot see the Saviour Jesus as a real human being, but only as a heavenly being who only touches the earth to bring people onto the path of salvation. For Irenaeus, the key witness for true Christian teaching is the Evangelist John. In his work "Against Heresies," Irenaeus primarily refers to the Prologue of John (John 1,1-18) in order to record, on the one hand, the divine dignity of Jesus and, on the other hand, his true incarnation. In doing so, he also sets out the arguments for the coming centuries, for which he became the most important pioneer.

#### *The councils of the 4th and 5th centuries*

Here we will pass over the theologians of the 3rd century, pioneers of later church decisions, and turn briefly to the council decisions of the 4th and 5th centuries, which formulate the church's teaching on Christology and the Trinity for the future. The First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325 AD) is particularly important for our question about the nature and way of Jesus. The confrontation here is with Arianism, which saw Jesus not as a son of the same essence as the Father, but as a first creature. This then led to the confession quoted at the beginning of this paper of Jesus, God's only begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all time, God from God, Light from Light, etc., whereby the Council's main concern was to establish that Jesus was of the same nature like the Father. The bitter debates leading up to the Council had led to the fact that the only thing that mattered was the nature of Jesus. His way was no longer asked. The subsequent First Council of Constantinople (381 AD) established the divinity of the Holy Spirit, the Council of Ephesus (431 AD) once again established the divinity of Jesus and that of Chalcedon (451 AD) the two Natures in Christ against Monophysite denial.<sup>13</sup> With this, the discussions about Christology slowly died down and the Nicene -Constantinopolitan Creed began its journey through the centuries to the present day.

#### *Back to the origins?*

What is important here is not the validity of this Creed, but rather its comprehensibility today and its significance. It is not only today's industrial workers who will have difficulty with the language and ideas of the religious statements of the 4th and 5th centuries. Over time, the Gospel was carried to numerous non-European cultures that no longer follow the tradition of Greco-Roman antiquity. Inculturation means translating the Gospel into new cultures with their own religious and linguistic requirements.<sup>14</sup> In Europe itself, for most people, the language and world of thought of antiquity are far away. How would one have to formulate faith today so that it can be understood? In addition, the Christian faith has lost its relevance for many today because it is preached in a way that is too limited to the question of the nature of Jesus. The way of Jesus has fallen out of sight. How do you act as a Christian today?

*Example: the Dutch Catechism*

Today's catechisms attempt not to simply interpret the Nicene and Constantinople Creeds. The "Catechism of the Catholic Church" (1993)<sup>15</sup> follows the Apostles' Creed in its course, although it goes into detail about the disputes and doctrinal decisions of the councils of the early church.

The so-called "Dutch Catechism" from 1966, German "Glaubensverkündigung für Erwachsene" (1969), takes a completely different path<sup>16</sup>. It no longer follows the Creed, but tells about Jesus, as it previously told about the path to Christ among the nations and in Israel. What appears to be completely omitted from the traditional Creeds is now presented in detail, namely the life of Jesus from its beginning to the end. An important section deals with the "Kingdom of God" as the central content of Jesus' proclamation and effectiveness. Jesus was prepared to give his life to proclaim this kingdom. From here we can ask ourselves how we might try to move from looking at the nature of Jesus to inviting us to follow his way. Perhaps it would awaken the hearts and ears of some contemporaries.

*Jewish-Christian Perspectives on Jesus in the NT*

The Greek perspective on Jesus has quickly become dominant. We find it particularly in the Gospel of John right from the beginning, the Prologue, but also in Paul and his School. See the hymns in Phil 2,6-11; Eph 1,3-14; Col 1,15-20. Thus, the later Councils were prepared.

On the other side, there are texts in the NT which see Jesus more in a Jewish perspective. We must limit ourselves to a few examples. In the first text, the Letter of James, Greek elements are almost missing, in the other two writings (the Apocalypse and the Letter to the Hebrews) they occur, but are not dominant.

The Letter attributed to James, the Brother of the Lord, is perhaps the most Jewish-Christian document of the NT. Its Christology is very simple. Jesus is called repeatedly “the Lord Jesus Christ” (Jas 1,2; 2,1) or simply “the Lord” (5,7f). In Jas 2,1, we have the most developed Christology of the Letter: “My brethren, show no partiality as you hold the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory”. “Christ” is the messianic title, “Lord” is used by the same author also for God the Father (1,7; 3,9; 4,10.15; 5,11). If applied to Jesus, it expresses the relation of the faithful to Jesus as their master and is not necessarily understood in the sense of a divine nature of Jesus. “The Lord of glory” may refer to the actual state of Jesus, now glorified at the right hand of the Father.

Towards the end of the Letter (5,7f), the author admonishes his readers to be ready for the coming of the Lord, expected soon. Here, he combines Jewish Apocalypticism with the early Christian expectation of a future coming of Jesus at the end of history for judgment. No statement about the nature of Jesus is implied who simply remains “the Lord” but his role in history is at stake. This seems to be a typically Jewish approach to Jesus and will be confirmed by the analysis of the two following Writings of the New Testament.

The Apocalypse of John shows the influence of early Christian Christology. It has recently been studied by Konrad Huber.<sup>17</sup> A divine nature of Jesus is not affirmed, but rather supposed, for instance, where God is called the Father of Jesus (Rev 1,6; 2,28; 3,5.21; 14,1). The dignity of Jesus appears in the final chapters of the Apocalypse, where the “Lamb”, the preferred title for Jesus (see below), receives the same eschatological honour as the Father. Thus, we read in ch. 21: “And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb. And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb” (Rev 21,22). Here Jesus, the Lamb, receives the same dignity as God the Father, although without the use of Christological titles which would express this dignity.

In fact, the role of Jesus is expressed in the Apocalypse rather in temporal categories. This has been seen by Konrad Huber who calls his paper: “Jesus the First and the Last”. These are the dominant attributes of Jesus in the last book of the Bible. They occur in the Apocalypse right from the beginning. Jesus is “the first and the last” (Rev 1,17; 2,8; 22,13), “who is and who was and who is to come” (1,4.8), “the Alpha and the Omega” (1,8; 21,6; 22,13), “the first-born of the dead, and the ruler of kings on earth” (1,5). Jesus is called repeatedly the “Christ”, i. e. the expected Messiah of Israel (Rev 1,1f.5; 11,15; 20,6). The other dominant title is the “Lamb” (ἀρνίον, *passim* from 5,6). It has its roots in OT tradition, be it the lamb mentioned in the Fourth Song of the Servant in Is 53,7, be it the Paschal Lamb of the Exodus tradition. This title of Jesus



does not express his nature, but his mission in Salvation History. As the lamb slaughtered for the benefit of his people, he fulfils a role in God's plan of salvation. The same can be said of the "Christ", the promised Saviour of Israel and the nations.

A third example of a Jewish-Christian perspective on Jesus in the NT could be the Letter to the Hebrews. From its probable origin in Alexandria results the double influence of OT tradition and Hellenism. Under this aspect, the Letter to the Hebrews has much in common with the writings of Philo of Alexandria, an almost contemporary of our author. The impression imposes itself that our author is more strongly influenced by OT and early Jewish tradition than Philo and less by Hellenistic thought. For the introduction to the Letter and its interpretation see among other contributions my lectures at the Pontifical Biblical Institute from 2002 to 2004, in dialogue with my former colleague Albert Vanhoye SJ, the later Cardinal<sup>18</sup>.

A good introduction into the theology of the Letter to the Hebrews is found in the prooemium of the first four verses of chapter 1. Here, the double influence which we mentioned becomes already manifest. On the one side, chronological indications determine the text. We observe the movement from God's talking to the Fathers through the prophets in the past to his talking to "us" in the Son in the present days, the "last days", with an opening towards the future, when the Son will be appointed the heir of all things. We may call this a perspective of Salvation History. On the other side comes in the influence of Hellenism and Jewish Hellenism with the statement that through the Son all things were created. Here we are not far from the Prologue of the Gospel of John (Jn 1,3), influenced by Jewish-Hellenistic traditions about the divine Word, preexisting and taking part in God's work of creation. Here it is added: "He reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of his nature, upholding the universe by his word of power" (Heb 1,3). In the remainder of the Letter to the Hebrews, the dimension of Salvation History will remain dominant, as we will see.

In a first section, the superiority of the "Son" over the angels will be outlined (Heb 1,5 – 2,18). But Christ is not seen statically, but as the one who gave his life for opening eternity to those who believe in him (cf. 2,9f). So, we are back to history.

The central part of the Letter (Heb 3,1 – 10,39) deals with Jesus Christ High Priest after the order of Melchizedek (cf. 6,20). According to A. Vanhoye, the whole Letter to the Hebrews is nothing else but a treatise on this subject. He sees a concentric structure of the Letter built around the central section 5,11 – 10,39. An alternative would be to find in the Letter a linear structure which leads to the final exhortation of being steadfast in the trials of apostasy in a situation of persecution. Thus, the whole Letter would be a "word of exhortation" (Heb 13,22)<sup>19</sup>

rather than a treatise despite the doctrinal passages of the document. This would correspond to the contemporary approaches to our Letter with the instruments of speech analysis according to the rules of ancient rhetoric.

The central section of our Letter can be seen as a midrash on Ps 110,4: “The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind, ‘You are a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek’”. As this High Priest, Jesus enters the heavenly Sanctuary and takes his seat at the right hand of the Father (Heb 8,1). With this message, the Letter to the Hebrews is another document oriented towards Salvation History which finds its accomplishment in Jesus Christ and his mission. Ontological statements about Jesus are no longer found after the prooemium except his designation as “Son” (Heb 1,2.8; 3,6; 5,8; 7,28). Once more, we are invited to reflect about this alternative possibility of seeing Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Johannes Beutler, *Vom Wesen Jesu zum Weg Jesu: Stimmen der Zeit* 148 (2023) 699-707.

<sup>2</sup>See J. Beutler, *Der Weg des Menschensohnes (Mk 8.27 -13.37)*: [https://www.sankt-georgen.de/fileadmin/user\\_upload/personen/Beutler/beutler3.pdf](https://www.sankt-georgen.de/fileadmin/user_upload/personen/Beutler/beutler3.pdf)

<sup>3</sup>See D. Marguerat, *Die Apostelgeschichte (KEK 3)*, Göttingen <sup>18</sup> 2022, 1. Auflage dieser Auslegung.

<sup>4</sup>See U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. – form- und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen (WMANT 5)*, Neukirchen-Vluyn <sup>3</sup> 1974.

<sup>5</sup>U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17) (EKK I/2)*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990, 196-216 also arrives at such an ultimately positive view.

<sup>6</sup>In this sense, see again U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28) (EKK I/4)*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002, 452-454.

<sup>7</sup>Here too, Jesus speaks as a child of his time and his people, but prepares the way for later theological developments, cf. F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (1,1 – 9,50) (EKK III/1)*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1989, 160f.

<sup>8</sup>See J. Beutler, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien <sup>2</sup>2016, 58-68.

<sup>9</sup>See J. Beutler, *Die Johannesbriefe (RNT)*, Regensburg 2000; Revised in English: *The Letters of John. Translated and Interpreted (Analecta Biblica. Studia, 19)*, Rome 2023.

<sup>10</sup>See J.A. Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter, eingeleitet, übertragen und erläutert*, Darmstadt 1986, 109-215.

<sup>11</sup>See S. Heid, *Justinos, Märtyrer: LThK <sup>3</sup> 5 (1996) 1112f.*

<sup>12</sup>See F. Dünzl, *Irenaeus: LThK <sup>3</sup> 5 (1996) 583-585.*

<sup>13</sup>See A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche (9 Bde.)*, Freiburg et al. 1979-2002.

<sup>14</sup>See D. Ansoerge, *Kleine Geschichte der christlichen Theologie. Epochen, Denker, Weichenstellungen*, Regensburg <sup>2</sup> 2021, 352: “Welche Hegemonie-Ansprüche bringen sich in einer eurozentrischen Theologie zur Geltung – und mit welchem Recht? Ist die griechisch-hellenistische Denkform dem christlichen Glauben tatsächlich wesensgemäß – oder ist sie nicht vielmehr prinzipiell überholbar durch außereuropäische Denkformen?”

„Which claims to hegemony are asserted in a Eurocentric theology and with what right? Is the Greek-Hellenistic form of thought actually intrinsic to the Christian faith - or is it not, in principle, overtaken by non-European forms of thought?”

<sup>15</sup>Munich – Vienna etc.

<sup>16</sup>German edition of the Dutch Catechism, Herderbibliothek 382, Freiburg i. B.

<sup>17</sup> K. Huber, *Jesus Christus - der Erste und der Letzte. Zur Christologie der Johannesapokalypse*, in: J. Frey, J. K. Kelhoffer, F. Tóth, edd., *Die Johannesapokalypse. Kontexte – Konzepte – Rezeption (WUNT 287)*, Tübingen 2012, 435-472.

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.sankt-georgen.de/lehrstuchlelehrende/emeriti/johannes-beutler-sj/> Im Volltext zugängliche Publikationen.

<sup>19</sup> This verse is left out in the proposal of structure of A. Vanhoye in his book “*La structure littéraire de l’Épître aux Hébreux. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée*”, Desclée de Brouwer 1976, 59.