

Copyright © 2022 Johnson Pang

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation, or instruction.

GLORY AND GLORIFICATION IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN:  
THE GRANTING OF ΔΟΞΑ TO BELIEVERS IN JOHN 17:22

---

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Faculty of  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Johnson Pang  
May 2022

## **APPROVAL SHEET**

GLORY AND GLORIFICATION IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN:  
THE GRANTING OF ΔΟΞΑ TO BELIEVERS IN JOHN 17:22

Johnson Pang

Read and Approved by:

---

James M. Hamilton, Jr. (Chair)

---

Thomas R. Schreiner

---

Robert L. Plummer

Date \_\_\_\_\_

To Emily

*An excellent wife who can find?*

*She is far more precious than jewels.*

Proverbs 31:10 (ESV)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
PREFACE.....	xii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION, HISTORY OF RESEARCH, AND METHOD.....	1
History of Research.....	4
Commentaries.....	6
Studies on Glory in John.....	8
Studies on Glory in John 17:22 .....	23
Summary and Reason for Further Study .....	29
Methodology: Biblical Theological .....	30
Outline of Study .....	38
2. JESUS’S GLORY IN THE PROLOGUE .....	39
Prologue as Hermeneutical Key.....	40
Interpreting John 1:14–18 as a Cohesive Unit .....	41
Background of John 1:14–18 .....	45
John 1:14: Introducing a New Δόξα in Ancient Terms.....	54
Δόξα: The Glory of God.....	59
Δόξα as the Radiance of God’s Character.....	63
Excursus: God’s Glory in Exodus.....	66
Δόξα Manifested in Signs and Wonders in Exodus .....	67
Exodus: Δόξα in Soteriological Context .....	74

Chapter	Page
Glory New: Ως μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός.....	86
Glory Old: Πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.....	92
John 1:15–18 New Δόξα Replaces the Old .....	99
1:15: The Baptist Testifies to Divine Δόξα .....	100
1:16–18: The Gift of Revelation in Jesus Christ .....	104
Conclusion .....	114
3. JESUS’S GLORY IN HIS PUBLIC MINISTRY .....	118
Glory and the Structure of the Gospel.....	118
Survey of Δόξα in John 1–12.....	121
John 2:11: Miracle at Cana .....	122
John 5:41, 44: Blinded by Seeking Δόξα .....	129
John 7:18: Disbelief and Δόξα Continued.....	132
John 8:50-54: Failure to Render Δόξα .....	134
John 9:24: Disbelief and the Healing of the Man Born Blind .....	138
John 11:4, 40: The Raising of Lazarus .....	142
John 12:41, 43: Rejection as Fulfillment.....	150
Glory as Hermeneutical Framework .....	160
4. GLORIFICATION AND JESUS .....	167
A Brief Overview .....	167
Δοξάζω and the Hour .....	169
The Events of Glorification .....	170
Relation between Glorification of the Hour and the Glory-Ministry of Jesus .....	171
Δοξάζω: Glory and Honor.....	175
Δοξάζω: A Climactic Sign .....	181
Glorification and the Death of Jesus.....	183
Death and Resurrection as “Sign” .....	185

Chapter	Page
Δοξάζω: Revelation of God’s Love .....	193
A New Revelation of God.....	197
Conclusion .....	202
5. GLORIFICATION AND DISCIPLESHIP .....	205
John 12:23–28: Following Jesus unto Death .....	207
John 13:31–38: Loving as Jesus Loves.....	210
Glorification and Jesus .....	210
Glorification and Discipleship.....	216
John 14:13: Jesus Continues His Work of Glorification through the Disciples.....	219
How Are They “Greater Works”? .....	220
What Are the “Greater Works”? .....	224
John 15:8: Fruit-bearing Israel Glorifies God.....	226
Fruit and the Love Command.....	228
The True Vine and Fruit .....	233
John 16:14: The Holy Spirit will Glorify Jesus .....	239
What Does “Glorifying Jesus” Mean?.....	239
Why is Jesus Glorified? .....	243
John 21:19: Discipleship unto Death .....	245
Conclusion: Discipleship as Glorification .....	249
6. GLORY GIVEN TO THE DISCIPLES .....	253
Overview of John 17 .....	253
Purpose of the Prayer.....	253
Structure of the Prayer.....	257
Glory and Glorification in John 17:1-5.....	260
Glory and Glorification in 17:6–19.....	266
The Basis for His Prayer: Jesus’s Completed Mission.....	266

Chapter	Page
The Purpose of His Prayer: The Disciples' Future Mission .....	274
Glory and Glorification in John 17:20–26 .....	275
John 17:20–21 .....	275
John 17:22–23 .....	277
The Nature of Unity .....	281
The Basis and Example: Father and Son .....	282
The Unity of Father and Son .....	282
The Unity of Believers .....	284
Means for Unity: Jesus in Them .....	287
Means for Unity: Granting of Glory .....	290
Lexical Considerations .....	290
τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς .....	292
Glory as Mission? .....	301
Sharing in God's Glory: Glory as Status and Appearance .....	303
Glory, Unity, and Mission .....	305
Glory as God's People .....	308
Conclusion .....	311
7. CONCLUSION .....	313
Chapter Summaries .....	313
Synthesis of Glory and Glorification in John .....	318
Areas for Further Study .....	322
Contribution of Current Study .....	324
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	328



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin of Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
<i>CGL</i>	Diggle, James, ed. <i>The Cambridge Greek Lexicon</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
<i>DCH</i>	Clines, David J. A., ed. <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2016.
DGE	Adrados, Francisco R., ed. <i>Diccionario Griego-Español</i> . 7 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2002
EGGNT	Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament Series
<i>EQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>GELS</i>	Muraoka, Takamitsu. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
HB	Hebrew Bible
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>

<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
LXX	Septuagint
MGS	Montanari, Franco. <i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> . Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
MT	Masoretic Text
NAC	New American Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDNTTE</i>	Silva, Moisés, ed. <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . 2nd ed. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	VanGemeren, Willem A., ed. <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary

<i>RivB</i>	<i>Rivista Biblia Italiana</i>
SacPag	Sacra Pagina
<i>SBJT</i>	<i>Southern Baptist Journal of Theology</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SNTS	Society for New Testament Studies
<i>TDNT</i>	Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
<i>TLG</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature</i> .
<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Verbal connections between John 1:14–18 and LXX Exodus 33–34 .....	52
2. Thematic connections between John 1:14–18 and LXX Exodus 33–34 .....	53
3. Self-descriptors of Yahweh in Exodus 33–34 .....	77
4. Comparison of Exodus 34:6 MT, LXX, and John 1:14 .....	93
5. LXX translations for the adjectives יָחִיד, יָחִיד, and יָחִיד .....	97
6. Visual representation of χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος .....	106
7. Comparison of John 1:17 and 1:18 .....	107
8. Distribution of δόξα / δοξάζω in John .....	120
9. Comparison of John 5:21–24 and John 8:49–51, 53 .....	137
10. Glory as hermeneutical frame pt. 1 .....	161
11. Glory as hermeneutical frame pt. 2 .....	161
12. Jesus’s glorification and discipleship .....	205
13. Parallels between John 16:13 and 16:14–15 .....	240
14. Breakdown of John 17:9–11a .....	271
15. Clausal comparison between 17:21 and 17:22–23 .....	277
16. Use of Δόξα and Δοξάζω in the Gospels .....	318
17. Glory and mission in John .....	320

## PREFACE

At so many points along the way it was doubtful whether this dissertation would ever be finished. There have been so many friends and fellow students who have helped me over the years that I cannot possibly name them all here. Southern Seminary, with its professors and programs, was a great blessing to us in our five years there. Those were formative years, both intellectually and spiritually. We gained friends and life-long partners in ministry. Jim Hamilton provided for me not only a model of biblical fidelity and rigor in scholarship, but a constant pastoral presence. He cared for my soul and my family more than for my dissertation, and for that I am grateful. My fellow brothers in the trenches kept me going. I will never forget the study sessions at Panera Bread with Jonathan Kiel and Dan Maketansky as we prepared for Gentry comps. I also want to thank Erick Loh, Daniel Stevens, and Will B. Chan as they offered their time in reading early drafts and provided helpful feedback. Emil Grundmann also deserves special mention as he helped me through difficult passages of German.

The writing of this dissertation could not have happened without the love, support, patience, and encouragement of my wife. Emily has been ever so good to me, I do not deserve her love. I could not have done this without her. My children have lived under the specter of “Daddy still needs to finish his dissertation” all their lives, and they have endured it with great patience. My parents, and in-laws as well, have shown consistent support and care towards our family throughout this time.

The PhD journey has been long and difficult, but filled with glory. Emily and I married in 2010, moved to Kentucky, and began the program in earnest. Along the way we lived in Kentucky, Los Angeles, and Baltimore. We served and worshiped at

Kenwood Baptist in Louisville, New Life Church in Woodland Hills, Jesus our Redeemer in Baltimore, and now at Community Christian Alliance Church in Granada Hills, California, where Emily and I both grew up. We have been greatly loved by our church families. On our journey God has also given us three precious children and taken one home. The study of glory and glorification in John has anchored our souls in ways we could not have imagined as we suffered the storms of extended ICU stays and the death of our third child. God knew what we needed better than we did. Above all, we needed to know him, and Jesus Christ whom he had sent (John 17:3). This finished PhD represents much more than an academic achievement. It is a testimony of God's abounding grace.

*Soli Deo gloria.*

Johnson Pang

North Hills, California

May 2022

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION, HISTORY OF RESEARCH, AND METHOD

At a job interview, N. T. Wright was asked by the panel why he had written much on Paul and the Synoptic gospels, but not on the Gospel of John. Wright responded, “The Gospel of John is very much like my wife . . . I love her very much but I do not profess to understand her.”<sup>1</sup> The enigmatic yet beloved Gospel of John<sup>2</sup> has been the source of favorite verses for believers (e.g. John 3:16) while it has simultaneously confounded scholars (e.g. John 20:21). A reason for this is John’s accessible language which also can be interpreted a number of different ways. One such example is the word “glory” (δόξα), which has become common Christian parlance—widely utilized but rarely explained. Studies on the Gospel of John<sup>3</sup> have long focused on glory and Christology,

---

<sup>1</sup> As reported by Grant Lemarquand as he introduced M. M. Thompson during the Wheaton College Theology Conference in 2010. M. M. Thompson, “The Gospel of John Meets Jesus and the Victory of God,” Wheaton College, April 16, 2010, YouTube Video, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D2bcxk2pUwE>.

<sup>2</sup> I will refer to the Gospel of John variously as “Gospel of John,” or “Gospel,” or “John,” depending on the context. I will avoid the designation “John” as reference to the Gospel of John when it may be confused with reference to the author of the Gospel or John the Baptist.

<sup>3</sup> For some recent overviews see Klaus Scholtissek, “The Johannine Gospel in Recent Research,” in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 444–72; Klaus Scholtissek, “Johannine Studies: A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions II,” *Currents in Research* 9 (2001): 277–305; Klaus Scholtissek, “Johannine Studies: A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions,” *Currents in Research* 6 (1998): 227–59. Older surveys include Robert D. Kysar, “The Gospel of John in Current Research,” *Religious Studies Review* 9, no. 4 (October 1983): 314–23. Wilbert Francis Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, ed. C. K. Barrett, 4th ed. rev. (London: Epworth Press, 1955). For a survey of scholarship from 1963 to 1974 see Robert D. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975). For bibliographies, see Edward Malatesta, *St. John’s Gospel, 1920-1965: A Cumulative and Classified Bibliography of Books and Periodical Literature on the Fourth Gospel*, *Analecta Biblica* 32 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967); Gilbert van Belle, *Johannine Bibliography 1966-1985: A Cumulative Bibliography on the Fourth Gospel*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 82 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1988); Stanley E. Porter and Andrew K. Gabriel, *Johannine Writings and Apocalyptic: An Annotated Bibliography*, *Johannine Studies Series* 1 (Leiden:

especially as it relates to δόξα and σὰρξ in John 1:14.<sup>4</sup> But rarely is attention given to the disciples' glory. In John 17:22–23, before his arrest, Jesus prayed to the Father:

καὶ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὥσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν· ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὥσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν, ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ ἠγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἠγάπησας.<sup>5</sup>

The glory that you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and you in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me.<sup>6</sup>

In light of the profound christological statement in 1:14 regarding Christ's glory and the emphasis given to glory and glorification in John, this giving of δόξα to the disciples is surely significant. The giving of δόξα is the means for unity and mission—major themes in John, placed here in clear logical relation to one another. In the immediate context, Jesus prays not only for his disciples, but also for those who would believe through them: that they would all be one (ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὧσιν, 17:21). Since 17:22b–23 contains a parallel statement to this prayer, 17:22 shows that the giving of δόξα is the means that Jesus has provided (or will provide?) to fulfill the request of 17:21. Given the importance of δόξα for unity and mission and the fact that this is the only place that δόξα is given to people in John, proper understanding of its meaning is essential.

The interpretation of δόξα in 17:22 has varied since the early church. Augustine saw it as the future glory of the body, as did Thomas Aquinas.<sup>7</sup> Chrysostom allegedly

---

Brill, 2013).

<sup>4</sup> The two poles of debate which have set the modern discussion are the views of R. Bultmann and E. Käsemann. Bultmann stressed the first part of the verse, “And the Word became flesh,” and focused on the incarnation of the Word. Käsemann’s emphasis was on the second part, “and we have seen his glory,” and argued that John exhibited a naïve Docetism, emphasizing the divine glory of Jesus. Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*, trans. Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968); Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Scribner, 1951), 2:40–59.

<sup>5</sup> All quotations in NT Greek will be from the NA28 unless otherwise noted.

<sup>6</sup> All quotations from the English Bible will be from the ESV unless otherwise noted.

<sup>7</sup> Augustine of Hippo, “Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to St. John,” in *St. Augustin: Homilies on the Gospel of John, Homilies on the First Epistle of John, Soliloquies*, ed. Philip Schaff, trans. John Gibb and James Enns, vol. 7, *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of*



originated the view of δόξα as the gift of miracles.<sup>8</sup> Gregory of Nyssa understood glory to be the Holy Spirit.<sup>9</sup> John Calvin interpreted it to be the restored glory of the image of God in man. No consensus has been achieved down to the present day.

Studies on John 17:22–23 are preoccupied with unity and discussions of glory are scant. Scholars debate the nature of unity, whether spiritual, institutional, moral, or otherwise.<sup>10</sup> This is understandable given the need for church unity throughout the ages. But curiously, the δόξα given as a means for this unity is largely neglected. What exactly is the δόξα given to the disciples? How is it a means for unity, leading then to world-wide witness? Without an understanding of what this δόξα is, attempts at understanding the pursuit of unity, according to 17:22–23, will be incomplete at best and completely flawed at worst.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, how does the giving of δόξα contribute to the unfolding narrative and themes of John? What role does it play in persuading his audience to believe or persevere in belief?<sup>12</sup>

---

*the Christian Church*, First Series (New York: Christian Literature, 1888), 409. Roger Matzerath, *The Prayer of Christ for Unity: St. John 17:20-23* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1950), 99.

<sup>8</sup> Frederick D. Bruner, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 1016. But see the analysis by Matzerath, *The Prayer of Christ for Unity*, 98.

<sup>9</sup> Constantine Scouteris, “People of God - Its Unity and Its Glory: Discussion of John 17:17-24 in Light of Patristic Thought,” *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 30, no. 4 (1985): 419.

<sup>10</sup> See R. Brown’s discussion on various views of unity, Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible Commentary 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 2:774–79. For a full length study dedicated to “oneness” in John, see Mark L. Appold, *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John*, WUNT II 1 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1976).

<sup>11</sup> E.g. John F. Randall, “The Theme of Unity in John 17:20-23,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 41, no. 3 (July 1965): 373–94. Randall notes the whole section (17:22–23) depends on the giving of δόξα, yet does not elaborate on its definition or function.

<sup>12</sup> I think it is possible to see the audience of the gospel as inclusive of both believers and non-believers. The textual-critical and syntactical debate around 20:30–31 does not conclusively point either way. See the exchange between Gordon Fee and D.A. Carson, D. A. Carson, “The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 4 (December 1987): 639–51; Gordon D. Fee, “On the Text and Meaning of John 20,30-31,” in *The Four Gospels, 1992: festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al., vol. 3, 3 vols. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2193–2205; D. A. Carson, “Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30-31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no. 4 (2005): 693–714. From the literary perspective of the “implied reader,” E. W. Klink concluded that the content of John implies a general audience, Edward W. Klink, *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*, SNTS Monograph Series 141 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 152–84. Stanley Porter assesses the gospel as “public proclamation” and concludes that the internal evidence points to a wide audience,

This study will be a full length investigation into the meaning and significance of the giving of δόξα to the disciples. It will require not only an exegetical study of John 17:22–23, but also a grasp of John’s use of δόξα and δοξάζω throughout the Gospel while being sensitive to the unfolding narrative. Additionally, attention will be given to OT texts these passages may lead us to consider.

### History of Research

The importance of glory/glorification (δόξα/δοξάζω) in John is duly noted by scholars, yet it surprisingly has not received much focused study. Richard Bauckham, in a recent essay (2015) noted that glory “is rarely given extended exposition.”<sup>13</sup> For several decades the only monograph on the subject was Wilhelm Thüsing’s *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium* from 1960.<sup>14</sup> Recently two German monographs have remedied this, one a revised dissertation on glory/glorification, and another a *Habilitationsschrift* on glory in John and Paul.<sup>15</sup> There is not yet a full length

---

including both Christian and non-Christian communities, Stanley E. Porter, “Public Proclamation of Jesus in John’s Gospel,” in *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 37–62. On a related note, see the work of Sosa Soliezar, who argues against a sectarian reading of John and highlights the Gospel’s universal significance, in Carlos Raúl Sosa Soliezar, *Savior of the World: A Theology of the Universal Gospel* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019).

<sup>13</sup> Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 43. As for glory in Paul, see Carey C. Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 69 (Leiden: Brill, 1992); Donald L. Berry, *Glory in Romans and the Unified Purpose of God in Redemptive History* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016). I want to thank Tom Schreiner for pointing me to Berry’s work. Berry’s thesis for glory in Paul corresponds at some points to mine regarding the glory of believers in John: “Paul’s conception of glory (δόξα) . . . is about God manifesting his nature and character in all of creation through image-bearers who share in and reflect his glory,” *Glory in Romans*, 5.

<sup>14</sup> Wilhelm Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 21 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970). Updated in 1970.

<sup>15</sup> The revised dissertation: Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). The *Habilitationsschrift*: Rainer Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*, Herders Biblische Studien 50 (Freiburg: Herder, 2007). Chibici-Revneanu is discussed below, but Schwindt, so far as I can tell, does not contribute anything new to the discussion. He interprets it as the “divine life rooted in the loving unity of the Father and Son,” and does not give much explanation, Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit*, 370. Unfortunately, due to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020–2021, I was not able to access and interact with Schwindt’s work after my initial assessment in 2016, thus my interaction with his work in the rest of my study on glory is limited.

study in English on glory,<sup>16</sup> and the lacuna of a detailed study on the occurrence of δόξα in John 17:22–23 remains.

There are only a few specific studies on δόξα in John 17:22, and I will review four of them. Two aim to interpret unity, and incidentally cover glory. One is an article exploring δόξα from a social-scientific perspective. Lastly, there is an unpublished dissertation.

Many studies on the theme of glory in John do not give much attention to John 17:22 either.<sup>17</sup> The survey below will proceed as follows: commentaries; general studies on δόξα/δοξαίω in John; then studies on δόξα in 17:22 specifically.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Though there are unpublished studies, such as the dissertation done by Wayne Ellis (overviewed below), and a masters thesis by Christine Poston. Wesley G. Ellis, “An Investigation into the Meaning of ΔΟΞΑ in the Fourth Gospel” (PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1968); Christine Caballero Poston, “The Motif of Glory in the Gospel of John” (Master’s thesis, Trinity International University, 2004).

<sup>17</sup> These additional works are not included in the survey. They either do not discuss glory in 17:22 or do not further the discussion past what has been presented in the current survey. Paul E. Robertson surveys all the glory passages in John, and understands John 17:22 to mean God’s presence and power, “Glory in the Fourth Gospel,” *The Theological Educator* 38 (September 1988): 121–31. Paula von Mirtow does not define glory in 17:22, “The Glory of Christ in the Fourth Gospel,” *Theology* 49, no. 317 (November 1946): 336–40, 359–65. Alfred E. Garvie argues for a re-ordering of material and does not treat 17:22, “The Glory in the Fourth Gospel,” *Expositor* Eighth Series 17 (1919): 36–47. Constantine Scouteris focuses on unity, although he presents Gregory of Nyssa’s view that glory in 17:22 is the Holy Spirit. Gregory of Nyssa’s reasoning is that the people of God can only be united by the Spirit, and links this giving with the giving of the Spirit in John 20:21, see Constantine Scouteris, “People of God - Its Unity and Its Glory.” Andreas Köstenberger writes on glory in John’s Gospel and Revelation with the aim of showing that John’s theology of glory is at the same time a theology of the cross. He does not discuss John 17:22. He includes John 17:22 on his table of occurrences, and he refers to 17:22 once in a parenthetical remark along with a string of other verses. Andreas J. Köstenberger, “The Glory of God in John’s Gospel and Revelation,” in *The Glory of God*, ed. Christopher W. Morgan and Robert A. Peterson, *Theology in Community* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 111. R. B. Lloyd, “The Word ‘Glory’ in the Fourth Gospel,” *The Expository Times* 43, no. 12 (August 1932): 546–48. Works on unity, even focused on 17:20–23 do not define glory either, T. Evan Pollard, “That They All May Be One: John 17:21 and the Unity of the Church,” *The Expository Times* 70, no. 5 (February 1959): 149–50; Randall, “The Theme of Unity in John 17”; Dirk G. van der Merwe, “The Character of Unity Expected among the Disciples of Jesus, According to John 17:20–23,” *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 13 (2002): 224–54; S. W. Theron, “INA OSIN EN. A Multifaceted Approach to an Important Thrust in the Prayer of Jesus in John 17,” *Neotestamentica* 21, no. 1 (1987): 77–94.

<sup>18</sup> The following works are reviewed: Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*; Ellis, “Investigation into the Meaning”; George B. Caird, “Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics,” *New Testament Studies* 15, no. 3 (April 1969): 265–77; Margaret Pamment, “The Meaning of Doxa in the Fourth Gospel,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 74, no. 1–2 (1983): 12–16; W. Robert Cook, “The ‘glory’ Motif in the Johannine Corpus,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27, no. 3 (September 1984): 291–97; Joong Suk Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John: Restoration of Forfeited Prestige* (Oxford, OH: M. P. Publications, 1995); Johan Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, JSNTSup 160 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 138–65; Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*; Jörg Frey, “The Glory of the Crucified One,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology*

## Commentaries

A survey of commentaries will show that δόξα in John 17:22 is in need of further study and explication. Because of the paucity of discussion overall and the focused nature of this current study, the following will simply give an overview of how select commentators (thirty-two of them) have defined the term.

Not only is there no consensus on the term's meaning, but sometimes scholars are intentionally agnostic (Beasley-Murray),<sup>19</sup> leave the term undefined (J. Brant; R. E. Brown; F. F. Bruce; Hoskyns; Neyrey),<sup>20</sup> or lightly discuss the term but leave the definition unclear (Westcott; R. H. Lightfoot; Carson; Köstenberger; D. M. Smith; F. D. Bruner).<sup>21</sup>

---

*in the Gospel of John*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 237–58; Jesper Tang Nielsen, “The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 3 (July 2010): 343–66; Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 43–62; William Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017); Matzerath, *The Prayer of Christ for Unity*; Harry R. Boer, “The Glory of Christ and the Unity of the Church,” *The Ecumenical Review* 12, no. 1 (October 1959): 11–22; Ronald A. Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage in the Fourth Gospel: Understanding the Doxa Given to Disciples in John 17,” in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, Biblical Interpretation Series 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 281–309; Corinne Hong Sling Wong, “The Δόξα of Christ and His Followers in the Fourth Gospel: An Inquiry into the Meaning and Background of Δόξα in John 17.22” (PhD diss., University of Pretoria, 2005).

<sup>19</sup> G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, WBC 36 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 303. After surveying some opinions, he states, “whatever it may be, it is a gift of the son of God.”

<sup>20</sup> Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 225–29; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 335. Hoskyns does not define it, but does reference 1:14, in Edwyn Clement Hoskyns and Francis Noel Davey, *The Fourth Gospel* (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 505; Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 248–88; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:770–71, 2:774–79.

<sup>21</sup> This means they seem to define it but are unclear on what it actually is. Westcott sees it as knowledge of God or divine nature. Brooke F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, ed. Arthur Westcott (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 257. R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 299. Carson in his commentary seems to identify glory with the revelation of God's character, and the giving of glory as Jesus bringing to completion his revelatory task. Then in his separate work on the farewell discourse he seems to identify glory with the glory of Jesus' exalted state. Additionally, to possess Jesus' glory presently is to endure, like Jesus, the “enmity of the world and walk as suffering servants. This is our glory, not our shame.” D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 569; D. A. Carson, *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus: An Exposition of John 14–17* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), 197–98. Köstenberger likewise relates glory to Jesus' revelatory task, and says it is not Jesus' preexistent glory, but “glory that Jesus was awarded in order to carry out his earthly mission.” Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 498. D. Moody Smith, *John*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 316. Bruner, *The Gospel of John*, 1016–17.

Otherwise, commentators have proposed that δόξα in 17:22 is: glory given to Jesus upon return to the Father (Barrett);<sup>22</sup> divine nature (Bernard);<sup>23</sup> adoption (Godet; Macgregor);<sup>24</sup> knowledge of the Father (Haenchen);<sup>25</sup> full revelation of God's character (Keener);<sup>26</sup> honor and reputation of divine name (Lincoln);<sup>27</sup> honor/reputation (L. Morris; M. M. Thompson);<sup>28</sup> love (Moloney);<sup>29</sup> name of God, faith, words of God, and sharing in Jesus's work of revelation (Bultmann);<sup>30</sup> function as the revealer of God/mission (Lindars; Michaels);<sup>31</sup> authority and power to continue Jesus's work (Ridderbos);<sup>32</sup> divine

---

<sup>22</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 513.

<sup>23</sup> J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ed. A. H. McNeile, ICC 29 (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929), 2:578.

<sup>24</sup> Frédéric Louis Godet, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Timothy Dwight, Classic Commentary Library (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1955), 2:342. G. H. C. Macgregor, *The Gospel of John* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1928), 318.

<sup>25</sup> Ernst Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Robert W. Funk, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2:155.

<sup>26</sup> Keener sees the giving of glory as fulfilling 1:14, that it is the "full revelation of God's character given to the disciples in Jesus Christ . . . believers who walk in this revelation of God's character cannot divide from one another." Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 2:1063.

<sup>27</sup> Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 438–39.

<sup>28</sup> Morris does not define it, but says that "true glory lay in the path of lowly service wherever it might lead them" and he quotes Barclay who equates glory with "honour," so that he equates glory with the "path of lowly service, which is true glory." Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, Revised edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 650, 650n67. Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 356–57.

<sup>29</sup> Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 474. See also Francis J. Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1998), 120. He states that the δόξα is the love bestowed upon the Son by the Father.

<sup>30</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 515–16. Bultmann also thinks the giving of glory is language of myth, because the idea of the messenger equipping others with brilliance or light is common in Mandaean writings.

<sup>31</sup> Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1972), 530. J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 877.

<sup>32</sup> Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 563.

presence (Talbert; Whitacre);<sup>33</sup> divine presence and life (Witherington);<sup>34</sup> the manifestation of God's being, nature, and presence, in a manner accessible to human experience (Klink);<sup>35</sup> splendor and power of God's presence (R. Mounce);<sup>36</sup> and the anticipation of divine life (Schnackenburg).<sup>37</sup>

The opinions above can be further categorized and grouped, and are not all mutually exclusive, but their variety point to the need for clarity. Sometimes commentators will go on to discuss how this giving of *δόξα* relates to unity and witness, but very often the logic of the verse is merely restated, or the focus moves quickly toward unity.<sup>38</sup> There needs to be further explanation as to what the lexeme *δόξα* means in interaction with its immediate context, how it relates to the unfolding narrative of John, and precisely how it functions as the means for unity and witness.

## Studies on Glory in John

**Wilhelm Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium* (1970).** Thüsing's published doctoral dissertation from 1960 and updated in 1970, examines the Johannine themes of lifting up (*ὑψώω*) and glorification (*δοξάζω*). The majority of his work deals with glory and glorification, and he argues that

---

<sup>33</sup> Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 229. Rodney A. Whitacre, *John*, IVP New Testament Commentary Series (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 416–17. Whitacre actually describes it with a few phrases, but it seems like he emphasizes divine presence.

<sup>34</sup> Ben Witherington, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 271.

<sup>35</sup> Edward W. Klink, *John*, ZECNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 723. Klink is here quoting C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 206.

<sup>36</sup> Robert Mounce, "John," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 10 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 607.

<sup>37</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 3:192.

<sup>38</sup> E.g. see Brown's extensive discussion on unity, while never defining glory, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:774–79.

glorification consists in two stages. The first stage is the earthly work of Jesus culminating in his “hour,” where the Father is glorified through the obedience of the Son. The “raising up” of Jesus (cf. 3:14–15; 12:32), he argues, does not include the ascension, and is at the crucifixion, which is part of this first stage. The glorification of the Father at the cross results in the glorification of the Son, who is seen as the revelation of the Father. The second stage is the return of Jesus to the Father. After his death and resurrection, Jesus once again has the glory which he had with the Father before time (17:5) and this glorification includes Jesus receiving all power, including the sending of the Spirit, which is the characteristic of this second stage (cf. 7:39; 16:14; 14:13).

The giving of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22 is part of this second stage, and is part of the Spirit’s work of glorification in and through the disciples. To define  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , Thüsing first considers all the gifts the Father has given to the Son (e.g. his name [17:11], his words [17:8], and the Spirit without measure [3:34]), and he concludes that it is very likely that the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of 17:22 is *die Gabe der lebenspendenden Offenbarung* (“the gift of the life-giving revelation”) which Jesus gives through the Spirit.<sup>39</sup> He also considers the connection to 1:14 and adds that  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in 17:22 means grace and truth. Thüsing explains the lexical choice of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  by its connection to love and unity. Because the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of Jesus is given from the love of the Father (17:24) and the aim of the giving is unity (17:22), and because this unity is also emphasized through the command to love in 15:12, 17, therefore the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of Jesus is in this way the splendor of the unity of the love of Jesus and his Father. Thüsing also sees a parallel between 17:22 and 15:8 where the disciples, by their love for one another, bear fruit in converting many and thus render glory to God.

Thüsing’s discussion of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in 17:22 is helpful at several points, but ultimately confusing. Thüsing helpfully draws the connection between love and unity, and connects 17:22 to 1:14. Nevertheless, how is  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  the gift of the life-giving revelation, while also

---

<sup>39</sup> Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, 181–82.

grace and truth, and also the splendor of the unity of the love of Jesus and his Father? This is unclear how these elements relate to one another, and how the lexeme relates to or communicates these various definitions he provides.

**Wayne G. Ellis, “An Investigation into the Meaning of ΔΟΞΑ in the Fourth Gospel” (1968).** In this unpublished dissertation, Ellis examines δόξα and δοξάζω in the Gospel, concluding that δόξα in the Gospel “accords with the Old Testament concept of the glory of God and complements at vital points the New Testament teachings concerning δόξα.”<sup>40</sup> Ellis affirms that the LXX drastically changed the meaning of δόξα from Classical Greek, and that the δόξα of the Lord in the LXX has two major aspects: the essential being of God and the expressions of that being. Ellis briefly examines every occurrence of δόξα/δοξάζω in the Gospel and offers a descriptive account of what he finds, not necessarily arguing for a certain pointed conclusion. He covers δόξα in John 17:22 with only one sentence, and he does not give further explanation other than to paraphrase Bernard, who understands δόξα to be the divine nature.<sup>41</sup>

**G. B. Caird, “Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics” (1969).** Caird offers an analysis of the meaning of δόξα and δοξάζω in order to answer the question: “What does the Johannine Jesus mean when he says that God is glorified?”<sup>42</sup> He identifies five ingredients in the meaning of any word or expression (in varying proportions): (a) dictionary definition; (b) contextual determination;<sup>43</sup> (c) the

---

<sup>40</sup> Ellis, “Investigation into the Meaning,” ix.

<sup>41</sup> Ellis, “Investigation into the Meaning,” 115. Ellis does indicate elsewhere in his exposition that the disciples had already begun to reflect Jesus’ nature, although in a limited way, 122, 131, 151-152. Cf. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, 578.

<sup>42</sup> Caird, “Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel,” 265.

<sup>43</sup> He acknowledges here not just the textual context, but the historical and conceptual/cognitive context.



referent; (d) verbal association; (e) emotive force.<sup>44</sup> He states that the first two factors determine the word's sense, and that is what Caird focuses on. When asking what Jesus means when he says "God is glorified in him" (John 13:31), one proper answer is "the cross," but that would only be the referent. Caird rightly notes that most commentators elaborate on the referent, without discussing the sense, "They are telling us (correctly) that John uses the verb *δοξάζεσθαι* to denote the Cross, but not what John wishes to say about the Cross by the use of this verb."<sup>45</sup>

He argues that the first half of John 13:31 should be translated, "Now the Son of Man is glorified" (*ἐδοξάσθη*, as a true passive), and the second half "God has revealed his glory in him" (*ἐδοξάσθη*, intransitive passive). His argument is twofold, first he establishes the meaning of *δόξα/δοξάζω*, concluding that the LXX has influenced a semantic shift from the Classical meaning.<sup>46</sup> Second, he argues that the passive form of the verb *δοξάζω* can be semantically be intransitive, rather than a true-passive. He bases this on the possibility of the passive-form to communicate intransitive meaning, and the LXX, when the translator used the passive *δοξάζω* for the reflexive/intransitive meaning of the *niphal* *כבד* and *שקד*.

Caird's article makes an important contribution although it does not address *δόξα* in John 17:22. Caird's argument demonstrates further the influence of the LXX, especially on the Gospel's theology of glory. In addition, he shows that the aorist passive of *δοξάζω* may very well indicate not that God is honored, but rather that God reveals his

---

<sup>44</sup> The first three are self-explanatory. For (d) verbal association, he means verbal connections in the larger context (e.g. repetition of the word throughout the gospel); and for (e) emotive force, he means the "emotive and associative power of words."

<sup>45</sup> Caird, "Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel," 266.

<sup>46</sup> Caird concludes that the LXX usage of *δόξα* is determinative for its meaning in John. Outside the LXX, *δόξα* only has the subjective sense: (a) opinion ("what seems to me"); or (b) reputation ("what seems to others"). Similarly, *δοξάζω*: (a) to form or hold an opinion; or (b) to hold someone in high regard or esteem. The LXX used *δόξα* to render *כבוד* and extended the range of meaning to include objective meanings that convey one's worth, status, importance, impressiveness, or majesty. Caird, "Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel," 266–68.

glory. Recent discussions about the middle voice and deponency may lend weight to Caird's argument that the passive form need not be semantically passive. As Caird indicates, this would affect the interpretation of passages such as John 15:8, "By this my Father reveals his glory [*ἐδοξάσθη*; ESV "is glorified"], that you bear much fruit and so prove to be my disciples." Several scholars, in complement to Caird's observations, also include the sense of honor, such that God is honored in the revealing of his glory.<sup>47</sup>

**Margaret Pamment, "The Meaning of *doxa* in the Fourth Gospel" (1983).**

Pamment understands the foot-washing account in John 13 to explain glorification and glory in terms of love. Glory is the expression "of selfless love and unmerited generosity," as opposed to any notion of splendor. She concludes that "*δόξα* in the Fourth Gospel is used of the theophany of God's love," and thinks the Isaianic usage of *δόξα* in the LXX influenced the Evangelist's decision to use the term.<sup>48</sup> She does not include the *δόξα* of 17:22 in this theophany, for she sees it as "honor," including it with her discussion of 5:41–47, 7:18, 8:49–59. She takes the aorists in 12:28 and 17:22 to refer to the hour, and thus 17:22 refers to the "fate of the disciples after Easter."<sup>49</sup> Pamment does well to note the description of glorification as love and consider the influence of the LXX. But we need not dispense with any notions of splendor. Certainly the humiliation and dishonor of crucifixion run counter to notions of glory, but this seems precisely to be the point. The splendor of God manifested in an act of love is unexpectedly encountered at the cross of Jesus Christ.

---

<sup>47</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:606; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 482; Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, "Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine *δόξα*-Language," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Gilbert Van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 223 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 522.

<sup>48</sup> Pamment argues that the Evangelist uses glory instead of love, in order to link back to LXX language, especially to Isaiah and the Song of the Servant's suffering in Isaiah 52:13ff. Pamment, "The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel," 15.

<sup>49</sup> Pamment, "The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel," 13.

**W. R. Cook, “The ‘Glory’ Motif in the Johannine Corpus” (1984).** Cook asks, “What is meant by ‘glorify God’? And, even more basically, what is the glory of God?”<sup>50</sup> He seeks to examine John’s contribution to the doctrine of glory, and highlights glory as the revelation of the character of God. He classifies the glory of Christ under four headings: pre-incarnate glory, incarnate glory, passion, and exaltation. Cook explains the difference between the first two as one of degree of manifestation, that Jesus’s “intrinsic character and divine nature” was “purposefully veiled and obscured by and during his earthly life.”<sup>51</sup> Referring to 17:22, Cook observes that believers share in God’s glory, which results in their unity, with no further analysis or explanation.

**Joong Suk Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John: Restoration of Forfeited Prestige* (1995).**<sup>52</sup> Suh’s monograph is a meso-sociological perspective<sup>53</sup> on the characteristics of the glory of Jesus and the glory of the Johannine community. He follows J. Louis Martyn’s two-level reading of the text, and assumes that “the story of Jesus in John is the story of the Johannine community.”<sup>54</sup> Suh sees three stages of glory

---

<sup>50</sup> Cook, “The ‘glory’ Motif in the Johannine Corpus,” 291.

<sup>51</sup> Cook, “The ‘glory’ Motif in the Johannine Corpus,” 295.

<sup>52</sup> Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*.

<sup>53</sup> See his appendix overviewing macro/micro/meso views. The macro-sociological approach focuses on the constraints of the social structures on the individual. The micro-sociological approach focuses on the individual and his or her role and capacity. He proposes to consider the author of the Gospel on the meso-level, where “John” is both the constructor and constructed of the community, he is the “creative theologian whose theology constrains his community, and at the same time he is the community spokesman whose statements are constrained by the community’s proclivity,” Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 5. In the body of his work it is unclear how his sociological approach causes a different analysis of the text. Unfortunately he does not interact with honor and shame or the wider contemporary culture of the Gospel of John.

<sup>54</sup> Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 40. However, Suh calls for a re-assessment of Martyn and Brown’s reconstruction of the Johannine Community. For Brown the high Christology of the community came through a low Christology group merging with another high Christology group, which then resulted in debates with the Jews. Martyn claimed that after expulsion from the synagogue, the community was led to new christological formulations. Suh claims that the pre-existence Christology originates not with expulsion, but with the Jewish Christians themselves, who believed that Jesus was both the Messiah, but also the Son of God / God (9). The high Christology was not a reaction to expulsion, but rather came after believing in Jesus the Logos, and retrospectively understanding that the believers had “been in heaven before they were born on earth.” In Suh’s reading, the expulsion from the synagogue reinforced the high Christology, rather than originated it. See Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the*

for Jesus: forfeiture of glory at Jesus's incarnation; struggle for glory in Jesus's earthly life (as he strives to gain recognition of his status); and restoration of glory at his ascension and re-joining the Father. The Johannine community mirrors this process, although differently.

Jesus forfeits his status as God by becoming flesh (John 1:14) although Jesus is still "transcendental divinity" embodied in the flesh. Suh makes much of the flesh/spirit divide, and even claims that Jesus's "complete restoration of God's position is achieved when he rids himself of his humanity and ascends to heaven."<sup>55</sup> Believers also forfeit their glory being in the flesh. Suh argues that John 10:34, "You are gods," insinuates the self-definition of the community—"its members perceive themselves as 'gods.'"<sup>56</sup> Suh takes other passages and freely applies them to the community's self-understanding (e.g. because for Jesus, earth is the visited sphere, not heaven, so it also is for the community). How did they come to this self-understanding? The community, Suh answers, after believing in the Logos, retrospectively also understood themselves to have a heavenly origin. Their glory, forfeited in the flesh, can only be regained through Jesus's prayer, "without Jesus's giving activity they cannot receive the glory" (17:22).<sup>57</sup> Thus the giving of *δόξα* in 17:22 is the restoration of this divine glory.

Suh's analysis is problematic. The application of the two-level reading made popular in scholarship by Martyn, Brown, and Meeks brings more confusion than it does clarity.<sup>58</sup> Suh does not prove why John 10:35 should provide evidence for the

---

*Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 25–54.

<sup>55</sup> Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 36. However, there is no evidence in John that Jesus ever "rids himself" of his humanity, or that he ceases to be embodied in the flesh.

<sup>56</sup> Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 41.

<sup>57</sup> Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 51.

<sup>58</sup> The Johannine community hypothesis, once seen as established and firm, has now lost its grip on scholarship. Note Kysar's words in his survey of Johannine scholarship in 1975: "the theology of every stratum of the gospel relates to the community of faith . . . [T]he gospel cannot be read meaningfully apart from some understanding of the community out of which and to which it was written." Then compare his statements thirty years later: "For me, the evidence used as the foundation for the community

community's self-identity as gods. Thus Suh does not have any exegetical grounding when he states that the Johannine community claims not only to have "divine features in themselves but to be 'gods.'"<sup>59</sup> His three-stage process of glory applied to the Johannine community is forced.<sup>60</sup> As a result, his analysis of John 17:22 that Jesus is praying for the restoration of divinity-lost is based on a highly speculative framework.

**Johann Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology* (1998).**<sup>61</sup> Ferreira argues that ecclesiology is a major Johannine concern, and that "it played an important role in the

---

interpretation has become increasingly fuzzy." Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel*, 269–70. Robert D. Kysar, "The Whence and Whither of the Johannine Community," in *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown, S.S.*, ed. John R. Donahue (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 72. See Bauckham's critique of the general approach of Gospel studies to assume that each gospel was written for the communities in which they were written. Alternatively, Bauckham argues for the greater likelihood that the gospels were written for distribution and wider readership than their own communities, which also throws into question the ability for interpreters to reconstruct a "Johannine community" from the evidence of the text, in Richard Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 9–48. See also Klink's work where he applied Bauckham's thesis in *The Gospels for All Christians* specifically to the Gospel of John, and sought to demonstrate how the two-level Johannine community paradigm is unfounded. Klink, *The Sheep of the Fold*. However, there are some who still argue for the Johannine community hypothesis, for example most recently, Martinus C. de Boer, "Expulsion from the Synagogue: J. L. Martyn's History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel Revisited," *NTS* 66 (2020): 367–91.

<sup>59</sup> Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 136. He also appeals to John 1:13, stating that in this verse the community claims to define themselves as born from God, insinuating that their original dwelling place was in heaven. He neglects the context which states that God had given those who believed in Jesus the right to become children of God (1:12). This does not speak of their heavenly origin in general, but of the heavenly origin of their new life which they received upon believing in Jesus.

<sup>60</sup> An example is when Suh defines the second stage of glory for the community, the struggle for glory. He states that it is a struggle for recognition of divine status against Jewish Christians from the Petrine apostolic tradition. Suh quotes John 14:12, "Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever believes in me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these he will do, because I am going to the Father." Suh interprets the "you" to be Jewish Christians (belonging to the Petrine apostolic tradition), and the "whoever believes" as proper believers, those of the Johannine community. Thus the verse reflects the social situation of the community, in their struggle to reveal not just Jesus' divinity, but their own divinities over and against these other Jewish Christians. His own analysis seems inconsistent, he views "you" and "whoever believes" as contemporary referents in the community, ostensibly making the whole verse reflect the current community situation. But then Suh interprets "will do" (future tense ποιήσει) as referring forward to the time of the community. Even if one grants the two-level reading, this is inconsistent and arbitrary exegesis. Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 69–73. There are other errors one can point out as well. Suh claims Craig Evans as arguing for the *Trimorphic Protennoia* as the primary background of the prologue, when that is exactly what Craig Evans is arguing against, Suh, *The Glory in the Gospel of John*, 29. Cf. Craig A. Evans, "On the Prologue of John and the Trimorphic Protennoia," *New Testament Studies* 27, no. 3 (April 1981): 395–401; Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*, JSNTSup 89 (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993).

<sup>61</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*.

formation of John's theological content."<sup>62</sup> His interest is not in the social history (*Sitz im Leben*) of the Johannine community, but rather the theology of the Gospel of John (although he holds to the two-level reading of John, following Martyn). He conducts an exegetical and terminological study of John 17 and has an entire chapter on Johannine glory.

Ferreira briefly examines the background of glory, starting with the כבוד יהוה in the OT.<sup>63</sup> From Exodus and Ezekiel he concludes that the glory of God has become a technical term to denote the "presence and revelation of God," highlighting specifically his saving activity for and with his people.<sup>64</sup> Ferreira also notes connections with power and judgment, but sees these as ultimately undergirding the goodness of God in his saving activity (cf. Ex 33:19). He connects the prologue of John with the Exodus account, and sees John 1:14 as characterizing Jesus's ministry as a revelation of δόξα, δόξα referring to "the presence of God with his people for salvation."<sup>65</sup> In John 17:22, δόξα is the mission Jesus received from the Father, and the δόξα that Jesus gives is the sharing in his mission. "The disciples' δόξα then is to continue the divine mission of Jesus."<sup>66</sup> Ferreira summarizes his view of Johannine δόξα: it "describes the revelation or realization of the grace and power of God's salvation in the life of the community."<sup>67</sup>

I appreciate Ferreira for including a chapter on glory so he could situate his analysis of John 17 within a wider framework, and also for recognizing the importance of the prologue as programmatic for its interpretation. His connection of John 1:14 to

---

<sup>62</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 14.

<sup>63</sup> He also briefly examines the glory of God (limiting himself to futuristic contexts) in the Pseudepigrapha, and then also in the Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically the *Rule of the Community*, the *Zadokite Document*, the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, and the *War Scroll*.

<sup>64</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 142.

<sup>65</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 151.

<sup>66</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 159.

<sup>67</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 161.

Exodus is on the right track. However, Ferreira empties  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of actual semantic content, and imports associated elements. For John 17:22, how can  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  be understood as “mission”? He states, “The disciples receive  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  as they participate in the mission of Jesus,” but then he defines  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  as mission. This is confusing. The disciples receive  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  as they participate in  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ ? Also, how does “mission” relate to  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ ’s possible semantic range? The blurring of semantic meaning with contextual associations began with his analysis of  $\text{כבוד}$  in the OT, where Ferreira sees it as a revelation of God’s saving activity, rather than as a revelation of God himself.<sup>68</sup> When he imports this into John 1:14 he understands the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of Jesus as purely *functional*. Jesus reveals God’s *saving* presence, rather than Jesus reveals God.<sup>69</sup> His analysis results in an untenable definition of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22.<sup>70</sup> This provides an example for the need of semantic clarity in defining  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and careful analysis of its background (especially Exodus 33–34).

---

<sup>68</sup> This can be seen when he identifies God’s  $\text{כבוד}$  with God’s goodness (Exod 33:19), and then he states “in the book of Exodus God’s goodness is his saving activity on behalf of his people.” Because God’s goodness (in the wider context) is expressed in saving activity, Ferreira imports the whole into the meaning of  $\text{כבוד}$ . He also misses how John 1:14, “full of grace and truth,” is an allusion back to the attributes of God in Exodus 34:6, “abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness.”

<sup>69</sup> My analysis is confirmed by Ferreira’s own statement, “In John, glory is a soteriological concept and not an ontological one.” Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 161. This is problematic—Jesus discloses the Father in the Gospel of John (1:18). When one sees Jesus, they see God, not merely the mission of God to save sinners (14:9). At the beginning of his Johannine analysis, Ferreira affirms  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  as the “presence of God with his people for salvation,” but by the end, he drops “presence of God” from his definition, and  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  becomes anything that can fall under the umbrella of the “saving ministry of Jesus.”

<sup>70</sup> He rejects “splendor,” “majesty,” “brightness,” and “so on” as metaphysical or abstract interpretations. His interpretation of John 12:41, “Isaiah said these things because he saw his glory” is forced. He notes that in the vision the temple was filled with smoke, likely coming from the burning altar. Ferreira then concludes it could have been that the author (of the Gospel of John) saw the burning altar as anticipatory of the sacrifice of Christ, and in this, the prophet saw his glory. This is how Ferreira links Isaiah seeing God’s glory not with splendor or majesty, but with the functional aspect of God’s saving goodness. Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 157, 161.

Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten* (2007).<sup>71</sup>

Chibici-Revneanu's slightly revised version of her doctoral dissertation<sup>72</sup> published in the second series of WUNT, is the most comprehensive work on glory and glorification in John to date. It is a massive work (totaling 746 pp.). She analyzes every occurrence of δόξα and δοξάζω (276 pp.) and thoughtfully treats δόξα in 17:22 (13 pp.). As to her overall argument, she proposes a uniform understanding of δόξα throughout the gospel (as opposed to earthly glory vs. heavenly glory, or some other division)<sup>73</sup> while affirming a multi-dimensionality to δόξα. There is *one* glory, the glory of God (linking back to OT glory, כבוד יהוה). John does not refer to different glories but he does refer to “two different *relations* between Jesus and the one glory of God.”<sup>74</sup> John 1:14, glory from God (παρὰ πατρός) is different than 17:5, glory with God (παρὰ πατρί). These *παρά*-relations:

provide the key to the understanding of δόξα in John: While on earth, Jesus was given glory *from* the Father (παρὰ πατρός), after going back to the Father he has glory *with* the Father (παρὰ πατρί). This is why Jesus can, after a lifetime of revealing δόξα (παρὰ πατρός), pray for his glorification with δόξα (παρὰ πατρί bzw. παρὰ σεαυτῶ).<sup>75</sup>

Additionally, she argues that δόξα/δοξάζω are linking terms, creating a “theological horizon,” uniting many different themes (e.g. Exodus, temple, kingship) through the exegetical method of *gezerah shawah*. Through the Gospel of John the term is elaborated until it culminates in the passion narrative.

---

<sup>71</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*; See also two articles she has since published on glory Chibici-Revneanu, “Variations on Glorification”; Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, “Gottes Herrlichkeit. Impulse aus dem Johannesevangelium,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 50, no. 1 (2008): 75–94.

<sup>72</sup> Under Christfried Böttrich at the Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald, 2006.

<sup>73</sup> W. Thüsing understands glorification to occur in two stages; G. C. Nicholson proposes five stages of glory. Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*; Godfrey C. Nicholson, *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*, SBL Dissertation Series 63 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 149–51.

<sup>74</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, “Variations on Glorification,” 517 (emphasis original).

<sup>75</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, “Variations on Glorification,” 517.



For 17:22, she argues that δόξα means both “theological” glory and “profane-anthropological” glory (honor/praise). She understands Jesus as passing on the same glory which he had with the Father from eternity, and which was given from the Father as God’s sent one while on earth.<sup>76</sup> Thus believers are mediators of revelation, bearers of revelation through their being sent by Jesus. Simultaneously, it is “profane-anthropological” (honor/praise) glory, by which men get true honor, to belong to Jesus and his Father.<sup>77</sup> Δόξα in 17:22 clarifies the relationship between the believers and the world. Believers should reveal God to the world through their unity, and it is in itself a revelation of God.

Chibici-Revneanu’s work is helpful in several ways. She situates her understanding of δόξα within a thorough study of Greek, Jewish, and early Christian literature, tracing out its different uses and relationships. She analyzes every occurrence of δόξα and δοξάζω, helpfully giving attention to the possible honor-shame context. In her analysis of John 17:22, she stresses the functional and social aspects of δόξα. It is the “seal” (*Seigel*) of the mission,<sup>78</sup> and it is a sent-one-δόξα (*Gesandten-δόξα*), while it is also the honor (*Ehre*) of the disciples, helping to promote group identity. Her sophisticated theory for the Gospel’s use of δόξα/δοξάζω should provide fruitful interaction, while I can build on some of her observations about 17:22.

**Jorg Frey, “‘dass sie meine Herrlichkeit schauen’ (Joh 17.24): Zu**

***Hintergrund, Sinn, und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der δόξα Jesu*” (2008).<sup>79</sup>**

---

<sup>76</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 291. She argues that even in instances like John 5:44, “How can you believe when you receive glory [δόξα] from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the only God?” There is not a different δόξα at play, but an inappropriate understanding of δόξα, a “nonentity” (*ist ein ,Nichts‘*) (cf. 8:54).

<sup>77</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 295.

<sup>78</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 292, 296, 298. It seems she means by this: the guarantee of the mission.

<sup>79</sup> Frey’s work, originally an address to the general meeting of SNTS in August 2007, was published in *NTS* in 2008, then subsequently republished in a collection of essays in 2013 and then translated into English in another collection of essays in 2018. Jörg Frey, “‘. . . daß sie meine Herrlichkeit

Frey's thesis is that the Gospel of John presents Jesus's glory from a Spirit-remembered post-Easter perspective. Thus the Christological portrait that emerges is one where Jesus's glory is a retrojection of post-Easter glory. Frey seeks to account for the hermeneutical perspective of the Gospel, for other accounts of Jesus locate glory as a consequence of the conquest of death rather than in the passion and death itself. His analysis on glory and glorification focuses on the hermeneutical perspective of the Gospel of John, and Frey does not discuss the implications of his work on glory in John 17:22.<sup>80</sup>

**J. T. Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel" (2010).** Nielsen critiques the previous recent monographs of Chibici-Revneanu and Schwindt for not interpreting Johannine glory in light of the narrative plot of the Fourth Gospel. He draws from Aristotle's *Poetics*, asserting that a narrative must have a whole and complete plot, which includes beginning, middle, and end. There also needs to be a turning point (*περιπέτεια*) and a cognitive turn from ignorance to knowledge (*ἀναγνώρισις*).<sup>81</sup>

---

Schauen' (Joh 17,24). Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der Δόξα Jesu," *New Testament Studies* 54, no. 3 (July 2008): 375–97; Jörg Frey, "... daß sie meine Herrlichkeit Schauen' (Joh 17,24). Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der Δόξα Jesu," in *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten*, WUNT 307 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 639–62; Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One."

<sup>80</sup> Frey's work is provocative and merits consideration as one approaches the Gospel as a whole, and interpretation of glory and glorification in particular. At several points throughout my study I will note both agreement and disagreement with how he analyzes glory and glorification in John. But I will sketch out more broadly here his hermeneutical perspective. Following Günther Bornkamm, Frey takes a pneumatological interpretive approach where the Farewell Discourses offer an interpretive key to John. In light of the Spirit's sending, the theological language of the Johannine community and its developed Christology can be explained. The Gospel of John provides the history of Jesus from the perspective of the post-Easter community, such that Jesus is remembered and presented in light of his δόξα. Frey writes, "Therefore, talk of the δόξα of the earthly one and especially talk of the δόξα of the preexistent one are likewise possible only in retrospect, in the believing recognition of the glorification of the crucified one. Here lies—at least noetically—the basis of the Johannine Christology," in Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One," 243–44. He contends that it is not possible to speak of Jesus' glory apart from this perspective, so the glory witnessed in John 1:14, and throughout John's narrative, must be the glory of the crucified glorified Christ. Frey explains how the Gospel of John's perspective contrasts with other traditions, such that the Johannine perspective goes far beyond "the older tradition" by portraying the earthly Jesus "as already acting with divine authority and glory," in Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One," 257.

<sup>81</sup> Nielsen understands the turning point (*περιπέτεια*) to be the crucifixion of Jesus, and the

Nielsen seeks to uncover the Johannine plot according to Aristotle’s “whole and complete narrative” and then explain how these narrative structures determine the meaning of δόξα/δοξάζω. He identifies the main task of Jesus as the execution of his mission to give eternal life to believers, with the leading theme as Jesus attempting to win faith. Jesus does this through his words and deeds, which reveal his close relation to God and his own divine character—it is when Jesus is recognized as God’s agent that God is recognized as being revealed in the words and works of Jesus, “when this happens, Jesus fulfils his role as saviour.”<sup>82</sup> The narrative plot revolves around “God’s wish to be recognized through Jesus,” and to express this structure Nielsen argues that the evangelist uses δόξα/δοξάζω, which principally means divine identity and the recognition of this identity. Nielsen mentions the giving of δόξα to the believers in 17:22 as including them into the divine community. People who perceive Jesus’s status are included into it, and consequently they take over Jesus’s obligations through their relation to him.

**Richard Bauckham, “Glory” (2015).** Bauckham provides a “preliminary attempt at an analytic overview” of the theme of glory in the Gospel of John. He traces the usage and meanings of כבוד in the OT, δόξα in Classical Greek, in the LXX, and in the NT, concluding that the NT usage has two categories of meaning: “honor, reputation” and “visible splendor.” Similarly, the verb δοξάζω in the NT means “to honor, to praise” and sometimes “to endow with visible splendor.” He surveys the occurrences under two major headings, “Glory Seen in Jesus” and “Jesus and God Glorified.”

---

cognitive turning point (ἀναγνώρισις) to be the point of full realization of Christ’s identity with Thomas’ confession. The application of Aristotle’s description of a whole and complete narrative may not be appropriate to John, Aristotle’s *Poetics* describes the ideal Greek tragedy. Additionally it is debatable whether the cognitive turning point in John’s narrative is Thomas’ confession, for the audience is not held to the same plight of whether one recognizes Jesus to be Lord and God, but already know from the prologue and other editorial comments the true identity of Jesus. For example, the audience would have had the same conclusion from the previous incident with Jesus’ appearing to the other disciples.

<sup>82</sup> Nielsen, “The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel,” 351.

Bauckham's work is valuable for several reasons. First, he recognizes the semantic value of the lexemes δόξα/δοξάζω. He analyzes them in context and makes appropriate connections without reading the associations back into the meanings. This is seen when he considers the impact of the lexeme on each context, and appropriately discerns which meaning is appropriate for the context. For example, in 17:22 he identifies δόξα as the radiance of God's character.<sup>83</sup> He then moves to consider how this is related to the mission of the disciples and other relevant themes. Previous examples have shown that scholars are sometimes quick to ignore the semantic contribution of δόξα.

Second, although he admits 17:22 is "especially difficult to interpret," he attempts it. Bauckham, very much in line with the proposal of this study, suggests that it is "glory as the radiance of God's character" and links it closely with God's love. He supports his reading by connecting it with John 15:8 and 21:19, where the disciples will glorify God by bearing fruit, and Peter's martyrdom will also glorify God. Thus, "the glory of God seen in the flesh of Jesus is reflected also in the disciples when they follow his example."<sup>84</sup>

**William Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel* (2017).** This work is an updated and extensively reworked version of his previously published *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel* (1989, second edition in 1992).<sup>85</sup> Loader provides an extended discussion on the glory and glorification of Jesus.<sup>86</sup> He identifies two glories in John, an earthly glory that

---

<sup>83</sup> He also seems to connect it back to 1:14. He proportionally spends most of his analysis on 1:14-18. Bauckham understands the presentation of Jesus as the incarnate Word to be the eschatological fulfillment of the Sinai covenant, "a revelation of glory that fulfills the Sinai covenant by qualitatively surpassing it." Thus he sees strong connections to Exodus 33-34, so that he defines the glory of Jesus as "the radiance of the character of God." Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 50, 52.

<sup>84</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 62.

<sup>85</sup> William R. G. Loader, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues* (New York: Verlag P. Lang, 1989).

<sup>86</sup> Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 213-49.

Jesus bears as God's Son and manifests to those with faith, and a heavenly glory that belongs to the Son with the Father in heaven. The glorification of Jesus refers not primarily to the cross but to his return to heavenly glory with the Father. Loader categorizes John 17:22 under Jesus's earthly glory, and he identifies it as that which Jesus has provided to his disciples, the revelation of God.<sup>87</sup>

### **Studies on Glory in John 17:22**

#### **Roger Matzerath, *The Prayer of Christ for Unity: St. John 17:20–23* (1950).**

Matzerath completed this published dissertation at the Pontifical Gregorian University. His aim was to ascertain what the unity was that Jesus prayed for, specifically in John 17:20–23. He devotes a section to investigating the meaning of *δόξα* in 17:22 and concludes that it is “divine filiation,” or the divine nature.<sup>88</sup> This divine filiation is Christ's by nature, and the believers' by participation. This *δόξα* is communicated to believers through the Eucharist and sanctifying grace. His study is most helpful for the survey of opinions he provides from late 19th and early 20th century commentators. His approach is to survey opinions, find what is most in common, and after a very brief survey of other *δόξα* passages, conclude with what is most agreeable out of the surveyed opinions. There is not enough consideration given to the OT background, and he does not consider how 17:22 may be related to the giving and seeking of glory by men (5:41–44; 7:18; 8:50–54; 12:43). This is understandable since his focus is on the unity of the prayer.

#### **Harry R. Boer, “The Glory of Christ and the Unity of the Church” (1959).**

Boer's aim is to present suggestions regarding the source and purpose of Christian unity

---

<sup>87</sup> Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 233, 237, 239. See my critique of Loader's view on glorification in chapter 4, and for my critique of his two-glories view see chapter 6.

<sup>88</sup> Matzerath, *The Prayer of Christ for Unity*, 94–116. Regarding unity, he concludes “the faithful are one among themselves in a unity of faith and charity by being united to and in God through His indwelling in them which is appropriated by the Holy Spirit and accomplished in sanctifying grace” (94).

in John 17:22–23, focusing on the phrase “that they may be one.” In so doing he attempts to define δόξα. He discards the “common” meanings of δόξα, assuming it is obvious we would not “get very far on the road to an answer” that way. First he distinguishes between two kinds of δόξα, one which is proper to Jesus as the Son of God and the other which is derived, and given to him. He locates δόξα in John 1:14 (“we have seen his glory”) as proper to Jesus, while in 17:5, 22 δόξα is given to him (17:5, “glorify me in your own presence”).<sup>89</sup> Boer concludes that δόξα in 17:22 is the Holy Spirit:

The glory of Christ which he has received from the Father and in turn given to the Church is the power, the love, the witness, the working of the Holy Spirit which entered her life through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. . . We cannot identify *doxa* and Spirit, but we can also hardly distinguish between them; much less can we separate them.

Boer attempts to prove his case primarily from NT passages outside of John (Rom 1:4; 6:4; 8:11; 1 Pet 4:14; 1 Cor 3:7–11, 17, 18) and makes the mistake of taking what is closely associated with δόξα as its meaning. Even in John, the Spirit is linked with δόξα (John 7:39; 16:14), but Boer’s explanation accounts neither for the lexical choice itself nor its semantic range of meaning.

**Ronald A. Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage in the Fourth Gospel: Understanding the *Doxa* Given to Disciples in John 17” (2001).** Piper utilizes two social scientific models for his study: Mediterranean honor and shame, and patron-broker-client relations. Piper sees a difficulty in understanding δόξα in the Gospel of John with the OT background related to the Hebrew word כבוד, associating it with some “kind of visible display of power, ostensibly a sensory phenomenon.”<sup>90</sup> In particular, he finds it

---

<sup>89</sup> He sees a kinship yet difference in these glories. The derived glory is that which Jesus has as the Son of God made man, who has accomplished the work given to him. Boer draws from Hebrews 1:3–4, and Phil 2:9 for this *given* glory. Boer comments, “Perhaps it is best to say that at his resurrection Jesus received a glory that he had not had before and that this glory, while like the glory which is the essential property of the Son, is yet a *derived*, a *given* glory.” “The Glory of Christ and the Unity of the Church,” 14.

<sup>90</sup> Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage,” 282.

difficult to attribute this kind of meaning to δόξα in John 17:22, “Does it make sense to talk of those who are purportedly with him at the Last Supper having already received for themselves a visibly observable ‘act of divine power’?” He argues that the primary sense of δόξα in 17:22 is “honor,” a “key value in the ancient Mediterranean world.”<sup>91</sup> He situates the giving of δόξα to the disciples in the context of patron-client relations, with Jesus serving as the broker between the disciples and the Father.

Part of Piper’s argument is to demonstrate that when the language of δόξα is used in connection with a human giver or recipient, it has the meaning of “honor.”<sup>92</sup> He argues these are not primarily cases of perception or revelation of divine power, and so scholars who attempt a definition of δόξα with “divine” or “revelatory” significance are misguided.<sup>93</sup>

John 17:22 shows the disciples receiving “honor” as a result of their association with their God-patron, which strengthens their group identity. This “honor” leads to unity, which is understood in social-scientific terms as “reliance on a common broker.” Their unity also involves a “fictive ethnicity” (a sort of extension of the “fictive kinship” model), pointing to the believers as the “*true* Israel, the true clients chosen by God, just as Jesus is the *real* broker.”<sup>94</sup> The giving of δόξα promotes this group relationship and is a re-assertion of their identity.

---

<sup>91</sup> Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage,” 282–83.

<sup>92</sup> Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage,” 287.

<sup>93</sup> In regards to John 5:41, 44; 7:18; 9:24; 12:43, Piper makes a good point, while in 17:22 it is not so clear that it is hard to conceive glory referring to “divine” or “revelatory” significance.

<sup>94</sup> Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage,” 307. As support for this “fictive ethnicity” understanding, he adduces several passages: John 11:51, Jesus dying for the “nation” (ἐθνός), which is associated with the scattered children of God; John 15’s vine imagery, which is connected with Israel; John 10 and the shepherd and flock imagery; and John 1:47, Nathanael being referred to as a genuine Israelite (ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλῆτης).

Piper's study is helpful at various points, although he applies the social-scientific models too rigidly onto the text.<sup>95</sup> His arguments that δόξα in contexts of human reception should be understood as "honor" are strong and worth considering, and his emphasis on the social dimension of the verse are needed, whatever one's view is on the *Sitz im Leben* of the text.<sup>96</sup> However, to understand δόξα in John 17:22 as about group relationships and identity to the exclusion of other considerations overlooks the theological emphases δόξα carries in John.

**Corinne H.S. Wong, "The Δόξα of Christ and his Followers in the Fourth Gospel: An Inquiry into the Meaning and Background of Δόξα in John 17:22"**

(2005). The only full length study to date on the meaning of δόξα in John 17:22 is an unpublished dissertation by Wong in 2005.<sup>97</sup> She addresses three specific questions: (1) Who are the people to whom Jesus has given δόξα in John 17:20–23; (2) What is the δόξα that Jesus has given to his followers? (3) What is meant by the reference to the oneness of the believers in vv. 20–23? Her dissertation breaks down into two large sections: a "lexical background" of δόξα; and the δόξα of Christ and his followers in John 17.

A good portion of her study is concentrated on the lexical background of δόξα. She first examines the usage of δόξα in non-biblical Greek and of כבוד in the OT. Then she surveys the LXX and Apocrypha, and glory in the OT Pseudepigrapha. She turns also to the Targums to consider the Aramaic expressions *memra* (the word) of God, *yeqara* (the glory) of the Lord, and the *shekinah* (the presence) of the Lord. The remainder of her

---

<sup>95</sup> See my critique in chapter 6, footnote 86.

<sup>96</sup> Piper is not favorable to the reading where the Johannine community is sectarian over and against other believers (contra Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, 83–88.). But he does affirm that the purpose of the Gospel of John could be to promote the views of the Johannine group(s) more widely in the church, and he affirms that at some point the Johannine group(s) belonged to the synagogue and were subsequently expelled. In this case, a reassertion of identity would be expected, he writes, and he adds that "fictive" ethnicity would apply to those incorporated into the "new group who might not have the same history. This may be precisely the likely situation from which and to which the Fourth Evangelist wrote." Piper, "Glory, Honor and Patronage," 308.

<sup>97</sup> This was completed under Jan van der Watt at the University of Pretoria.



study focuses on John 17, particularly 17:20–23. Her approach to semantic analysis is informed by the principles laid out by Louw and Nida.<sup>98</sup>

Wong concludes that δόξα has two basic meanings in John, “Divine glory, meaning the divine nature either in its invisible or visible form, and honor, meaning recognition, renown, fame, praise, prestige, respect, reputation, or enhancement of status or performance.”<sup>99</sup> She also concludes that for δοξάζω, in the majority of occurrences, the meaning is “to cause the divine character or being of the Father and/or the Son to be revealed.”<sup>100</sup> For John 17:22, δόξα includes the character of God (holy, righteous, loving), ἐξουσία to become the children of God and to do the works Jesus himself was doing (i.e. to give life and to judge), and exaltation and honor in heaven.<sup>101</sup> She also adds, “the presence of the Divine Being in the believer’s heart is the δόξα.”<sup>102</sup> She does not explain how δόξα can have all of these elements in John 17:22 while also claiming δόξα has the basic meaning of divine glory or honor.

A few weaknesses demonstrate a need for further study. First, her definitions of δόξα and δοξάζω in John are not well substantiated.<sup>103</sup> Her inquiry into the meaning of δόξα

---

<sup>98</sup> As set forth in several works: J. P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989); J. P. Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek*, Semeia Studies (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); Eugene A. Nida and J. P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*, Resources for Biblical Study 25 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

<sup>99</sup> Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 158.

<sup>100</sup> Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 164.

<sup>101</sup> Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 234, 255–56, 263.

<sup>102</sup> Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 256.

<sup>103</sup> There are several issues with her survey of background literature as well. Her analysis of texts is of limited use because she identifies terms associated with glory, then wherever those terms appear, she also interprets them to refer to glory (when nothing in the context would indicate it). For example, she states that “*light, garments, crowns and thrones* are metaphors for glory in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. These metaphors are also used in the NT when speaking of the glory of believers (e.g. *light*, John 12:36; Eph 5:8; *garments*: Gal 3:27; Col 3:10; Rev 3:5, 18; 19:8; Rom 13:12; *crowns*: Rev 2:10; 2 Tim 4:8; Jas 1:12; *thrones*: Matt 19:28; Rev 3:21; 20:4).” She refers to a litany of NT texts as evidence of metaphors for glory, which upon examination none of the texts are. The only text that mentions glory is Matthew 19:28 where the Son of Man will sit on his glorious throne (ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ), throne is not a metaphor for glory but is described as glorious. Another specific example would be when she states, “Δόξα is conceived as a shining light toward which Jacob walks” referring to Baruch 4:2-3. This is not true. Baruch 4:1 indicates it is the commandments of God, the law, which are referred to with light imagery in

into John is comprised of: survey of lexicons (6 pp.); survey of Bible translations (3 pp.); comparison between lexicons, translations, and commentaries (7 pp.);<sup>104</sup> survey of all δόξα passages (6 pp.); survey of all δοξάζω passages (3 pp.); and survey of different terms related to δόξα and δοξάζω (9 pp.). Her overview of δόξα (nineteen occurrences, in six pages) and δοξάζω (twenty-three occurrences, in 3 pages) is insufficient. In being so brief it has little to no exegesis on significant passages that would impact exegesis on 17:22. Her survey is largely either descriptive or assertive, rather than making arguments for the terms' meanings.<sup>105</sup> Additionally, her treatment of John 1:14 which is programmatic for the rest of the gospel (and I would argue is important for 17:22) is inadequate.<sup>106</sup> A treatment of δόξα in 17:22 requires situating it within John's general theology of δόξα/δοξάζω and Wong neglects to do this.

Second, her conclusion regarding δόξα in 17:22 does not have clear support or argumentation. It is actually quite difficult to ascertain her line of argumentation, or *why* she understands all these elements (character of God, ἐξουσία, mission, exaltation, presence of God) as part of the gift of δόξα given to the disciples. She provides a lot of description regarding the interconnectedness of these themes, but it is unclear how her descriptions amount to an argument towards a conclusion. Further complicating the issue, she “merges” several elements together, “It is suggested here that God's gift of δόξα to his Son comprises God's name, ἐξουσία, and mission, and these three merge into one

---

Baruch 4:3. Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 95.

<sup>104</sup> She looks at seven commentaries: Barrett, Bultmann, Brown, Beasley-Murray, Lindars, Schnackenburg, and Westcott.

<sup>105</sup> Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 162. For example, in describing the use of δόξα in John 7:18 (“the one who seeks the δόξα of him who sent him”) she asserts that the meaning of the phrase includes both endeavoring to bring honor to God, and it “would probably also mean desiring to cause God's own majesty and divinity to be revealed.” Additionally, she says all the common passages where δόξα is understood to mean honor/praise can also mean “divine glory from God.” These double meanings are not self-evident and need argumentation.

<sup>106</sup> She rightly notes that the pair χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια reflects the OT pair חַסֵּד וֶאֱמֻנָה, then mistakenly states the pair may be translated “steadfast love or lovingkindness.” She comments no more on the well-noted connection to Exodus 33–34.

another.”<sup>107</sup> Because her argumentation isn’t explicit, the logic of it remains vague. Perhaps she identifies these elements because she identifies many of these things as given to the Son by the Father in John 17, and thus related to the giving of *δόξα* in 17:22. This may explain why she identifies certain characteristics of God as included in *δόξα* (holiness, righteousness, and love; described of God in 17:11, 25, 26). Her analysis of *δόξα* is helpful in that she describes how it is related to many other themes in John, but the error she makes is that all of its associations become part of her definition, which actually run contrary to her earlier definition of *δόξα* as either divine nature or honor.

### **Summary and Reason for Further Study**

As we conclude the history of research, two observations can be made. First, *δόξα* in 17:22 is in need of further study. The commentaries surveyed show consensus neither on the definition of *δόξα* nor on how it works within the logic of 17:22–23 or John’s overall narrative. Studies on glory in general either ignore the verse, re-state its logic in different terms, or suggest a definition without much explanation. Even in a dissertation devoted to glory in John, Ellis dedicated only one sentence to 17:22, content to cite a commentary and move on. For a gospel known as “the gospel of glory,” this significant statement about the disciples receiving Jesus’s glory is strangely neglected. Furthermore, there has not been a full length published work in English that gives due attention to the theme of glory or glorification in John.

Second, among studies that did discuss 17:22 there remains a need to clarify how the lexeme *δόξα* contributes to the context and logic of the passage, and how it may function in the larger discourse of the Gospel of John. Ferreira’s definition and explanation of *δόξα* as “mission” falls prey to James Barr’s critique in blurring word and concept, as does Wong and Boer.<sup>108</sup> Matzerath concludes that *δόξα* means “divine nature,”

---

<sup>107</sup> Wong, “The Doxa of Christ and His Followers,” 217.

<sup>108</sup> For a helpful methodological correction to illegitimate totality transfer see Lee Irons’ *The*

but does not sufficiently explain how it is the means for unity and witness, and how it then connects with the overall theology of the book of John. Nonetheless, the exceptions to the above point to promising paths of investigation. Thüsing identifies several items as δόξα which are plausible. He connects 17:22 with 1:14, and also with the splendor of love and unity. Piper's study highlights the contribution of a social-scientific perspective in examining the cultural value of honor. Bauckham's brief suggestion regarding δόξα in 17:22 does not consider honor/status. Conversely, Piper's consideration of honor/status excludes splendor. Chibici-Revneanu's sustained reflection on the passage shows the possibility to combine both meanings of "splendor" and "honor" in its interpretation. She associates δόξα with the revelatory task of the disciples (mission) along with their honor/status, and I will look to build on and interact with her work.

### **Methodology: Biblical Theological**

The overarching approach of this study will be biblical-theological. Among the various ways biblical theology (BT) can be defined,<sup>109</sup> I find G. K. Beale's discussion helpful, who categorizes his approach as "biblical-theological-oriented exegesis" and who in turn depends on Geerhardus Vos' definition. Vos defined BT in this way: "Biblical theology, rightly defined, is nothing else than the exhibition of the organic progress of

---

*Righteousness of God*, who makes distinctions within lexical concept (utilizing Ogden-Richards' triangle of symbol, sense, and referent) and between lexical concept and discourse concept (relying on Cotterell and Turner; meaning on the sentence level, and meaning that incorporates the wider discourse context). Charles Lee Irons, *The Righteousness of God: A Lexical Examination of the Covenant-Faithfulness Interpretation*, WUNT II 386, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 61–65; Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989), 68–72, 152. See also the explanation of the triangle with modification from Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 103. The original triangle had "thought or reference" in place of "sense" which can be confusing. C. K. Ogden et al., *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1946), 11.

<sup>109</sup> See the discussion of and history of BT in Charles H. H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 3–102; Brian S. Rosner, "Biblical Theology," in *The New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000). For a recent attempt to classify BT within five categories, see Edward W. Klink and Darian R. Lockett, *Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012).

supernatural revelation in its historic continuity and multiformity.”<sup>110</sup> This definition provides a helpful starting point and accounts for several aspects of this present study: First, the study is textual. The focus is on revelation, not redemption (borrowing Vos’ terminology); Second, revelation is given over time, and within history—thus we must study each text in its historically conditioned environment; Third, later revelation organically develops from earlier revelation, and so we must be sensitive to how later biblical authors are interpreting and developing earlier texts. The remaining discussion will elaborate on these three aspects.

First, the present study is textual and is focused on the final form of the text. Much of Johannine scholarship has been concerned with the sources, redaction, composition, and historicity of the text.<sup>111</sup> Conversely, some forms of literary and narrative criticism focused solely on synchronic study and eschewed historicity.<sup>112</sup> Vos provides balance by explaining revelation as a function of redemption; without the historical acts of redemption, revelation hangs on nothing.<sup>113</sup> Historicity is important, and

---

<sup>110</sup> G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 1–14. Vos’s definition was given at his inaugural address in 1894 as Professor of Biblical Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. Geerhardus Vos, “The Idea of Biblical Theology as a Science and as a Theological Discipline,” in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 1980), 15. His definition is consciously formed to exclude an anti-supernatural bias and the history of religions approach. See also the reprint of his 1902 publication and his biblical theology, Geerhardus Vos, “The Nature and Aims of Biblical Theology,” *Kerux* 14, no. 1 (May 1999): 3–8; Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948), 3–18.

<sup>111</sup> See the commentary by Von Walde for a recent example of interpretation in accordance with form criticism and compositional theory. Urban C. Von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, vol. 2, Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

<sup>112</sup> The classic example in Johannine studies is the groundbreaking work by R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983). See also Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, eds., *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, Resources for Biblical Study 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

<sup>113</sup> Vos, “The Idea of Biblical Theology as a Science and as a Theological Discipline,” 8. Vos states, “revelation is designed to prepare, to accompany, and to interpret the great objective redemptive acts of God, such as the incarnation, the atonement, [and] the resurrection.” His further discussion of revelation in his *Biblical Theology* can be misleading, Vos, *Biblical Theology*, 6–7. Vos incorporates certain historical activity (e.g. crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus) into his definition of revelation, creating two categories, act-revelation and word-revelation. Although Vos focuses on word-revelation as accompanying the historical acts of God (redemption), he leaves open the possibility that the task of BT is to exhibit the process of unfolding divine revelation by examining act-revelation, effectively going “behind” the text. See

indeed essential—but study of the text itself takes precedence, not the reconstruction of events.<sup>114</sup> This study will undertake a synchronic study of John as well as texts John may take up and use (e.g. Exodus, Isaiah).

Second, revelation is given over time, in historic continuity *and* multiformity. Beale writes, building on Vos' definition, "In this light, a biblical-theological approach to a particular text seeks to give its interpretation first with regard to its own literary context."<sup>115</sup> This study will be sensitive to the historical nature of the text—its literary, cultural, and social context. I understand John to be a first century author<sup>116</sup> writing to a

---

the cautions by Poythress and Hamilton, Vern S. Poythress, "Kinds of Biblical Theology," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 70, no. 1 (2008): 130, 136; James M. Hamilton, *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 43–44. The event "behind" the text is only accessible through the interpretational worldview of the author, and thus the proper object of inquiry for divine revelation is the canonical text itself, the *text* is revelation. For a discussion of accessing "objective history" from a critical-realist perspective see N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 82ff. See also Hans Frei's work, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, which played a critical role in showing how historical-critical studies led to a departure from studying the actual text in question, Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative; A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974).

<sup>114</sup> For an abbreviated overview to studies on the historicity of John prior to 2004, see Craig L. Blomberg, "John and Jesus," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 209–28. For some excellent reflections on methodology as it relates to historical issues in John, see D. A. Carson, "Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel: After Dodd, What?," in *Gospel Perspectives: A Study of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, ed. David Wenham and R. T. France, vol. 2 (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1981), 83–145.

<sup>115</sup> Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 9.

<sup>116</sup> I take the minority view in current scholarship and understand the author and beloved disciple of the Gospel of John as John the son of Zebedee. See Westcott's defense of the traditional view, Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, v–xxxii. See also the recent evaluation by Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:81–115. Alternatively, for the view that both the author and beloved disciple is John the Elder see Martin Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989). Richard Bauckham builds on Hengel's work, and Furlong argues from his reading of the early Christian tradition for John the Elder, Richard Bauckham, "Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Gospel of John," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 33–72; Dean Furlong, *The Identity of John the Evangelist: Revision and Reinterpretation in Early Christian Sources* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2020). See also Ruth Edwards' brief but informative overview where she claims we cannot identify the beloved disciple with certainty, nor was he the author of the Gospel, Ruth B. Edwards, *Discovering John: Content, Interpretation, Reception*, *Discovering Biblical Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 24–32. More recently Simon Gathercole has persuasively argued against the common assumption of anonymity when it comes to the authorship of the four Gospels. The two arguments commonly put forward for anonymity are that the Gospels themselves do not identify the author and that the titles were probably added sometime in the second century. Gathercole does not so much dispute these facts (although he points out the titles were likely added *earlier* in the second century rather than later), but points out that these facts are not relevant for anonymity, and do not lead to a conclusion of anonymous authorship. He shows that the standard reasons for anonymity cannot hold up under the evidence, and that the "most likely conclusion from the evidence is that the attributions are original," in Simon J. Gathercole, "The Alleged Anonymity of the Canonical Gospels," *Journal of Theological Studies* 69, no. 2 (October 2018): 447–76. His arguments are

first century audience.<sup>117</sup> The gospel is a literary work in the vein of Greco-Roman biography, and should be understood according to its own stated purpose (20:31).<sup>118</sup> I seek to uncover the distinctly Johannine understanding of *δόξα* in general and of its use in John 17:22 in particular and how 17:22 contributes in persuading his hearers to believe.<sup>119</sup> This pursuit entails close historical-grammatical exegesis of 17:22–23 and

---

not for the authorship of the gospels but for their attributions. Nonetheless his conclusions strengthen the case that either John the Apostle or John the Elder are the most likely candidates for authorship. See also his chart for testimonia attesting to the four Evangelists as gospel writers. He points out twelve testimonia (nine in the second century) that name John as a gospel writer, (p. 473).

<sup>117</sup> The publication of the 1920 discovery of the John Rylands Greek Papyrus 3.457 (P<sup>52</sup>) containing John 18:31–33, 37–38 has led scholars to conclude a dating of John's gospel in the late first century. Colin H. Roberts published the fragment in 1935 and dated it to "the first half of the second century" but with caution. Since then several scholars have agreed with Roberts. Cf. Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 55–56. This would mean the Gospel would have been written and circulated by the end of the first century, early part of the second. A reassessment of the papyrus fragment was done by Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse in 2012, giving the range of 125–175 C.E., Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse, "Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 88, no. 4 (December 2012): 443–74. But see also Brent Nongbri's caution that the range should expand out and include late second, early third century. B. Nongbri, "The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel," *Harvard Theological Review* 98, no. 1 (2005): 23–48. So the manuscript evidence is helpful but does not guarantee a first century date. The dating of the gospel to the first century, then, relies on the author's claim of eye-witness testimony to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. I do not, however, think John's writing reflects the situation in the late first century, according to the two-level reading popularized by Martyn, but that John actually set out to write an account set in the past. This is not only the most natural way to read the text, but recent studies have demonstrated it to be historically plausible. See the recent work by Bernier who argues that the *ἀποσυνάγωγος* passages (9:22; 12:42; 16:2) do not need to reflect the late first century setting, and also Bauckham's work that shows John to evidence historical realism for a pre-70 period and thus should be taken as an account set in the past (in "Jewish Messianism"). Bauckham also argues along generic (genre) lines that the Gospel exhibits characteristics of ancient historiography, tracing how it evidences precise topology and chronology (in "Historiographical Characteristics"). See Jonathan Bernier, *Aposynagōgos and the Historical Jesus in John: Rethinking the Historicity of the Johannine Expulsion Passages*, Biblical Interpretation Series 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Richard Bauckham, "Jewish Messianism According to the Gospel of John," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 207–38; Richard Bauckham, "Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 93–112. Rather than viewing the *Birkat Ha-Minim* as a factor for dating the Gospel, much more plausible is Köstenberger's consideration of the impact of the temple's destruction on the writing of the Gospel, Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 60–71.

<sup>118</sup> Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, SNTS Monograph Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). See especially his section on the Fourth Gospel, 220–39. Pennington builds on Burridge's work and distinguishes more clearly the canonical gospels from other contemporary *bioi*, and he provides thoughtful implications for identifying the gospels as *bioi*, Jonathan T. Pennington, *Reading the Gospels Wisely: A Narrative and Theological Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 27–35.

<sup>119</sup> I will use "hearers" and "readers" interchangeably, acknowledging that both hearing the text in a public setting and the private reading of manuscripts occurred in early church. See Larry W. Hurtado, "Manuscripts and the Sociology of Early Christian Reading," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 49–62;

other key texts, while keeping in view the unfolding narrative of John. While there is the possibility of interaction in John's vocabulary and theology with Greco-Roman literature, the focus on this study will be on how Jesus is presented in largely Jewish terms, specifically in light of the OT.<sup>120</sup>

---

Larry W. Hurtado, "Oral Fixation and New Testament Studies? 'Orality,' 'Performance' and Reading Texts in Early Christianity," *New Testament Studies* 60, no. 3 (2014): 321–40.

<sup>120</sup> See Evans' index of quotations, allusions, and parallels of other ancient sources to the NT. He also lists resources providing a more comprehensive index for specific backgrounds (DSS, rabbinic, Greco-Roman), Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 342–409. See also the index by Lange and Weigold of OT quotations and allusions in Second Temple Jewish literature, Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements* 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 53–195. Related to this is the question of genre and literary influence with regards to the farewell discourse (John 13–17). See the discussion in Fernando F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 5–19. See also the more recent analysis of possible options given by Judith A. Diehl, "The Puzzle of the Prayer: A Study of John 17" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2007), 220–73.



This investigation will also be sensitive to the possible social dimensions of the text, utilizing insight from social-scientific criticism.<sup>121</sup> Broadly speaking, social-scientific criticism operates in two major modes:<sup>122</sup>

- (1) providing a social description or history to make “an insider’s view or understanding of the phenomenon accessible to outsiders,”; or
- (2) using social-scientific models in the exegesis of biblical texts to explain “behaviors reflected in (or prescribed by) the texts, organizational structures, the legitimation of authority, the cultural patterns that provide the context for meaning, and the like.”

This study will utilize insight from the second approach, specifically in order to explain “cultural patterns that provide the context for meaning.” “Honor and shame” has been noted as a “pivotal value” in Mediterranean culture.<sup>123</sup> David A. deSilva explored honor-

---

<sup>121</sup> Social-scientific studies in the NT have proliferated since the 1970’s. See pp. 17–36 in Elliott for a very informative survey of research in the emergence of social-scientific study of the NT ca. 1970–1990. John Hall Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, New Testament Series (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 7. For other overviews on the discipline for biblical studies see Philip Richter, “Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: An Appraisal and Extended Example,” in *Approaches to New Testament Study*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 266–309. David A. DeSilva, “Embodying the Word: Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament,” in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 118–29. Stephen C. Barton, “Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives in New Testament Study,” in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 34–64. When we interpret, we are imagining a scenario in which our exegesis makes sense to the ancient reader, and social-scientific approaches aim to help bridge the conceptual differences between now and then. This may play an important role in curbing ethnocentric and anachronistic interpretations of the NT, which we as interpreters by default are prone to make. This aim of social-scientific study is admirable, but we must exercise caution in using the social sciences to inform biblical study, as with any other discipline. In guarding against anachronism, applying modern models can be self-defeating if they are insufficiently informed, deterministically utilized, or applied to inappropriate contexts. This is why the approach of deSilva in grounding the models in ancient sources is a helpful addition to Malina’s work (see note below). See the responses by anthropologists in *Semeia* 68 to the appropriation of honor and shame in biblical studies. John Chance calls for caution, but commends the transdisciplinary approach, while Gideon Kressel does not think it is an appropriate anthropological model for reading John 18–19, *contra* Neyrey. Jerome H. Neyrey, “‘Despising the Shame of the Cross’: Honor and Shame in the Johannine Passion Narrative,” ed. Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Semeia*, no. 68 (1994): 113–38; John K. Chance, “The Anthropology of Honor and Shame: Culture, Values, and Practice,” ed. Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Semeia* 68 (1995): 138–51; Gideon M. Kressel, “An Anthropologist’s Response to the Use of Social Science Models in Biblical Studies,” ed. Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Semeia* 68 (1995): 152–61. See also the cautions in DeSilva, “Embodying the Word: Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament,” 126–27; Elliott, *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?*, 87–100.

<sup>122</sup> DeSilva, “Embodying the Word: Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament,” 121.

<sup>123</sup> The first attempt at examining the concept of honor in anthropology is the work by Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, and it provides a foundational starting point for many biblical scholars, especially Julian Pitt-Rivers’ essay. Bruce Malina is largely responsible for taking Pitt-Rivers and

shame in the NT by using both rhetorical criticism and social science. His socio-rhetorical study highlights “honor discourse,” and proposes a model by which we can investigate how an author may be tapping into the cultural sensibilities of honor and shame to persuade his audience towards a specific course of action.<sup>124</sup> His questions and criteria for investigating honor discourse may prove helpful in establishing the significance of δόξα in 17:22.<sup>125</sup>

Third, I understand later biblical authors to be taking up and developing earlier biblical texts, part of BT’s task is to exhibit this organic process.<sup>126</sup> This study will be

---

introducing his work into biblical studies. Julian Pitt-Rivers, “Honour and Social Status,” in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. John G. Peristiany, The Nature of Human Society Series (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 19–77. Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3rd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 27–57. See also Philip F. Esler, *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (London: Routledge, 1994), 25–29; Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, “Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 25–65. Alternatively, Timothy Ling challenges the Context Group’s readings of Mediterranean honor and shame, Timothy J. M. Ling, *The Judean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 136 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 11–61. David deSilva takes a slightly different approach and also factors in more Classical studies and grounds his model in ancient sources, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, SBL Dissertation Series 152 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

<sup>124</sup> David A. DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999). Additional studies have been done specifically with honor and shame models in relation to occurrences of δόξα in the Gospel of John, though not necessarily socio-rhetorical, M. S. Collins, “The Question of Doxa: A Socioliterary Reading of the Wedding at Cana,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 25, no. 3 (1995): 100–109; J. H. Neyrey, “The Trials (Forensic) and Tribulations (Honor Challenges) of Jesus: John 7 in Social Science Perspective,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 26, no. 3 (1996): 107–24; DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*; Nijay Gupta, “A Man of No Reputation: Jesus and Ascribed Honor in the Gospel of John,” *Ashland Theological Journal* 40 (2008): 43–59. See also the social-scientific commentary by Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).

<sup>125</sup> For example, an investigation would take note of: “Language that establishes or affirms the honor of the group or its members before the alternate court of reputation by: (a) detailing the honor the individual now possesses and the basis for this honor as defined by the group’s world-construction; (b) praising the group for its adherence to the minority culture’s values and giving expression to their honor and reputation within the larger body of significant others (a place for epideictic oratory); (c) reinterpreting the group’s experience of dishonor or disapproval at society’s hands, defusing the dominant culture’s deviancy-control techniques or even turning them to advantage vis-à-vis group honor and commitment; (d) promising future honor and vindication for the group and dishonor for the group’s opponents, advising individuals to follow as the path to their own honor and security the course that will promote the survival of the group and preserve the group’s distinctive world-construction and values (a place for deliberative rhetorical strategies, including the strategic use of epideictic rhetoric—examples—to support the promise of honor or disgrace),” DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*, 27–28.

<sup>126</sup> Vos describes the organic, historic development: “Elements of truth . . . are seen to grow out of each other, each richer and fuller disclosure of the knowledge of God having been prepared for by what preceded, and being in its turn preparatory for what follows” Vos, “The Idea of Biblical Theology as a Science and as a Theological Discipline,” 11. Beale describes the pursuit in terms of analyzing a text in its

sensitive to the phenomenon of intertextuality, or inner-biblical exegesis.<sup>127</sup> The gospel itself presents the hearers with various hints and clues to go back and search the OT Scriptures in order to understand what is being narrated, simultaneously challenging us to go back and re-examine those same Scriptures *because* of what has been narrated.<sup>128</sup> I will follow Beale's general approach in assuming that "OT quotations and allusions in the NT have in mind the broader context of the OT passage from where they come."<sup>129</sup> Accordingly, I will not just analyze the OT text alluded to (e.g. John 1:14 and Exod 34:6), but also consider its greater context. Throughout my study I will assume Richard Hays' criteria for echoes and allusions, with slight modification.<sup>130</sup>

---

own redemptive-historical epoch, and then to the epoch or epochs preceding and following it, for NT texts in particular, it is the interpretation of NT texts "in relation to the preceding epochs found in the OT, which often occurs through analyzing the use of particular OT passages in the NT," Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 9.

<sup>127</sup> The phenomenon of Scripture using Scripture is commonly called "intertextuality" in biblical studies, but the term originated in the context of a post-modern reader-oriented approach. For this reason, when intertextuality is used it is best to either clarify its use in biblical studies, or to use alternative terminology such as "inner-biblical exegesis." See the brief discussions in G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 39–40; Samuel Emadi, "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading," *Currents in Biblical Research* 14, no. 1 (October 2015): 10; David I. Yoon, "The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and Its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies," *Currents in Biblical Research* 12, no. 1 (October 1, 2013): 58–76.

<sup>128</sup> E.g., passages like "Isaiah saw his glory" in reference to Jesus (John 12:41), Jesus indicating that Moses wrote about him (5:46), and that Abraham rejoiced to see his day (8:56). Richard Hays' remarks in *Reading Backwards* are worth noting, "The Gospels teach us how to read the OT, and—at the same time—the OT teaches us how to read the Gospels." Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), 4.

<sup>129</sup> Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 11.

<sup>130</sup> Hays seven tests: (1) Availability: is the proposed source available to the author?; (2) Volume: Is there an explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, how much rhetorical stress does the allusion receive in the discourse?; (3) Recurrence: How often does the author elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage? (4) Thematic coherence: How well does the alleged allusion fit into the line of argument the author is developing?; (5) Historical plausibility: Could the author have intended the alleged meaning effect? Could his readers have understood it?; (6) History of Interpretation: Have other interpreters noticed the same allusions?; (7) Satisfaction: Does the proposed reading make sense, illuminate the surrounding discourse, produce a satisfying account of the effect of the allusive relation? These are taken and (slightly) modified from Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32. Where Hays uses the term "echo" I use "allusion." Sometimes scholars differentiate between "allusion" and "echo," where an intertextual "echo" may be a subconscious or unintentional use of another text by the author. I focus on "allusion," because my interest is in the authorial intent of the text rather than its unintended effects. See also Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 31–40.

Finally, although descriptive in nature, on the other hand BT should affect our present view of God, “in order that our theology may adequately perform its function of glorifying God.”<sup>131</sup> Theology is prescriptive, not just descriptive.<sup>132</sup> Ultimately this study is undertaken to serve and edify the church, so in the conclusion of the study there will be consideration of the implications on both academia and the church.

### **Outline of Study**

The interpretation of John 17:22 requires an understanding of how John utilizes the terminology of glory and glorification in his prologue and how he develops their use through his narrative. Because of this chapters 2–5 consist largely of examining the use of glory and glorification as it relates to both Jesus and his disciples in order to prepare for an interpretation of John 17:22 in chapter 6. Chapter 2 will examine δόξα as introduced in John 1:14–18 with reference to the proposed background of Exodus 33–34, and also consider the importance of the prologue in our understanding of δόξα for the rest of the Gospel. Chapter 3 surveys the use of δόξα in Jesus’s public ministry (chs. 1–12). Chapter 4 considers glorification and Jesus, while chapter 5 surveys the passages related to glorification and discipleship. Chapter 6 will attempt to interpret John 17:22 in the context of Jesus’s prayer (ch. 17) and in relation to glory and glorification in John. Chapter 7 will summarize the entire study and describe its contribution to both scholarship and the church.

---

<sup>131</sup> Vos, “The Nature and Aims of Biblical Theology,” 8. James Hamilton, providing another angle on contemporary application through BT, asserts that understanding the worldview of the biblical authors will allow us to “cross the bridge into their thought-world and never come back . . . I hope that you will adopt the perspective of the biblical authors and that you will read the world from the Bible’s perspective.” James M. Hamilton, *What Is Biblical Theology?: A Guide to the Bible’s Story, Symbolism, and Patterns* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 22–23.

<sup>132</sup> As Beale affirms, “the mere development of a theology of either Testament is a descriptive task, but the content of that theology manifests an imperative for God’s people to follow and obey.” *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 5.

## CHAPTER 2

### JESUS'S GLORY IN THE PROLOGUE

The beginning of John 17:22 sets the agenda for our study. Jesus's *δόξα* is given to the disciples. It follows that we must first discern what the *δόξα* of Jesus is and provide an adequate description of it before we can understand the *δόξα* of the disciples. The prologue is the seminal passage in which John himself bears witness to the *δόξα* of Jesus (John 1:14) and provides the interpretive grid for understanding Jesus's *δόξα* in the narrative. For this reason the current chapter will focus on *δόξα* in John 1:14.

This chapter asserts that John sets the stage for his ensuing narrative, first, by defining *δόξα* as the radiance of God's character, thus the glory of Jesus *is* the glory of the Yahweh. Second, by placing *δόξα* within the framework of Yahweh's self-revelation to his people. Namely, that the new revelation of Yahweh through Jesus has now transcended the revelation of Yahweh given through Moses. Third, John sets the stage for his ensuing narrative by generating the expectation that God may reveal this *δόξα* by a great act of deliverance which displays his gracious character, just as he did in the past with Israel in the book of Exodus. At the close of the chapter I will sketch out some implications for the disciples' *δόξα* of 17:22. The procedure of study will be as follows. A brief explanation will be given as to why this study begins in the prologue, I will then argue for John 1:14–18 as a cohesive unit and propose Exodus 33–34 as the most salient background for the passage. Finally, the majority of the chapter will be exegesis of John 1:14–18 with a sustained reflection on how Exodus 33–34 informs it.

## Prologue as Hermeneutical Key

A correct interpretation of Jesus's  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John must first begin with analysis of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in the prologue. Methodologically, Pancaro went the reverse direction when he spent several hundred pages of analysis on  $\delta\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in John and only at the end turned to the prologue. Pancaro was following Bultmann who wrote that the prologue becomes "clear only in the light of the whole Gospel."<sup>1</sup> If we can accept the placement of the prologue as part of the gospel, and as intended to introduce it, then it is altogether more likely that we are to read the rest of the gospel in light of the prologue. The relationship between the prologue and the rest of John is more accurately described by C. K. Barrett, who called the prologue a theological interpretation on the narrative that was to follow.<sup>2</sup> J. Zumstein rightfully recognizes the prologue's "meta-reflective character" and how it sets the "hermeneutical framework" in which the ensuing narrative should be read:<sup>3</sup>

This opening word does not place itself on the same level as the following narrative; rather, it assumes a prior reflection about the narrative. The meta-reflective nature of the Prologue marks its intratextual relationship with the narrative, which properly begins in 1:19. In other words, the Prologue should be understood neither as the first episode of the Gospel (it does not tell about the beginning of Jesus's life but rather takes up the theological significance of the incarnation), nor as a summary of its

---

<sup>1</sup> As quoted in Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity According to John*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 534. Pancaro did not examine John 1:17 until page 534 in his monograph.

<sup>2</sup> C. K. Barrett writes, "The Prologue is necessary to the gospel, as the gospel is necessary to the Prologue. The history explicates the theology, and the theology interprets the history," in *The Prologue of St. John's Gospel* (London: Athlone Press, 1971), 28. Köstenberger says that the prologue "provides a theological introduction to the gospel," in Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 176. Hooker argues as well that we should read the rest of the gospel in light of the prologue, Morna D. Hooker, "Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret," *New Testament Studies* 21, no. 1 (October 1974): 40–58. Similarly, Dodd indicates that "In considering the Prologue, therefore, we have in our minds the *whole* story which it epitomizes and interprets," in C. H. Dodd, "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship," in *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1957), 10. It is not necessary though to affirm that the prologue introduces every element and tells the whole story of the gospel as if every detail in the narrative must find its fount within the prologue. For a summary of different views on how the prologue relates to the gospel, see Stan Harstine, *A History of the Two-Hundred-Year Scholarly Debate about the Purpose of the Prologue to the Gospel of John: How Does Our Understanding of the Prologue Affect Our Interpretation of the Subsequent Text?* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2015).

<sup>3</sup> Jean Zumstein, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John," in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, trans. Mike Gray (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 123.

dramatic plot (the passion, particularly, Jesus's death on the cross, is not mentioned), nor as its theological précis (most notably, the christological title "Logos," while basic to the Prologue, occurs nowhere else in the book). Rather, the Prologue functions to stake out the hermeneutical framework in which the narrative should be read.

Therefore when the narrative begins in John 1:19, as readers we are predisposed by way of John 1:14–18 to understand occurrences of δόξα or δοξάζω a certain way. For example, recognition that 1:14–18 should be interpreted together as a unit, and that 1:16–18 continues the thought of 1:14 allows us to understand why χάρις might not be mentioned again in the rest of the gospel although there are four occurrences in 1:14–18. Because χάρις is subordinated either as an explanation of the content of δόξα (in 1:14 and 1:17) or to further explain the revelation of δόξα (in 1:16, χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος), the absence of χάρις in the rest of the gospel is not so strange. It is used in the prologue to explain the δόξα of Jesus, and thus when a vision of the δόξα of Jesus is attested to in the narrative, in a sense χάρις is present.<sup>4</sup> I will not be arguing that the definition of δόξα as found in John 1:14 must be read into every occurrence of δόξα in the narrative, but that in 1:14 John provides the foundational framework for understanding the δόξα of Jesus and its significance.

### **Interpreting John 1:14–18 as a Cohesive Unit**

A significant part of my argument in this chapter rests on the presumption that John 1:14–18 should be read together as a unit. John 1:14 not only introduces δόξα as an important element in John but provides its foundational descriptions and points of reference which 1:15–18 immediately elaborate.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Contra* Kuyper, who suggests "grace" is dropped in the rest of gospel because the author intends to "let the word truth carry the full import of the concept within the expression, 'grace and truth'," in Lester J. Kuyper, "Grace and Truth: An Old Testament Description of God, and Its Use in the Johannine Gospel," *Interpretation* 18, no. 1 (January 1964): 14. Pancaro also follows Kuyper, but for different reasons, in *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 541.

Among modern scholars it is generally agreed that 1:1–18 as a unit opens the gospel, but there is no consensus on its structure.<sup>5</sup> Some detect a linear progression, others multiple “waves” of parallel themes, others a large chiasm, and still others a chiasm within a chiasm.<sup>6</sup> Culpepper, building on Boismard, argued for the following chiastic structure:<sup>7</sup>

- A. vv. 1–2: Word with God
- B. v. 3: What came to be through the Word: Creation
- C. vv. 4–5: What we have received from the Word: Life
- D. vv. 6–8: John sent to testify
- E. vv. 9–10: Incarnation and Response of the World
- F. v. 11: The Word and his own

---

<sup>5</sup> Although there is near consensus that 1:1–18 is the “prologue” see Peter J. Williams’ article which caused Andreas Köstenberger to label John 1:1–18 with the more general term “introduction” instead of “prologue.” Williams argues that a major textual division after 1:18 is unlikely and states that examining the textual tradition leads us to see a break after 1:5 and 1:17. Against this, see my arguments below that 1:14–18 should be taken as a unit. Peter J. Williams, “Not the Prologue of John,” *JSNT* 33, no. 4 (June 2011): 375–86; Köstenberger, *A Theology of John’s Gospel and Letters*, 176.

<sup>6</sup> See the summaries given by R. Alan Culpepper, “The Pivot of John’s Prologue,” *New Testament Studies* 27, no. 1 (October 1980): 1–9; and M. Coloe, “The Structure of the Johannine Prologue and Genesis 1,” *Australian Biblical Review* 45 (1997): 40–44. John 1:14–18 is often described as the climax of the prologue, thus “revelation” or the disclosure of God in Jesus is widely recognized to be the major, or at least a major theme of the prologue, and thus the gospel (e.g. Beasley-Murray calls 1:14 the “center the gravity of the prologue, and indeed of the Gospel itself,” in *John*, WBC 36 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 4.). Yet the possible chiastic structure of the prologue would give weight to 1:12–13 as central (cf. Boismard and Culpepper), thus providing a more *salvific* purpose, very much in line with the explicit purpose identified in 20:30–31. Recognizing the centrality of both revelation and 1:12–13 is possible. The two go hand in hand and may be indicative of John’s narrative strategy; presentation of the Father disclosed in the Son is precisely what contributes to the salvific purpose of the gospel. The varying structural proposals of the prologue can lead us to recognize both a chiastic structure and a sequential progression towards 1:14–18 (cf. Phillips). Chiasm and linear progression need not be mutually exclusive, John may have layered the prologue with complexity that a single structural proposal cannot fully account for. Examples of recognizing both structures can be seen in C. H. Giblin, “Two Complementary Literary Structures in John 1:1–18,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104, no. 1 (1985): 87–103; B. T. Viviano, “The Structure of the Prologue of John (1:1–18): A Note,” *Revue Biblique* 105, no. 2 (1998): 176–84. Both Giblin and Viviano, however, account for “complementary” structure through the process of literary or compositional growth which I find too speculative. For varying proposals of chiastic structure see M. E. Boismard, *St. John’s Prologue*, trans. Carisbrooke Dominicans (London: Blackfriars, 1957), 73–81. Originally published in French under the title *Le Prologue de Saint Jean* in 1953. Culpepper, “The Pivot of John’s Prologue”; Jeffrey L. Staley, “The Structure of John’s Prologue: Its Implications for the Gospel’s Narrative Structure,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (April 1986): 241–64; Peder Borgen, “Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue of John,” *New Testament Studies* 16, no. 3 (April 1970): 288–95. Other proposals include Herman N. Ridderbos, “Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John,” *Novum Testamentum* 8, no. 2 (April 1966): 180–201; Coloe, “The Structure of the Johannine Prologue and Genesis 1.” A recent work arguing for a sequential unfolding of the prologue is Peter M. Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading*, Library of New Testament Studies 294 (London: T & T Clark, 2006).

<sup>7</sup> Culpepper, “The Pivot of John’s Prologue,” 16. Culpepper’s criteria in detecting chiastic parallels were corresponding (1) language, (2) concepts, and (3) content.



- G. v. 12a: Those who accepted the Word
- H. v. 12b: Authority to become children of God
- G'. v. 12c: Those who believed in the Word
- F'. v. 13: The Word and his own
- E'. v. 14: Incarnation and Response of the Community
- D'. v. 15: John's testimony
- C'. v. 16: What we have received from the Word: Grace
- B'. v. 17: What came through the Word: Grace and Truth
- A'. v. 18: Word with God

Such a structure has the advantage of making sense of the text as a whole while recognizing the many repeating or parallel themes within the prologue itself. As Viviano pointed out, the criticisms against such a structure are either that certain parallels are not as convincing or that “its very strength is its very weakness,” that is, it is too clean and neat.<sup>8</sup> It is not my intention to argue for this specific structure but first to highlight several parallels between 1:14–18 and 1:1–10 (A–E / E'–A'). The λόγος who was God and was with God in 1:1 is the μονογενής θεός in 1:18 who is in the Father's bosom. Through the λόγος came all things in 1:3 (δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο), and through Jesus came grace and truth in 1:17 (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο). In the only two references to John the Baptist in the prologue, he is sent from God in 1:6–8 and he bears testimony in 1:15. The λόγος became flesh, came among men and δόξα was witnessed in 1:14 while in 1:9–10 the φῶς came into the world.

What is the significance of these parallels? On the one hand, their correspondence invites mutual interpretation although they may not necessarily describe the same event.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, it is evidence of deliberate structure, showing how John 1:14–18 closes out the prologue. For example, the incarnation is described as both the coming of φῶς and the λόγος becoming flesh such that δόξα is seen (v. 9 // v. 14).<sup>10</sup> The

---

<sup>8</sup> Viviano, “The Structure of the Prologue of John (1:1-18),” 178.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. vv. 9–10 and v. 14 both describe the incarnation yet vv. 1–2 describes the presence of the λόγος with God at creation while v. 18 describes the presence of Jesus at the Father's side in general.

<sup>10</sup> This parallel gives greater plausibility for an allusion to Isaiah 60:1 where both δόξα and φῶς describe Yahweh's coming upon Israel, for a discussion on the possibility of this allusion see the last section of chapter 6.

parallels also evidence a progression from the beginning of the prologue to the end. Again using John 1:9 and its parallel to 1:14 as an example, the coming of the light in 1:9 is a description that is general compared to the actual enfleshment of the λόγος in 1:14. There is also progression in terms of specificity. All things came through the λόγος in 1:3, but more specifically, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ (1:17).<sup>11</sup> The λόγος is with God in 1:1–2, but more specifically, the μονογενής is in close proximity with the Father in 1:18.<sup>12</sup> The use of λόγος-terminology in 1:1 may find a ready conceptual home in Jewish or Greek thought while there is a radical new assertion in 1:14 where the λόγος became flesh.<sup>13</sup> Therefore a dramatic shift occurs beginning in 1:14. The relationship between θεός and λόγος in 1:1–2 has given way to father/son language in 1:14 and 1:18. From 1:1–13 there are only third-person descriptions, which shift to the first-person in 1:14 and 1:16. Thus in 1:14–18 John is taking up and building upon earlier concepts with increasing significance. The parallels also suggest that 1:14–18 closes out the prologue, demonstrating its cohesive structure and unity.<sup>14</sup>

John 1:14–18 should also be viewed as a unit in its own right.<sup>15</sup> The theme of seeing God envelops the unit forming an *inclusio*: “We have seen [ἐθεασάμεθα] his glory” (1:14); “no one has ever seen [ὠράκεν] God” (1:18). The familial terms μονογενής and πατήρ are utilized both in 1:14 and 1:18, and both are in the context of seeing God: “glory

---

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps this is in accord with creation/new creation motifs as well. For a recent monograph dealing with creation imagery in the Gospel of John see Carlos Raúl Sosa Soliezar, *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John*, LNTS 546 (New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), see esp. 53.

<sup>12</sup> As G. R. Beasley-Murray notes, there is no ascent in 1:18. The presence of Jesus with the Father gives authority to the revelation of the Father in the Son, in Beasley-Murray, *John*, 4.

<sup>13</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1989), 213.

<sup>14</sup> See also Catrin H. Williams, “(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and Body of John’s Gospel,” in *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts: Papers Read at the Colloquium Ioanneum 2013*, ed. J. G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle, WUNT 359 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 79–80.

<sup>15</sup> *Contra* Marianus Pale Hera who divided the prologue into the following sections: 1:1–5, 6–14, and 15–18, in *Christology and Discipleship in John 17* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 39–47.

as the only begotten [μονογενοῦς] from the Father [πατρός]” (NASB, 1:14) and “the only begotten God [μονογενὴς θεός], who is in the bosom of the Father [πατρός]” (NASB, 1:18). Additionally, the terms “grace and truth” in 1:14 are repeated in 1:17, the “fullness” (πληρώματος) of 1:16 echoes “full” (πλήρης) in 1:14, and the first person plural perspective begun in 1:14 (ἐθεασάμεθα) continues in 1:16 (ἐλάβομεν). The interconnected nature of 1:14 with 1:15–18 requires that we must go further than simply define δόξα as found in 1:14 but also must pay close attention to how John himself immediately develops and explains its significance. As I will argue below, John 1:15 builds on 1:14 by affirming the vision of δόξα as a vision of *divine* δόξα, and John 1:16–18 further develops the significance of Jesus’s δόξα by situating it within the framework of Yahweh revealing himself to his people.

### **Background of John 1:14–18**

There have been various backgrounds proposed for the prologue and for specific elements of 1:14–18. I am not interested in pursuing the question of underlying sources (e.g. did John adopt a wisdom hymn) or of redaction (e.g. is 1:15 a later insertion),<sup>16</sup> but in determining the most likely conceptual background as evidenced by cues from the final text. The prologue of John presents Jesus in the most exalted terms, although by name he is not introduced until 1:17. The first term to describe him is λόγος (1:1) and it is again used in 1:14. Therefore a discussion about the possible conceptual frameworks informing John 1:14–18 inevitably stem from the discussion around λόγος terminology. I will first overview some of the options for the background of λόγος terminology, draw some connections to our study of δόξα, then establish the most likely background for 1:14–18 specifically. In the course of this discussion I will seek to show

---

<sup>16</sup> See Stanley Porter’s recent overview on some of the approaches to the study of the prologue in Stanley E. Porter, “John’s Gospel Prologue and Jesus,” in *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 89–119.

that by using *λόγος* terminology John asserts something *new* about God and his glory, yet by arraying the presentation of the *λόγος* enfleshment and resultant vision of *δόξα* with evocations of Exodus 33–34, John roots the new in the old. His new assertion about Jesus and God’s glory draws from the Old Testament understanding of God and his glory.

There have been several backgrounds for *λόγος* proposed—Ed Miller identified as many as nine—and it is no easy task to adjudicate which is correct.<sup>17</sup> Part of the complexity is in the verbal and thematic correspondences to many varying texts and traditions. Earlier in modern scholarship Hellenistic backgrounds were emphasized, especially following the work of Rudolf Bultmann.<sup>18</sup> C. H. Dodd’s influential *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, in regards to the gospel in general, argued for Rabbinic Judaism, Hellenistic Judaism (represented by Philo), together with the

---

<sup>17</sup> Ed L. Miller, “The Johannine Origins of the Johannine Logos,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112, no. 3 (September 1993): 448–49. See also Brown, who categorizes the views broadly under Hellenistic backgrounds and Semitic backgrounds, Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible Commentary 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 1:519-24. Additionally, see Elizabeth Harris, *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*, JSNTSup 107 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 196–201; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 263–85; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:339-363; Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel*, 73–141; Jörg Frey, “Between Torah and Stoa: How Could Readers Have Understood the Johannine Logos?,” in *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts: Papers Read at the Colloquium Ioanneum 2013*, ed. J. G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle, WUNT 359 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 188–234.

<sup>18</sup> The implausibility of Bultmann’s hypothesis regarding the gnostic redeemer myth and the *λόγος* being linked to gnostic sources has been well documented. For his hypothesis see Rudolf Bultmann, “The History of Religions Background of the Prologue to the Gospel of John,” in *The Interpretation of John*, ed. and trans. John Ashton, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 27–46. The main problem with Bultmann’s hypothesis is that the gnostic documents which share language with the prologue, and the gospel as a whole, post-date the Gospel of John and there is no evidence of their pre-Christian influence. Rather it may be that the shared vocabulary may evidence Johannine influence on the gnostic documents. Craig A. Evans provides helpful criteria for evaluating the influence of extant sources we have which post-date the writing in question and finds Bultmann’s proposals (and those who have developed his views) lacking. See Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John’s Prologue*, JSNTSup 89 (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993); Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 215–16. Robert Kysar provides a brief critique regarding the historical method of both C. H. Dodd and Bultmann as it relates to the prologue, Robert D. Kysar, “Background of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Critique of Historical Methods,” *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16, no. 3–4 (1970): 250–55. See also Larry Hurtado’s discussion of the gnostic redeemer myth in “Fashions, Fallacies and Future Prospects in New Testament Studies,” *JSNT* 36, no. 4 (June 2014): 303–7. When presenting the options for the background of the *λόγος* some scholars now leave the gnostic option out of their list altogether, e.g.: Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 26; John L. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John’s Logos Theology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 1.

*Hermetica* as the “most direct sources for the background of thought.”<sup>19</sup> Dodd’s specific exploration of the background of λόγος led him to affirm that the OT *might* be the primary background, but that the Johannine λόγος corresponds most closely to the Philonic conception of the Logos.<sup>20</sup> Although connections with Greek philosophy may exist it is preferable to recognize the OT and contemporary Jewish thought as the most probable backgrounds to John’s λόγος due to: John’s various explicit references to written Jewish Scripture (John 1:23, 45; 5:39, 46–47; 12:14–16, 38–41; 13:18; etc.); allusions to the OT in the prologue itself (e.g. creation, 1:1–5; tabernacle/tent of meeting, 1:14; revelation of God to Moses, 1:14–18); an emphasis on Jewish festivals and feasts throughout the gospel (2:13, 23; 5:1; 7:2, 14, 37; 10:22; 12:1, 20; 13:1; 19:14, 31, 42); narrative asides explaining Jewish terms (1:38, 41, 42); and presentation of a Jewish expectation of a Messiah (1:19–28). John directs his readers to understand Jesus on Jewish terms, especially in reference to the OT. It is encouraging, then, to see that attention has been increasingly given to backgrounds related to Palestinian Judaism, spanning from the OT and Wisdom traditions in the Second Temple period to Targumic literature.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 133.

<sup>20</sup> Dodd does allow for a merging of both, “the Philonic conception of the Logos is present with and in the Hebraic conception of the Word of the Lord,” Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 279. In regards to Philo, who blended Judaism with Platonic and Stoic philosophy, he uses the word λόγος over 1300 times and there seem to be some significant parallels. See the parallels pointed out by Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 276–77; A. W. Argyle, “Philo and the Fourth Gospel,” *The Expository Times* 63, no. 12 (September 1952): 385–86. Also the discussion in Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 220–28. For a concise overview see Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:343–47. At one point Alfred E. Garvie confidently expressed that “the dependence of the Prologue on Philo is so evident as not to need discussion,” in “The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and the Evangelist’s Theological Reflexions,” *The Expositor* Eighth Series 10 (1915): 164. But as Hoskyns pointed out, parallel imagery doesn’t demand a literary relationship and Dunn concluded that “there is in fact no clear evidence favouring [direct dependence].” Edwyn Clement Hoskyns and Francis Noel Davey, *The Fourth Gospel* (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 158. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 216. In fact, several of the parallels are more striking only when considered in principal rather than in context, and some can be explained through a common tradition (e.g. *Cher.* 127 and *Sacr.* 8). Dunn, however, still finds Philo’s λόγος to be the most likely background.

<sup>21</sup> There is growing consensus not only regarding the importance of Judaism as backdrop to the gospel but also understanding the early Christology of the church as rooted in Judaism. See the comment by Chester, “The clear (though not unanimous) scholarly consensus is that, despite all the problems it creates for our understanding of early Christianity, a Christology that portrays Christ as divine emerges very early, in distinctively Jewish terminology and within a Jewish context,” in A. Chester, “High Christology -- Whence, Where and Why?,” *Early Christianity* 2, no. 1 (2011): 38.

John Ronning has recently renewed the argument for Targumic influence on John's λόγος as well as on other significant themes in John. Yet, if there are extant pre-Christian sources available to us that can readily explain its background, it is preferable to turn to those first.<sup>22</sup> Eldon Jay Epp argued that the prologue's "probable source of inspiration" and the "location of its ideational matrix" is from wisdom hymns found in Proverbs 8, Sirach 24:1–24, Baruch 3:9–4:4, and Wisdom of Solomon 7:22–10:1.<sup>23</sup> Epp

---

<sup>22</sup> Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. See also chapter three in Coloe's work on the temple where she relates God's presence as expressed in the Targumic *Memra*, *Shekinah*, and *Yeqara* to John's prologue, Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 58–61. The Targums post-date the first century AD and there are other pre-Christian sources readily available that can explain the usage of λόγος. Although there may be preserved within the Targums traditions that existed during Jesus' time, the Targums themselves vary in dating and literary development, for a recent overview on the Targums see Paul V. M. Flesher and Bruce Chilton, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*, Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 12 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011). Still, Ronning points out many parallels that may be worth noting. Through these Ronning makes a case that perhaps John would have heard Targumic readings in the synagogue which have influenced his choice to use λόγος theology and adapt it (not simply carry it over). Ronning uses the Targumic literature indiscriminately (see the critiques in the book review by Catrin H. Williams, "The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 136, no. 11 (November 2011): 1151–53). In favor of the Targumic background though, McNamara has argued that even Neofiti (with a complex literary development and dated to the 7<sup>th</sup> century AD) contains traditions which might date back to the second century. See McNamara's positive assessment of a Targumic proposal, originally published in *Expository Times* in 1968, but since updated with a postscript in 2010, Martin McNamara, "Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Exod 12:42)," in *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays*, WUNT 279 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 439–43. Flesher and Chilton dedicate a chapter of their work to arguing for the Targumic *Memra* as background to John's λόγος but must resort to: (1) separating the prologue from the rest of John; and (2) arguing that λόγος is actually *not* referring to Jesus. See Flesher and Chilton, *The Targums*, 423–36.

<sup>23</sup> Eldon Jay Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 128–46. In these various hymns, Wisdom is depicted as: present with God in creation (Prov 8:27 // John 1:1); granting life to men (Prov 8:35; Wis 9:2 // John 1:3–4); reflecting eternal light (Wis 7:26 // John 1:9); existing eternally (Sir 24:9 // John 1:1, 15); possessing glory (Wis 9:11 // John 1:14); dwelling in Israel (Sir 24:8, Bar 3:37 // John 1:14); and as God's word (Sir 24:3; Wis 9:1–2; Bar 4:1 // John 1:1, 14). It is not necessary to suggest these hymns as a model for the prologue's composition, as Epp does, but it certainly throws light on the various conceptual connections λόγος may have had for Jews. Links between John's λόγος and Wisdom tradition are widely recognized. Epp points out many overlapping functions and attributes for both Wisdom and Torah in Second Temple Judaism (existence prior to creation, existence with God/close relationship with God, role in creation, endurance for eternity, related to life/light/salvation, appearance in the world/among men, associated with truth, and characterized by glory), Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," 132–35. These are amongst the passages Epp marshals to justify the connection between Wisdom and Word: Sir 24:3; 24:23; Wis 9:1–2; Prov 2:6; Bar 4:1; 4 Macc 1:17; 2 Bar. 38:2–4; 77:16. For a different approach to λόγος and Wisdom tradition see Boyarin, who argues that John 1:1–5 is a midrash on Genesis 1 inherited by the Evangelist, with John 1:6–18 as a christological interpretation and expansion of that midrash (via the myth of Wisdom's misfortune in the world). I appreciate Boyarin's endeavor to make sense of the text as a unity, but I remain unconvinced by his overlay of the wisdom myth applied to a midrash of Genesis. Among other problems, his interpretation requires a reading of John 1:9–13 as a description of the pre-incarnate Logos making appearances among men, which the placement of the passage regarding John the Baptist in 1:6–8 would subvert. Daniel Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to

asserted that the author would have had these specific connections in mind which would show John using *λόγος* terminology to demonstrate Christ's superiority to the Torah.<sup>24</sup> Alternatively, Richard Bauckham has also detected connections between Jewish Wisdom/Word traditions and John's *λόγος* but he identified a different motivation than what Epp proposed. Bauckham contended that when Jesus is identified with God's Word or Wisdom, in the Jewish mind this would have been tantamount to including Jesus within the divine identity.<sup>25</sup> Finally, Carson and Köstenberger identify OT passages about the agency or creative power of God's word as the primary background for the *λόγος* (e.g. Gen 1:3; Isa 55:9–11; Ps 33:6).<sup>26</sup>

---

John," *Harvard Theological Review* 94, no. 3 (July 2001): 243–84.

<sup>24</sup> Epp concluded (and also draws from Rabbinic literature), in Epp, "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," 145–46:

Whereas Torah was a middle term between the God of steadfast love and faithfulness and his people, henceforth Christ mediates these prime attributes of God, grace and truth, to those who believe; whereas Torah conferred life, light and salvation, henceforth Christ is the giver of life and light to those who believe; and whereas Torah brought Moses *nearly* face to face with God, furnished God an abiding place in Israel, and was the "instruction" of God to his people, henceforth Christ is the direct encounter with God, the lodgment of the very glory of God, and the exegesis of God uniquely open to view.

See an updated recent overview on Word as Torah in William C. Weinrich, *John 1:1-7:1*, Concordia Commentary (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2015), 181–91.

<sup>25</sup> Richard Bauckham, "God Crucified," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 1–59. Bauckham demonstrated that early Jewish monotheism's understanding of God's unique identity did not preclude Christ's inclusion: "Early Jewish monotheism provided little precedent for such a step, but it was so defined and so structured as to be open for such a development," in "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 64. On Bauckham's analysis of the *λόγος* in John see Richard Bauckham, "Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 240–42. Reception of Bauckham's work has not been without criticism. For Larry Hurtado's critiques of Bauckham see "How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Approaches to Jesus-Devotion in Earliest Christianity," in *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?: Historical Questions About Earliest Devotion to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 22–25. A. Chester found Bauckham's division between God and intermediary or exalted figures unhelpful and proposed that examples like Enoch in 1 Enoch 37–71, and Philo's depiction of the Logos as an archangel make Bauckham's distinction untenable, Chester, "High Christology -- Whence, Where and Why?," 39–42.

<sup>26</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 115–16; Köstenberger, *John*, 2004, 27.

What is the primary background for John's λόγος? It is difficult to pinpoint one option dogmatically to the exclusion of all others. It doesn't seem probable that John would draw directly from the OT without any consideration for contemporary Second Temple understandings of Wisdom or Torah. Neither does John's presentation of Jesus largely in Jewish terms rule out an underlying jab against contemporary Greek thought by using a known philosophical term. It is possible that John intentionally used widely understood terms (e.g. λόγος, φῶς) in his prologue to offer, what Peter Phillips calls, a "text with a lower, more accessible threshold."<sup>27</sup> The most significant point to make for our current study is that with all of the approaches, when it comes to John 1:14 and the λόγος becoming flesh, John asserts something radically new. It is at this point that John transcends any analogy that may be had with Second Temple Judaism's Word or Wisdom traditions, the Philonic conception of the λόγος, or the Targumic *memra*. Boyarin remarked that the incarnational Christology in John 1:14 is what marks "the Fourth Gospel as a new departure in the history of Judaism."<sup>28</sup> The λόγος becoming flesh changes any previous conceptions of what one thought God was or how he was to be understood. Understood within John's logic of 1:14–18, as will be seen below, whatever one takes for the background of the λόγος, John is here asserting it to be insufficient and outdated. Whatever one's conception of God before Jesus must be re-evaluated in light of the revelation of δόξα Jesus brings.

What about the specific background of John 1:14–18? The connections with Jewish wisdom tradition pertain not only to λόγος terminology but to specific items in John 1:14–18 as well: Wisdom dwelling among Israel (Sir 24:8, Bar 3:37 // John 1:14),

---

<sup>27</sup> Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel*, 1–15. For possible Hellenistic connections see Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel*, 90–106; Frey, "Between Torah and Stoa: How Could Readers Have Understood the Johannine Logos?"

<sup>28</sup> Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra," 261.



possessing glory (Wis 9:11 // John 1:14), existing eternally (Sir 24:9 // John 1:15), and being identified with the Law (Bar 4:1; Sir 24:23 // John 1:17).

If it is possible to establish these connections (and provide compelling reasons for their function) with recourse to one source rather than several, this is to be preferred.<sup>29</sup>

Such a source is readily found in Exodus 33–34. The λόγος dwelling among people (ἐσκήνωσεν) with a manifestation of glory can refer to the “tent” of meeting/testimony (MT מוֹעֵד אֱלֹהִים; LXX σκηνή μαρτυρίου) where God’s glory appeared (Exod 33:7; 40:34 // John 1:14). The account of the temporary tent of meeting is immediately followed by Moses’s request to know God’s ways and see God’s δόξα (Exod 33:13, 18 // John 1:14). This in turn causes Yahweh to indicate that no one can see him and live (Exod 33:20), corresponding to John’s statement, “No one has ever seen God” (John 1:18). Furthermore, the giving of the law through Moses (John 1:17) finds a direct connection to Exodus 34:1–4 where the account includes both Yahweh directing Moses to write the Law on a second set of tablets and how Moses did so. Additional connections can be pointed out. Yahweh reveals himself to Moses as “abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness” (Exod 34:6), to which there is near consensus from modern day interpreters that John 1:14, “full of grace and truth,” refers.<sup>30</sup> Moses desires the presence of God with the people while John indicates the presence of God has come to dwell among men through Jesus (Exod 33:12–17 // John 1:14). The mediators of revelation are compared, Jesus who is in the Father’s bosom (John 1:18) versus Moses who only saw God’s back

---

<sup>29</sup> Although Sirach 24:1–24 provides a single text for three of these connections, there are various other connections that can be made to Exodus 33–34.

<sup>30</sup> For example, Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 126–29; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 14; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:35; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1972), 95, 97; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 39; Köstenberger, *John*, 2004, 42–45; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 166–67; Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 34–35; Edward W. Klink, *John*, ZECNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 109–11. See discussion below on “full of grace and truth.”

(Ex 33:23). The repetition of *χάρις* in Greek Exodus (33:12, 13 [2x], 16, 17; 34:9) may be in view when John indicates “from his fullness we have received grace upon grace” (John 1:16) since in both contexts *χάρις* is the basis upon which a revelation of *δόξα* is received.<sup>31</sup>

Table 1. Verbal connections between John 1:14–18 and LXX Exodus 33–34<sup>32</sup>

Exodus 33–34	John 1:14–18
Moses would meet with the LORD in the tent ( <i>σκηνήν</i> ) of meeting (Exod 33:7–11)	“The Word became flesh and dwelt ( <i>ἐσκήνωσεν</i> ) among us” (John 1:14)
Show me your glory ( <i>δόξαν</i> ); the LORD made his glory pass by (Exod 33:18, 22)	“We have seen his glory” ( <i>δόξαν</i> ) (John 1:14)
“Abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness” (LXX <i>πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός</i> ; MT <i>רַב־חַסֵּד וְאֱמֻנָה</i> ) (Exod 34:6)	“Full of grace and truth” ( <i>πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας</i> ) (John 1:14)
Moses found “favor” ( <i>χάριν</i> ) with God (Exod 33:12, 13 [2x], 16, 17; 34:9)	“We have received grace ( <i>χάριν</i> )” (John 1:16)

<sup>31</sup> The term *χάρις* in 1:16 refers most immediately to the revelation of God through Jesus versus the revelation of God through Moses (see below for this view), but the term itself may indicate the favor or gift that this revelation is based upon in both contexts.

<sup>32</sup> Some of the connections in both tables below are drawn from Boismard, *St. John's Prologue*, 135–39; A. T. Hanson, “John 1:14–18 and Exodus 34,” *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 1 (October 1976): 90–101; Evans, *Word and Glory*, 79–83. Some draw different contrasts between the two accounts, for example, Chibici-Revneanu contrasted the fact that Moses only had his face glorified (LXX Exod 34:29–35) while Jesus is completely glorified, Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 524.

Table 2. Thematic connections between John 1:14–18 and Exodus 33–34

Exodus 33–34	John 1:14–18
The Presence of God. Moses pleads for God’s presence among the people and meets with God at the tent of meeting (Exod 33:7–11, 12–17)	“The Word became flesh and dwelt among us” (John 1:14)
The Giving of the Law. Moses wrote on the tablets the words of the covenant, the ten words (Exod 34:1–4, 28)	“The law was given through Moses” (John 1:17)
Seeing God. No one can see the LORD and live (Exod 33:20)	“No one has ever seen God” (John 1:18)
Mediatorial role. Law is given through Moses (Exod 34:1–4)	“The law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ” (John 1:17)
Seeing Glory. Moses sees God’s “back” (Exod 33:23)	Jesus is “at the Father’s side” and reveals him (John 1:18)

The numerous connections with *one* source (Exodus 33–34) present the Exodus account of God revealing his glory to Moses as the primary background, suggesting that other possible connections, if present, are secondary at best.<sup>33</sup> These inner-biblical allusions to Exodus would be apparent to those familiar with the OT.<sup>34</sup> Although several scholars have acknowledged Exodus 33–34 as the primary background,

---

<sup>33</sup> Ridderbos posed the question, “we need to ask whether all of vss. 14–18 must be read against the background of the story of the giving of the law in Exodus 34” and answers in the affirmative, in Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 57. Ridderbos indicated he was following M. Hooker’s article “John the Baptist and the Johannine Prologue” when he meant to refer to Hooker, “Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret.” See also Evans’ comments on the parallels between John 1:14–18 and Exodus 33–34, “The incarnation of the *logos* cannot be correctly understood, unless it is seen against this comparison and contrast with Moses and the Sinai covenant,” in Evans, *Word and Glory*, 81. Hanson wrote, “It would be impossible to find a scripture passage which contains more fundamental elements in common with John i. 14–18. I find it inevitable to conclude that the one is the basis of the other,” in “John 1:14–18 and Exodus 34,” 95.

<sup>34</sup> For example, the *Temple Scroll* uses portions of Exodus 34:10–16 in its introduction, setting the scene for the entire work (11QT<sup>a</sup> II), see Sidnie W. Crawford, “Exodus in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 164 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 312–13. For the defining influence of the Exodus events in the OT and intertestamental literature in regards to glory see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 409–14, 425.

there has been insufficient attention given to its significance in informing the interpretation of John 1:14–18. Ridderbos noted:

Though most interpreters acknowledge the connection with Exodus 33 and 34 at least in regard to the expression “grace and truth,” only a few explore this link more deeply. That this link exists and that it illumines the comparison between Moses and Jesus is—in view of the striking points of resemblance—hard to deny.<sup>35</sup>

Even where previous Johannine studies have noted these allusions, there has been little to no recognition of the context of forgiveness in the Exodus account and what specific aspects of God’s glory are being revealed.<sup>36</sup> Although the focus is on glory, this study will provide a more sustained reflection on both Exodus 33–34 and John 1:14–18. In sum, Jesus is identified as God by way of λόγος terminology in John 1:1–4, and when 1:14 picks up the term again, John proceeds to evoke Exodus 33–34 in order to bring about a comparison between the previous manifestation of God’s glory through Moses and what is now witnessed in God’s glory in Jesus. We will now turn our attention to the exegesis of John 1:14–18.

### **John 1:14: Introducing a New Δόξα in Ancient Terms**

John 1:14 introduces the important theme of glory in the Gospel of John. In response to God taking on flesh and dwelling among men, John attests to a vision of

---

<sup>35</sup> Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 57.

<sup>36</sup> Some exceptions are: Boismard, *St. John’s Prologue*, 135–45; Hooker, “Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret,” 53–56; Hanson, “John 1:14–18 and Exodus 34”; Henry Mowvley, “John 1:14–18 in the Light of Exodus 33:7–34:35,” *The Expository Times* 95, no. 5 (February 1984): 135–37; Evans, *Word and Glory*, 79–83; Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 57–58; Ardel B. Caneday, “Glory Veiled in the Tabernacle of Flesh: Exodus 33–34 in the Gospel of John,” *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 20, no. 1 (2016): 55–72. Even amidst the scholarly shift in Johannine studies toward Jewish backgrounds and recognition of the pervasive influence of the OT, why have so many other scholars been content only to touch upon the reference to Exodus 33–34? Preoccupation with the identification of the prologue’s underlying sources, with determining the various points of contact with several possible backgrounds (esp. in regards to λόγος), and with the desire to bridge the conceptual gap between the OT and NT texts are likely reasons. In order to bridge the conceptual gap, there is the usual recourse to Jewish Wisdom tradition, the targumic *memra*, *shekinah*, and *yeqara*, and other Jewish interpretive traditions (e.g. Philo). These do not rule out Exodus 33–34 as a primary influence, and thus the wider context of Exodus 34:6 still needs to be treated adequately. Additionally, there is already a great deal of interpretive satisfaction in recognizing that the δόξα of Jesus corresponds to the OT כְּבוֹד of Yahweh, which finds easy confirmation in the phrase “full of grace and truth,” without needing to explore the context of Exodus 33–34 further.

glory. The paratactic structure of 1:14 includes three finite verbs, each separated by *καί*,<sup>37</sup> followed with two descriptions of *δόξα*. His third verbal clause, “and we have seen his glory” (*καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*), is in response to the first two verbal clauses. John 1:14 begins with a stunning assertion that something entirely new has happened, God has become flesh.<sup>38</sup> Yet what is new should be understood in the pattern of the old, as John evokes the OT, “and dwelt among us” (*καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*). Signaled by the repetition of *δόξα* are two additional elaborations which also fit this pattern of the new understood in the pattern of the old. A new manifestation of *δόξα* has occurred, in that it is *δόξα* as the “only begotten from the Father” (*ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*), yet it too should be understood in the pattern of the old, as *δόξα* “full of grace and truth” (*πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας*).

Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο	A new assertion (first verbal clause)
καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν,	with reference to the old (second verbal clause)
καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ,	John attests to glory (third verbal clause)
δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός,	Glory explained: New mediator
πλήρης <sup>39</sup> χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.	Glory explained: Ancient revelation

“And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we have seen his glory, glory as the only begotten from the father, full of grace and truth.” (NASB)

The *λόγος*, the divine one himself, through whom all things have been created, in whom is life (1:3–4), has taken on human nature, the divine has become a human person.<sup>40</sup> The author testifies that one result of the incarnation is the revelation of glory,

---

<sup>37</sup> The specific function of the initial *καί* in 1:14 is disputed. Coloe argues that it re-introduces the *λόγος* and is a continuation of 1:1 by way of contrast, Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 24–25. Barrett thinks it resumes v. 11, Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 164. The connection with 1:1 can be detected because of the resumption of *λόγος* terminology, however there can also be a continuation with the previous verses which just described those who did receive the light (1:12–13), relating to 1:14c, “we have seen his glory.”

<sup>38</sup> See my note above on how the previous assertions about the Logos would actually find easy conceptual parallels in literature contemporary with John, yet in 1:14 what is asserted about the Logos is altogether new and stunning.

<sup>39</sup> *Πλήρης* in form is nominative but it is more likely indeclinable (cf. Acts 6:5; BDF § 137.1).

<sup>40</sup> Coloe suggests a possible allusion to Isaiah 40:7–8 (LXX) where the *σὰρξ* and the *δόξα ἀνθρώπου* is compared to the *ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ* which abides forever. She finds an emphasis in John 1:14 on

therefore this revelation is linked to seeing the λόγος in the flesh. The supernatural glory of God is now to be seen in the man Jesus to whom the author bears witness. The locus of revelation in the σάρξ of Jesus indicates that the author bears eyewitness testimony yet also hints that the reader will now have to rely upon such testimony (cf. John 20:29; 21:24). Something entirely new has transpired.

The second verbal clause is coordinate with the first and further interprets it, using language reminiscent of Yahweh dwelling among Israel to confirm that indeed God has come to dwell among men.<sup>41</sup> This second clause garbs the stunning assertion of the first clause with OT evocations. The usage of σκηνώ with the divine λόγος as subject is followed by a vision of δόξα. These evoke the OT references to the dwelling of God among men in the tent of meeting, tabernacle, and even the temple.<sup>42</sup> The verb σκηνώ, meaning “pitch a tent,” “encamp,” or “take up residence,” occurs only five times in the NT and once in John.<sup>43</sup> Craig Koester points out that its cognate nouns make the verb uniquely fitting in this context relating both to flesh and to glory. The first corresponding noun σκηνή is connected to “glory” through its use in the LXX to refer to the OT tabernacle (Heb. מִשְׁכָּן; Ex 25:9; 26:1, 6, 7, 9, 12, etc.) and tent of meeting (Heb. הֵקֵל; 33:7) where God manifested his glory (Exod 33:9; 40:34). The second is σκῆνος which can be easily connected to the idea of “flesh” because its use often is in reference to the

---

the mortality of “flesh” and also notes that this emphasis on mortality continues in the Bread of Life discourse in John 6. Therefore Coloe also suggests that by using the word σάρξ “the death of Jesus is already intimated,” in Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 25.

<sup>41</sup> Brown is right to see that 1:14b also affirms that although the word became flesh, the word does not cease to be God. See his generally excellent discussion on verse 14a and 14b, Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:30-35. See also William Loader’s discussion, *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 373–92.

<sup>42</sup> Ridderbos does not detect a direct reference to the tabernacle and temple but he agrees that a connection with Exodus 33–34 would bring to mind God’s dwelling in the tent of meeting. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 51.

<sup>43</sup> The other four are in Revelation (Rev 7:15; 12:12; 13:6; 21:3). In a similar vein, Revelation 21:3 describes God dwelling with man (σκηνώσει) in the *eschaton*. It also occurs only once in the LXX, when Lot pitched his tent in Sodom (Gen 13:12).

human body (2 Cor 5:1, 4; Wis 9:15). Koester remarks, “Therefore tabernacle imagery is uniquely able to portray the person of Jesus as the locus of God’s Word and glory among humankind.”<sup>44</sup> Whether or not the audience of the gospel would detect a lexical association with σκῆνος, an allusion to the tent (σκηνή) of meeting (Ex 33:7–11) is more likely because of the other allusions to Exodus 33–34 present in John 1:14–18. In the context of Exodus 33–34 the presence of God was tied to the forgiveness of sins and his gracious character. The promise of his continuing presence among the Israelites was a sign of his forgiveness. Additionally, reference to σκηνή need not be limited to the tent of meeting but can refer to the tabernacle (Ex 40:34). And the verb may also allude to passages in the prophets where God promises to dwell among the people (κατασκηνώ, Zech 2:10 [2:14]; Joel 3:17 [4:17]; κατασκήνωσις, Ezek 37:27); implying that the promise of God’s presence is now realized in the λόγος become flesh.<sup>45</sup> Therefore the new vision of δόξα must be understood within a framework of OT patterns and promises, and how they may now be fulfilled in the coming of Jesus Christ.

The third verbal clause, “and we have seen his glory,” is the author’s firsthand testimony to the first two clauses. It is at this point that John personally attests to seeing the λόγος enfleshed. He knows that the λόγος has become flesh, that God has come to dwell among men, because he has seen the Word himself, who is God. This new vision of God’s δόξα stimulates reflection upon the OT promises of God to once again dwell

---

<sup>44</sup> Craig R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 22 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 102.

<sup>45</sup> And as such it seems John does not intend for the verb to merely communicate a temporary abode, as Barrett posits (cf. especially Rev 21:3), Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 165–66. Thus reference to the tent of meeting, tabernacle, and the temple in Jerusalem could be in view. The specific referent may not be as important as what they signify, the presence of God with Israel. Scholars have identified this verse contributing to the temple motif in the gospel, Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 116–25; Joseph R. Greene, “Integrating Interpretations of John 7:37–39 into the Temple Theme: The Spirit as Efflux from the New Temple,” *Neotestamentica* 47, no. 2 (2013): 335; Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 15–29. Alan Kerr argues specifically for reference to Exodus 25:9 and the tent of meeting, in Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 121–23.

amongst his people. Just as God had dwelled in his glory at his chosen place within sight of his people, God had now chosen to take up residence in flesh among his people.

Although he is not received by his own (John 1:11), evidently some did receive him, the author being one of them, recognizing him as the light. The first two verbal clauses together, in description of the same event, function to assert the newness of God's revelation in Jesus yet generate an expectation of relating this δόξα with the OT glory of Yahweh.

John continues in 1:14 to elaborate his vision of δόξα as new and old with two additional phrases, signaled by his repetition of δόξα. The first phrase, ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, explains, once again, that this is a new kind of δόξα by virtue of who is revealing it. While the second phrase, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, grounds this new vision of δόξα in the old revelation of Yahweh to Moses.<sup>46</sup> Taken together they demonstrate a continuity with the glory of God as revealed in the OT yet signify something different is revealed in Jesus since he is the μονογενής παρὰ πατρός. The new must be understood in light of the old. Before examining these two descriptions of δόξα, I will first establish the range of meaning for δόξα and argue for its meaning as the radiance of God's character.

---

<sup>46</sup> Schnackenburg briefly considers the merit of attaching παρὰ πατρός with δόξαν, rather than μονογενοῦς, but rejects it in favor of μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1:271-72. Boismard provides a more thorough discussion and also concludes in favor of μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. Boismard, *St. John's Prologue*, 52-53. Others have taken πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας with λόγος rather than with δόξαν. For example, Dumbrell states that it is because glory is the reflection of the Logos. Schnackenburg also argues that πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας should be taken with λόγος because δόξα, "as that of the only-Begotten Son, needs no further description." The allusion of the phrase πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας to Exodus 34:6, which is a description of God's δόξα, argues otherwise. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1:271-72; William J. Dumbrell, "Grace and Truth: The Progress of the Argument of the Prologue of John's Gospel," in *Doing Theology for the People of God: Studies in Honor of J. I. Packer*, ed. Donald M. Lewis and Alister E. McGrath (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 115. Whichever noun the descriptors modify, Brown detects no major difference in meaning. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:14. For example, if the phrase πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας modifies πατρός, then it still leads back to explaining the glory of the μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. If the phrase modifies λόγος, it is still piggy-backing a description of seeing the Logos' glory. Whether the phrase modifies λόγος, or δόξαν, or πατρός, the phrase ultimately further defines glory.



## Δόξα: The Glory of God

This section will not be a comprehensive study on the lexeme δόξα (or the Hebrew כְּבוֹד).<sup>47</sup> Rather, I seek to establish the range of meaning for this term and to propose which meaning or meanings are most appropriate for John 1:14. The term δόξα (from δοκέω), so familiar for biblical scholars in relation to divine glory, is not so associated in Classical Greek. LSJ lists four senses:

- (1) expectation;
- (2) notion, opinion, judgment;
- (3) the opinion which others have of one, estimation, repute; and
- (4) of external appearance: glory, splendor, esp. of the *Shechinah*.

Only the first three were active in classical Greek. The fourth category contains only examples from the LXX and the NT. The majority of the occurrences of δόξα in classical Greek are under the second and third categories, (2) the opinion one holds or (3) one's reputation (i.e. the opinion of another).<sup>48</sup> The denominative verb δόξαζω corresponded to these, "to suppose" or "to have an opinion." Δόξα can also have a positive meaning under the third category, "honor," and so the verb also took on this category of meaning, "to extol," or "to hold in honor."<sup>49</sup> But there is a marked difference in lexical usage when one turns to the Greek Bible. Muraoka's lexicon of the LXX lists:<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> For the most recent studies of the term δόξα and its underlying Hebrew term כְּבוֹד in relation to the gospel of John see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 335–510; Rainer Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*, Herders Biblische Studien 50 (Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 13–105; Johan Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, JSNTSup 160 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 138–65. See also the survey of key articles and works in the 20<sup>th</sup> century on the כְּבוֹד of Yahweh by Pieter de Vries, *The Kābōd of YHWH in the Old Testament: With Particular Reference to the Book of Ezekiel*, trans. Alexander Thomson, *Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 1–28. De Vries himself provides a full synchronic study of כְּבוֹד with several helpful indices and charts.

<sup>48</sup> See also Montanari (MGS), *CGL*, and *DGE*, s.v. "δόξα." Under the second sense LSJ further elaborates with "fancy, vision, hallucinations." Newman finds evidence here to place δόξα in the same semantic field as "epiphany" language and finds that it may contribute to why δόξα was chosen by the translators. Carey C. Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 69 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 148–51. Chibici-Revneanu disagrees, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 355n8.

<sup>49</sup> Moisés Silva, ed., "Δόξα," in *NIDNTTE*, 1:761–67.

<sup>50</sup> *GELS*, s.v. "δόξα."

- (1) status of honor and distinction;
- (2) external splendor, magnificent appearance;
- (3) an opinion which appears to be or commonly held to be right.

Additionally, BDAG categorizes the senses of δόξα as follows:<sup>51</sup>

- (1) the condition of being bright or shining, *brightness, splendor, radiance*;
- (2) a state of being magnificent, *greatness, splendor*;
- (3) honor as enhancement or recognition of status or performance, *fame, recognition, renown, honor, prestige*;
- (4) a transcendent being deserving of honor, *majestic being*.

The classical meaning of “opinion” is nowhere found in BDAG and most likely not in the LXX as well.<sup>52</sup> This semantic shift has been attributed to the choice of the LXX authors’ to use δόξα to translate the Hebrew noun כְּבוֹד.<sup>53</sup> The noun derives from the verb כָּבַד and at base means “to be heavy” with other extended meanings.<sup>54</sup> כְּבוֹד itself doesn’t seem to bear the literal meaning of “weight” but has taken on its extended meanings (e.g. that

---

<sup>51</sup> BDAG s.v. “δόξα.”

<sup>52</sup> The occurrences listed under Muraoka’s lexicon in his third category of “opinion” are dubious (Isa 11:3, Sir 8:14, and 4 Macc 5:18). Isaiah 11:3 describes the future messianic king who will not judge “according to what his eyes see” (MT, וְלֹא לְמַרְאֵה עֵינָיו יִשְׁפֹּט). The LXX reads, οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρινεῖ, and δόξα can be understood as either “appearance” or “status,” fitting the first or second semantic categories of Muraoka. Sirach 8:14 also occurs in a judicial context and δόξα is best understood as “honor” (NETS renders it as “status” and Brenton as “honour”), falling under Muraoka’s first category. In 4 Maccabees 5:18 the occurrence of δόξα is better understood as “reputation” or “status,” under Muraoka’s first category. Eleazar presents a defense of Jewish practice and argues that it is unbecoming of a Jew to eat defiled meat, and that even if the Jews were wrong about this issue, to eat defiled meat would violate their “reputation” (δόξα) for piety, “nor even so would it be possible to invalidate our reputation for piety [τῇ ἐπὶ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ δόξαν]” (NETS).

<sup>53</sup> There have been a number of proposals as to why δόξα was used to translate כְּבוֹד, Carey Newman summarizes the options: (1) an overlap in meaning (“honor”); (2) both כְּבוֹד and δόξα possessed a subjective-objective structural similarity; (3) both words were used in similar literary contexts (philosophical-theological discussions, ‘heavenly ascents,’ and dream-vision reports); and (4) the usage of the more neutral δόξα would not confuse the manifestation of pagan deities (ἐπιφάνεια) with the revelation of Yahweh. Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 134–53. Jörg Frey makes the suggestion that the OG translation of the Pentateuch and the influential Sinai theophany account was the catalyst that caused later LXX translators to adopt δόξα terminology as well, “The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint,” in *The Reception of Septuagint words in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Literature*, ed. Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten, WUNT II 367 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 85–104.

<sup>54</sup> C. John Collins writes “We may take as a working hypothesis that ‘weight’ is the central meaning of which the other uses are applications,” “כָּבַד,” in *NIDOTTE*, 2:577. Lexicons and theological dictionaries differ as to whether the noun כְּבוֹד is related to the notion of “weighty.” De Vries thinks it “unmistakable” that the notion of weight can be accorded to כְּבוֹד due to lexemes such as עֶשֶׂר (“riches”), כֶּסֶף (“silver”), and זָהָב (“gold”) being frequently connected with כְּבוֹד. See his discussion in de Vries, *The Kābôd of YHWH in the Old Testament*, 38–41.

which is impressive or weighty to another, “honor,” “reputation,” “wealth,” “majesty”).<sup>55</sup> As evidenced by BDAG’s categories, the NT writers have followed the LXX usage of δόξα,<sup>56</sup> especially as it pertains to visible splendor and majesty. BDAG’s four categories can plausibly be simplified to two, matching Muraoka’s first two. BDAG’s second heading is not very different than the first and may both be categorized under the general category of appearance (e.g., visible splendor). The fourth category only includes Jude 8 and 2 Peter 2:10, “glorious ones” (ESV), and even BDAG’s description suggests we may include the fourth with the third, leaving us with how Bauckham summarized the meanings of δόξα in the NT as either (1) appearance (e.g., brightness, visible splendor, majesty), or (2) status (honor, reputation, praise).<sup>57</sup> These two simplified categories of meaning for δόξα will be the starting point of discussion as we consider other occurrences of δόξα in later chapters as well.

What then does δόξα mean in John 1:14? Both notions of (1) appearance and (2) status seem to be activated in John 1:14. On the one hand, δόξα has to do with visible splendor or majesty (“we have seen [ἐθεασάμεθα] his glory”). While Abbott wishes to

---

<sup>55</sup> Although *HALOT* lists “heaviness, burden” in its range of meanings only two examples are given (Isa 22:4; Nah 2:10) and it doubtful whether the literal meaning of “heavy” applies. Clines classifies the range of meaning under three categories: (1) glory, splendor, majesty; (2) honor, reputation, wealth; (3) soul, inner being. *HALOT*, s.v. “כְּבוֹד”; *DCH*, s.v. “כְּבוֹד”

<sup>56</sup> See also L. H. Brockington, “The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of ΔΟΞΑ,” in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 1–8.

<sup>57</sup> Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 44. “Glorious ones” can plausibly be included in either category. If one notes the examples in the second category of BDAG, there are only a few, and if compared with the multitude of examples provided in BDAG’s first category, are not very different. Within these categories are further differences one can parse out. For example, under the category of status, it can refer to the prestige, honor, or reputation one has, or it can refer to the honor or praise one renders to another. One can possess the glory of high office (e.g., 2 Macc 14:7; Sir 7:4), which relates to the honor or glory one has before others, or one can give glory to another in the sense of extolling or enhancing another’s reputation (e.g., Rev 4:9, 11; Phil 1:11). For others who have similarly analyzed δόξα under two general categories, see Jesper Tang Nielsen, “The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 3 (July 2010): 347; Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 329. Nielsen breaks down the meanings of the term as (1) “social-hierarchical understanding of δόξα/δοξαζέειν as a relational status and recognition,” or (2) “the aesthetic idea of δόξα as divine appearance.” Chibici-Revneanu recognizes a multidimensionality to the term and identifies a “profane-anthropological” (honor/praise) glory, and a theological (revelatory) glory.

render *θεάομαι* as “contemplate” the Johannine usage of *θεάομαι* clearly refers to seeing with the eyes (John 1:32, 38; 4:35; 6:5; 11:45).<sup>58</sup> Therefore the author bears witness to the glory he has seen in Jesus, yet this glory is defined both in terms of who Jesus is (only begotten from the Father) and what he displays (“full of grace and truth”). The seeing of *δόξα* places its meaning squarely in the category of appearance, yet the further description of it as “glory as of the only begotten from the Father” (my trans., 1:14) also points to Jesus’s identity as God’s Son and thus his ascribed honor.<sup>59</sup> In this way John’s witness to what he has seen is simultaneously a confession to who Jesus is. The Gospel’s emphasis on *seeing* *δόξα* (1:14; 2:11; 11:40; 12:41) leads to the conclusion that the term *δόξα* in 1:14 primarily falls under the category of appearance, but not far away is the notion of status. For John bears witness in terms of what he has seen (and thus attests to *δόξα* as visible splendor), and it is most likely that what he has seen has led to the recognition of who Jesus is, so he simultaneously confesses Jesus to be the only begotten of God (*δόξα* as status).<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Edwin Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three* (London: A. and C. Black, 1905), 110. Both Bernard and Morris assert that the verb is always used in the NT to refer to seeing with the “bodily eye.” Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, Revised edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 92–93; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ed. A. H. McNeile, ICC 29 (New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1929), 1:21. See also Josaphat C. Tam’s work on perception in the Gospel of John where he performs a semantic analysis of the different verbs used of seeing (*θεάομαι*, *θεωρέω*, *ὁράω/εἶδον*, *βλέπω*, *ἐμβλέπω*, *ἀναβλέπω*). He concludes that apart from *ἀναβλέπω*, the verbs roughly share the same scope of meaning and avers that “different types of seeing cannot be determined by John’s choice of word,” in *Apprehension of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 399 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 34–36, 209–11.

<sup>59</sup> See Nijay Gupta’s essay for a discussion on the social scientific concept of ascribed honor and the Gospel of John, “A Man of No Reputation: Jesus and Ascribed Honor in the Gospel of John,” *Ashland Theological Journal* 40 (2008): 43–59. However, Gupta does not account for Jesus as the *μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός* (1:14) in his description of how the Fourth Gospel presents Jesus’ ascribed honor.

<sup>60</sup> After an exhaustive survey and analysis of all the occurrences of *δόξα/δοξάζω* in the Gospel of John, Chibici-Revneanu concluded that the Evangelist knew both general meanings of this term (profane, anthropological “honor” and also theological, “glory of God”) and applied both in his gospel, leveraging its ambiguity. She affirmed there was a “multidimensionality” to the use of the term in the Gospel, see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 329.

## Δόξα as the Radiance of God's Character

The allusion to the Exodus account gives further shape to the possible meaning and reference of the term δόξα as used in John 1:14. In Exodus God's glory is closely related to his goodness and character. When Moses requests to see God's glory, Yahweh replies that he will cause all his goodness (Exod 33:19, "all my goodness," כָּל־טוֹבִי) to pass before Moses. Yahweh then states that Moses will stand on the rock "while my glory passes by" (33:22, בְּעָבֹר כְּבוֹדִי).<sup>61</sup> Therefore the resulting revelation of God's character in Exodus 34:6–7 is described as both the goodness of God and the glory of God:<sup>62</sup>

The LORD passed before him and proclaimed, "The LORD the LORD, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children and the children's children, to the third and the fourth generation.

The LXX goes one step further and renders God's goodness in 33:19 as his glory ("my glory," τῇ δόξῃ μου). Thus the translator interprets God's glory as reference to the revelation of Yahweh's character.<sup>63</sup> John's allusion to this account leads me to conclude likewise about the use of δόξα in John 1:14. The glory of the λόγος is the divine glory and

---

<sup>61</sup> These responses of God tie glory to goodness and do not suggest such a "sharp juxtaposition" as Brueggeman argues, Walter Brueggemann, "The Crisis and Promise of Presence in Israel," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 1, no. 1 (1979): 56. On the lexeme translated as "goodness" [טוֹב] Duane Garrett points out that almost all its occurrences are in the context of material prosperity from the Lord, thus Garrett sees it implying "numerous and varied benefits" as opposed to "abstract perfection as an internal quality of YHWH," in Duane A. Garrett, *A Commentary on Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2014), 638, 649. The usage of טוב in Exod 33:19, however, more likely points to an internal quality of Yahweh (like its use in Psalm 25:7), which in the context of Exodus 32–34 need not be viewed as an "abstract perfection." As I will argue below, God's revelation of glory is very much tied to concrete benefits, and in this case, to his forgiveness of sins, renewal of the covenant, and promise of his presence.

<sup>62</sup> For a recent survey of both diachronic and synchronic studies of Exodus 34:6–7 see Nathan C. Lane, *The Compassionate, but Punishing God: A Canonical Analysis of Exodus 34:6-7* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010), 3–18. For further analysis of Exodus 33–34 see Peter J. Gentry, "'The Glory of God': The Character of God's Being and Way in the World: Some Reflections on a Key Biblical Theology Theme," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 20, no. 1 (2016): 149–61; R. W. L. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1983).

<sup>63</sup> So also Larry Perkins, "'Glory' in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations," in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 56 (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 99.

refers to the revelation of the character of God. But this does not account for the semantic contribution of δόξα itself.

What does using the term δόξα, or כְּבוֹד, contribute when used to refer to the revelation of the character of God? It is not that the character of God is simply to be equated with glory. There is significance in the selection of the word. Pieter de Vries conducted a full synchronic lexical study of כְּבוֹד in the OT and found that over half of the occurrences of כְּבוֹד (107 out of a total 200) refer to Yahweh whether he is explicitly named or indirectly referred to.<sup>64</sup> When כְּבוֹד refers to Yahweh, de Vries identified five (related) meanings:

- a. hypostasis (where כְּבוֹד features as an independent form of the appearance of Yahweh)
- b. indication of the glory/majesty of Yahweh revealed in creation, the cultus, history, or eschatologically
- c. honor/praise
- d. object of honor/praise
- e. attribute<sup>65</sup>

In his analysis the most common meaning of כְּבוֹד when referring to Yahweh is (a) hypostasis followed by (b) indication of glory/majesty. He points out, however, that these two meanings are often fluid, that “כְּבוֹד in the first meaning always implies כְּבוֹד in the second meaning.” In turn, one who has כְּבוֹד should receive (c) honor/praise, and is an (d) object of honor/praise (cf. Ps 66:2). In Carey Newman’s synchronic analysis of the phrase כְּבוֹד יהוה he finds the two most significant constructions to be: (1) the joining of כְּבוֹד

---

<sup>64</sup> de Vries, *The Kābôd of YHWH in the Old Testament*, 58–59, 78–80. De Vries includes the name Ichabod (1 Sam 4:21; 14:3) in his count making his total 202. The count of 200 is from a Logos search under the lemma כְּבוֹד. My own survey of כְּבוֹד confirms de Vries’ count of 107 instances referring to Yahweh whether directly or indirectly. In terms of the specific phrase כְּבוֹד יהוה it occurs thirty five times (Exod 16:7, 10; 24:16, 17; 40:34, 35; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 14:10, 21; 16:19, 42 [17:7]; 20:6; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chron 5:14; 7:1, 2, 3; Ps 104:31; 138:5; Isa 35:2; 40:5; 58:8; 60:1; Ezek 1:28; 3:12, 23; 10:4 [2x]; 10:18; 11:23; 43:4, 5; 44:4; Hab 2:14). See also Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 17–21. Newman includes Ezek 8:4 so his total is thirty six, but Ezek 8:4 reads כְּבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

<sup>65</sup> de Vries, *The Kābôd of YHWH in the Old Testament*, 56. His appendix to chapter three provides a table breaking down every occurrence of כְּבוֹד referring to Yahweh and provides his semantic analysis. It is unclear what he means by the fifth category of “attribute.”

יהוה with “movement” terminology; and (2) passages relating כְּבוֹד יהוה to appearance/sight terminology. Newman points out that movement to and fro, up and down, relates glory to “various spaces where Yahweh is thought to be (visibly) present.”<sup>66</sup> This corresponds with de Vries’ analysis which found that the most frequently occurring verb within the same clause as כְּבוֹד (in reference to Yahweh) is רָאָה (“to see”).<sup>67</sup> My own survey of the term as it refers to Yahweh yields at least 50 instances where כְּבוֹד is perceived by others.<sup>68</sup>

Thus כְּבוֹד frequently *communicates* worth, a *visible* (or, at least perceived) majesty or splendor. It is a figurative weightiness (i.e., importance) one has that is perceived by another: “in relation to God it implies that which makes God impressive to man, the force of His self-manifestation.”<sup>69</sup> Therefore when Exodus 33:22 states that God will make his כְּבוֹד pass before Moses, it refers not merely to the character of God (34:5–7) but to the *radiance* of his character; a *manifestation* of who he is, the full disclosure of which is impossible for man to *see* (רָאָה, 33:20). Furthermore, although כְּבוֹד is frequently linked with brightness (e.g. Exod 24:17; Isa 24:23) or simply the appearance of God (de Vries’ “hypostasis” category); it will not do in Exodus 33 to affirm this meaning of כְּבוֹד and not understand it in reference to the character of God. Moses does not merely wish to see the brightness of God, but he seeks to *know* something about God (cf. Exod 33:13, “show me [MT: הוֹדֵעַתִּי, from יָדַע] your ways”). Therefore by using the word “radiance” I do not necessarily mean a visible brightness but use it as metaphor for something that is communicated and perceptible.

---

<sup>66</sup> Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 20.

<sup>67</sup> de Vries, *The Kābôd of YHWH in the Old Testament*, 81–83.

<sup>68</sup> Exod 16:7, 10; 24:16, 17; 33:18, 22; 40:34, 35; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 14:10, 22; 16:19; 16:42 [17:7]; 20:6; Dt 5:24; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chron 5:14; 7:1, 2, 3; Ps 63:3; 97:6; 102:15 [102:16]; 102:16 [102:17]; Isa 24:23; 35:2; 40:5; 58:8; 60:1, 2; 66:18, 19; Ezek 1:28; 3:4, 12, 23 (2x); 9:3; 10:4 (2x); 10:18, 19; 11:22, 23; 39:21; 43:2 (2x), 4, 5; 44:4.

<sup>69</sup> G. Kittel, “Δόξα,” in *TDNT*, 2:239.

The כְּבוֹד of Yahweh in Exodus 33–34—and the corresponding δόξα of Jesus in John 1:14—should be understood in this way, as a manifestation of Yahweh’s splendor specifically in reference to his character. More succinctly, the δόξα of Jesus here is the radiance of God’s character. In John 1:14 the glory of Jesus refers to divine radiance, yet specifically to the character of God. This finds further confirmation in the following phrase, “full of grace and truth,” which is recognized to be an allusion to Exodus 34:6 and will be further explained below.<sup>70</sup> This Exodus background undermines Bultmann’s view that the revelation of God is simply that he is revealed, the fact of revelation, rather than the “what.” As the Gospel of John unfolds, the δόξα of Jesus manifests in his signs (John 2:11). The radiance of divine character is manifest not in a proclamation of abstract internal qualities of God but in historical concrete action.

### Excursus: God’s Glory in Exodus

The manifestation of glory in historical concrete action finds precedent in the wider context of Exodus and is worth examining.<sup>71</sup> The connections between John and Exodus are many, for example:<sup>72</sup> John 4:48 Jesus speaks of “signs and wonders” (σημεῖα

---

<sup>70</sup> Caneday, following Tsutserov, concludes similarly about the impact of the allusion on the meaning of δόξα, stating that John implies “two features found in his allusions to Exodus 33–34—(1) the visible appearance of God (Exod 33:20 – 23; 34:3, 29–30 LXX); and (2) the intrinsic character of God (Exod 33:18–19; 34:6–7 LXX).” Caneday, “Glory Veiled in the Tabernacle of Flesh: Exodus 33–34 in the Gospel of John,” 58–59; Alexander Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth: Ratification of the Sinaitic Covenant According to the Gospel of John* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2009), 146.

<sup>71</sup> It will not do, as many scholars have, to explore the meaning of Exodus 34:6–7 apart from its literary context. The comments of Moberly are appropriate:

To be sure, an awareness that the text was probably written centuries later than the time of Moses, and that possibly complex traditio-historical developments underlie it, requires an understanding of the genre of the text different from that which characterized almost all premoderns who simply assumed that Moses wrote it.

R. W. L. Moberly, “How May We Speak of God? A Reconsideration of the Nature of Biblical Theology,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2002): 195. His comments are especially apt in light of our current pursuit, which is to determine why John might have alluded to Exodus. This study assumes, along with “all premoderns” (and surely along with John), that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Unless we are ready to claim that the authors of the NT interpreted Exodus according to traditio-historical developments, studies that explore the lexical background of δόξα along historical-critical lines (cf. Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*; Schwandt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit*.) have limited use when it comes to determining its use and function by NT authors.

<sup>72</sup> See T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, Studies in Biblical Theology (Naperville, IL:



καὶ τέρατα; cf. Exod 7:3);<sup>73</sup> the Passover figures prominently in John’s narrative (2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:55; 12:1; 13:1; 18:28, 39; 19:14); and Jesus is presented as the paschal lamb fulfilling Exodus 12:46 (John 1:29, 36; 19:37).<sup>74</sup> The interplay between the revealing of God’s glory and the doing of signs and wonders in John may find a suitable background in Exodus.<sup>75</sup>

Additionally, the following exploration is warranted because the allusion to God’s glory being revealed to Moses must be understood within the wider context of Exodus and its immediate context in Exodus 33–34. I hope to show (1) that God’s revelation of his glory is significantly tied to concrete action; and (2) that God’s revelation of his glory to Moses in Exodus 34:6–7 specifically reveals the forgiving character of God.

### **Δόξα Manifested in Signs and Wonders in Exodus**

I will argue that God’s revelation of his glory is tied to concrete action first by surveying the terms used to describe the activities of God in the Exodus, and then by exploring their relation to God making himself known or demonstrating his glory. There are various terms used to describe the powerful acts of God in Exodus, the most prominent of which are sign (16x, אֵימָה), miracle/wonder (2x, *nif. ptc.* of פִּלְא; 5x, מוֹפֵת), and acts of judgment (3x, שְׁפָטִים).<sup>76</sup>

---

A.R. Allenson, 1963).

<sup>73</sup> There are 18 occurrences of sign(s) and/or wonder(s) together in Hebrew: Exod 7:3; Deut 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 13:2, 3; 26:8; 28:46; 29:2; 34:11; Isa 8:18; 20:3; Jer 32:20, 21; Ps 78:43; 105:27; 135:9; Neh 9:19. Although it is only found once in Exodus (7:3), all but five refer back to the exodus events. Of these five, four are in reference to prophetic ministry (Deut 13:2, 3; Isa 8:18; 20:3) and one is in reference to the curses upon Israel for disobedience (Deut 28:46).

<sup>74</sup> For the Passover as a unifying theme in John, see Stanley E. Porter, “Jesus, the Passover Theme, and John’s Gospel,” in *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 198–224.

<sup>75</sup> For the defining influence of the Exodus events in the OT and intertestamental literature in regards to glory, see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 409–14, 425.

<sup>76</sup> Occurrences of sign (אֵימָה): Exod 3:12; 4:8 (2x), 9, 17, 28, 30; 7:3; 8:19; 10:1, 2; 12:13; 13:9,

The first instance of “sign” (תֹּא, LXX σημεῖον) accompanies the first appearance of Yahweh in the narrative. The Angel of the LORD appears to Moses in 3:2 and identifies himself as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Yahweh indicates he is sending Moses to Pharaoh to bring the children of Israel out of Egypt and gives him a sign which will validate that Yahweh has indeed sent him. This sign, however, is not something the Israelites will experience until *after* they are brought out of Egypt, “this shall be the sign [תֹּא] for you, that I have sent you: when you have brought the people out of Egypt, you shall serve God on this mountain” (3:12).

Accordingly later in the exchange Moses is afraid the Israelites will not believe him so God gives Moses three signs: the staff turning into a snake; the hand turning leprous after putting it into his cloak; and water from the Nile turning into blood on dry ground (4:2–9). These signs are given so that “they may believe that the LORD... has appeared to [Moses]” (4:5). Later when Moses performs these signs before the elders of Israel they respond by believing (4:31). The LORD also instructs Moses to show the sign of the staff as proof when Pharaoh asks for a miracle (מוֹפֶת, LXX σημεῖον ἢ τέρας),<sup>77</sup> which results in Pharaoh’s heart hardening (7:9–13). Thus both miracle (מוֹפֶת) and sign (תֹּא) are used to refer to the same act and have the function of validating the one sent by God.

Sign(s) is also used to refer to the ensuing miracles God will perform through Moses. In 7:3 Yahweh tells Moses that Yahweh will multiply “signs and wonders” (from תֹּא and מוֹפֶת) and bring Israel out of the land “by great acts of judgment” (בְּשִׁפְטֵי יָדָיו). Moses also calls the fourth plague, the great swarm of flies, a sign (8:23). One of the purposes of the plagues was for the Israelites to recount to their children how Yahweh

---

16; 31:13, 17. Miracle/Wonder (*nif. ptcp.* of פִּלֵּא): 3:20; 34:10. Miracle/Wonder (מוֹפֶת): 4:21; 7:3, 9; 11:9, 10. Acts of judgment (שִׁפְטֵי): 6:6; 7:4; 12:12. Additional terms include פִּלֵּא (15:11) and נֹרָא (15:11; 34:10).

<sup>77</sup> Although the MT only has “miracle” (מוֹפֶת) the LXX has both σημεῖον and τέρας, as does the Samaritan Pentateuch.

had performed “these signs of mine” (אֲתֹתַי) among the Egyptians (10:1–2). These same signs are then called “wonders” (מוֹפְתִים, LXX τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα) in 11:9–10, both in reference to what is about to take place (11:9) and in a summary statement of what has taken place in reference to the previous nine plagues (11:10).<sup>78</sup> Thus the act of the destroyer in killing the firstborn while passing over the homes of the Israelites is in itself a sign, wonder, and is also called acts of judgment (שְׁפָתִים, 12:12).

The smeared blood of the paschal lamb on the doorposts and lintel which saves the Israelites from the destroyer is also called a “sign” for the Israelites (12:13). Additionally, the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread every year, along with the consecration of the firstborn is continually to be a “sign” for the Israelites (13:9, 16).<sup>79</sup> In this sense “sign” is a general symbol, event, or act that communicates information.

“Wonders” (*nif. ptcp.* of פָּלַא) occurs in 3:20 and 34:10. In 3:20 the wonders are what Yahweh will do when he stretches out his hand to “strike” (נָכָה) Egypt to cause Pharaoh to let the people go. The same verb for “strike” (נָכָה) is used 12:12–13 where Yahweh will strike the land of Egypt with the death of the firstborn, again linked with causing Pharaoh to let the people go. It is also used when Yahweh “struck” the Nile (5:25), turning the water into blood. Additionally, the other instance of פָּלַא is in 34:10 where it refers to what Yahweh is doing among the Israelites in renewing the covenant, or it can refer to what he will do in driving out the peoples in Canaan (34:11ff).<sup>80</sup>

A “sign” in Exodus functions on several levels. First it refers to proof that God has indeed sent Moses, validating his status or authority. The presentation of this proof

---

<sup>78</sup> I read 11:9–10 as a transition between the first nine plagues and the remaining acts of God in Egypt. 11:9 begins with a *wayyiqtol*, continuing the narrative with Yahweh’s comment to Moses about what Pharaoh *will* do, which is to fail in listening to Moses’ words so that Yahweh can multiply his wonders in Egypt. 11:10 then breaks the narrative chain with a *waw* + non-verb and follows with a *qatal* which can signal the pluperfect, “Moses and Aaron had done all these wonders before Pharaoh” (my trans.). Joüon §118d; *IBHS* §30.5.2b.

<sup>79</sup> The Sabbath is also called a sign between Yahweh and the people (31:13, 17).

<sup>80</sup> See Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 93.

results in either belief or the hardening of the heart. “Sign” is also used more widely to refer to the miraculous deeds done by Yahweh in delivering Israel from bondage to Egypt. Finally, it also carries the general sense of an event, symbol, or act that communicates information.

Signs, wonders/miracles, and acts of judgment are not strict synonyms, but they are all used to refer to the complex of actions Yahweh performs to secure the release of his people (hereon called the “works” of God in shorthand).<sup>81</sup> Perhaps “sign” is used most frequently as opposed to the other terms because the semantic value of the term itself highlights that the miraculous events are performed by God to communicate information.<sup>82</sup>

What is the relationship between the works of God and the revealing of his glory? Before Pharaoh plunged beneath the waters of judgment, Yahweh prefaced the actions, twice, indicating how we should view the ensuing event: “I will harden Pharaoh’s heart, and he will pursue them, and I will get glory [אֶפְרָדָה] over Pharaoh and all his host, and the Egyptians shall know that I am the LORD” (14:4, 17). The *nifal* of כָּבַד here probably carries a middle sense rather than the passive, “show myself glorious.”<sup>83</sup> Thus God reveals his glory in his works so that he might be known in one way by the Israelites and in another way by the Egyptians (cf. 6:7; 7:5). This is the first mention in Exodus of Yahweh getting glory, although the verb כָּבַד has been used several times in terms of hardening Pharaoh’s heart. It is used at a significant juncture when

---

<sup>81</sup> It is possible that acts of judgment specifically refer to the last and final plague, the death of the firstborn (cf. 12:12, Num 33:4), so John I. Durham, *Exodus*, WBC 3 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 87. He also points out that its repeated use in Ezekiel referring to a variety of judgments may make it inclusive of all the mighty deeds in Egypt and also of the rescue of Israel and the defeat of Egypt at the sea.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. P. Kruger, “אֹת,” in *NIDOTTE*, 1:331–33. For the theme of God making himself known in Exodus, see W. Ross Blackburn, *The God Who Makes Himself Known: The Missionary Heart of the Book of Exodus*, NSBT 28 (Downers Grove, IL: Apollos, 2012).

<sup>83</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “כָּבַד”; *BDB* s.v. “כָּבַד”; *DCH* “כָּבַד”. For the LXX translation of ἐνδοξασθήσονται taking a middle sense see George B. Caird, “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint, I,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19, no. 2 (1968): 453–75.

Israel is saved in the culminating event where the threat of Pharaoh and his army are finally removed (14:30, first use of **יָשַׁע** since 2:15).<sup>84</sup> Yahweh reveals his glory in acts of power to deliver his people, demonstrating who he is (cf. 15:3, “The LORD is a man of war; the LORD is his name”).<sup>85</sup> It is reasonable then to see the works of God (whether signs, miracles/wonders, or acts of judgment) as that which manifests his glory, leading to knowledge of Yahweh.

Another significant passage illustrating the relationship between works, glory and knowledge is in Exodus 16 where the people grumble for food and Moses and Aaron say to them, “At evening you shall know that it was the LORD who brought you out of the land of Egypt, and in the morning you shall see the glory of the LORD” (16:6–7, cf. 16:12). Keil and Delitzsch point out how the parallel, “at evening you shall know” and “in the morning you shall see,” demonstrates a close relationship between seeing and knowing.<sup>86</sup> In addition these both are in reference to concrete actions (quail in the evening and manna in the morning). In 16:12 the connection is drawn again, “At twilight you shall eat meat, and in the morning you shall be filled with bread. Then you shall know that I am the LORD your God.” They will see something of God’s power or glory in the provision of manna and thus know the LORD. Therefore knowing God and seeing his glory are closely connected and both are tied to concrete actions, the works of God.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> The noun **יְשׁוּעָה** is first used in the same context, 14:13, “Fear not, stand firm, and see the salvation of the LORD, which he will work for you today.”

<sup>85</sup> See also Exodus 9:16 where God indicates he will show his power [**הִרְאֵתִי אֶת־כֹּחִי**] so that his name may be proclaimed in all the earth, and 14:30–31 where the Israelites see God’s power [**אֶת־הַיָּד הַגְּדֹלָה**] in seeing the dead bodies of the Egyptians on the shore. The result of this demonstration of God’s power (or glory) is believing in Yahweh and Moses. For the connection between “power” (**כֹּחַ**) and “hand” (**יָד**) see Exodus 15:6; 32:11.

<sup>86</sup> C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 363.

<sup>87</sup> In connection with Exodus 34:6, Kuyper notes a close tie between **חֵסֶד/אֱמֶת** and concrete actions, Kuyper, “Grace and Truth,” 4–11.

How can the connection between seeing glory and knowing God be further clarified? Exodus 14:4 shows that seeing God’s glory leads to knowing God, or at least knowing something about God. Additionally, God’s glory being revealed in the provision of manna demonstrates that seeing his glory is about knowing him rather than seeing a vision of divine radiance. The “seeing” relates to experiencing or perceiving the concrete action performed. In 14:30 Israel “saw the Egyptians dead on the seashore,” which is immediately followed by “Israel saw the great power that the LORD used against the Egyptians” (14:31). This perception is what leads to fearing Yahweh, believing in him and his servant Moses (14:31). In Exodus 16:7 when Moses said to the Israelites that they would see God’s glory in the morning, he did not mean that God would reveal himself to the Israelites in his radiance but that they would know something about God by seeing the provision of manna. In other words, they were to experience God through his acts, and this is tantamount to God revealing his glory. Seeing glory leads to knowing; the relationship between the two is causal. Thus when God makes himself known, it is implied that it is because he is revealing his glory. Conversely, when God reveals his glory, it is implied that it leads to knowing something about God. This takes place in concrete action; it is in the works of God that glory is manifest.

In Exodus 33–34 God’s revelation of his character is closely followed by a declaration of tangible actions on Israel’s behalf, “Before all your people I will do marvels [MT: וַיִּפְלֹאֶת; LXX ἐνδοξά]” (Exod 34:10). Could it be that the LXX translator intentionally highlights the connection between the glory of God and the works of God by way of a cognate noun? This occurs as well in the song of Moses where neither כְּבוֹד or the verb כָּבַד occur. The LXX utilizes δόξα and δοξάζω along with ἐνδοξως several times to depict both Yahweh’s majesty and his works (Exodus 15:1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 21).<sup>88</sup> One example is Exodus 15:1:

---

<sup>88</sup> For δοξάζω: 15:1, 21 [גָּאֵה]; 15:2 [נוֹה]; 15:6, 11 [אָדַר]. For δόξα: 15:7 [גָּאֵה]; 15:11 [תְּהִלָּה].

MT: אֲשִׁירָה לַיהוָה כִּי־גָאָה גָּאָה  
 סוּס וְרֶכֶב וְרָמָה בָּיָם  
 LXX: Ἀισωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται  
 ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν.

The LXX translates the finite verb גָּאָה along with its cognate infinitive absolute גָּאָה with δεδόξασται and ἐνδόξως, respectively, “for gloriously he has glorified himself” (NETS).

The following line links the glorification of God with specific action, “horse and rider he threw into the sea” (NETS). In Exodus 15 the LXX utilized δόξα and its cognates to translate three different verbs and two different nouns.<sup>89</sup> Expanding to the book as a whole the translator for NETS Exodus, Larry Perkins, examined every use of δόξα, δοξάζω, ἐνδοξάζομαι, ἔνδοξος, ἐνδόξως, and παραδοξάζω and compared it with the MT. He makes four observations:

- (1) It is significant that LXX Exodus accounts for 64 percent of this word group’s occurrences (δόξα and all its cognates) in the Pentateuch and that it is used to render a wide variety of Hebrew terms;
- (2) The primary application of this terminology is to Yahweh himself and his actions or, by extension, to those who have come into direct contact with him by means of theophany;
- (3) The translator may have even coined two new verb forms (ἐνδοξάζομαι, παραδοξάζω) further suggesting intentionality in his rendering;
- (4) Because the verb כָּבַד and noun כְּבוֹד do not occur in the songs of Moses and Miriam, the frequent and clustered use of δόξα terminology to describe Yahweh and his actions seems very deliberate.<sup>90</sup>

Perkins concludes that the translator of LXX Exodus showed special interest in Yahweh’s glory and its demonstration, “In Greek Exodus Yahweh’s remarkable actions to liberate Israel and constitute it as his special people form the ‘robes’ that display his unique and

---

For ἐνδόξως: 15:1, 21 [גָּאָה, infinitive abs.].

<sup>89</sup> Regarding one of the nouns, תְּהִלָּה, Perkins erroneously stated that “this is the only context in the Septuagint where this noun is rendered by δόξα,” in Perkins, “‘Glory’ in Greek Exodus,” 101. Δόξα also renders this noun in Isaiah 61:3. Nonetheless this translation is still significant. תְּהִלָּה occurs 57 times in the Hebrew Bible, and is only rendered by δόξα twice.

<sup>90</sup> Perkins, “‘Glory’ in Greek Exodus,” 102. The following points are paraphrased and in some parts quoted from his article.

unparalleled splendor.”<sup>91</sup> Thus the LXX translation itself conveys an emphasis on the connection between the concrete actions Yahweh takes on behalf of his people and how that communicates the glory of Yahweh.<sup>92</sup>

In sum, in Exodus God frequently manifests his glory in concrete action, in signs and wonders.<sup>93</sup> He does this for the purpose of making his name known. Although explicit identification of seeing Yahweh’s glory does not take place until Exodus 16:7, or the explicit mention of Yahweh revealing glory until 14:4, there is good reason to believe these statements help us interpret the previous signs and wonders which have occurred. Additionally, signs are given to validate that God has indeed sent Moses. These signs can simultaneously lead to belief and hardening depending on the recipient.

### **Exodus: Δόξα in Soteriological Context**

The claim that the revelation of glory should be understood in the context of concrete action would seem to exclude Exodus 34:6–7. God reveals himself to Moses in an event where Moses sees his “back” and hears the proclamation of Yahweh and this is quite different than the other miraculous events which revealed God’s glory. The circumstances surrounding Exodus 34:6–7, however, lead to the conclusion that God’s glory is indeed perceived in the context of actions toward Israel: the forgiveness of sins, the renewal of the covenant, and the promise of God’s presence.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Perkins, “‘Glory’ in Greek Exodus,” 102. See also Jörg Frey who proposes that LXX Exodus may have set the stage for later LXX translators to adopt the term to translate כבוד in reference to יהוה, “The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint,” in *On the impact of LXX Torah on later LXX translations*, see Emanuel Tov, “The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 183–94.

<sup>92</sup> For the consideration of theological motivation in the translation of the LXX, see Emanuel Tov, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint,” in *Translation of Scripture: Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute, May 15-16, 1989*, Jewish Quarterly Review Supplement 1990 (Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1990). See also the brief discussion in Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 411.

<sup>93</sup> This is not the exclusive way God’s glory is manifest. God’s appearances to Israel on several occasions are described with glory language (16:10; 24:16, 17; 40:34, 35).

<sup>94</sup> See also Mark J. Boda when he distinguishes between the attributes of Exodus 34:6 and the



The refrain “that [X] may know that I am the LORD” occurs 9x in Exodus with either the Egyptians or Israelites as the subject of knowing.<sup>95</sup> Two significant observations arise from these passages. First, in every one of these instances the phrase is tied to concrete action. As Israel recounts afterward, in delivering his people God is revealed to be strong, a man of war, doing wonders, fearful before the nations, yet acting for his people (cf. Exod 15:3, 11, 15–18). In fact, connected with these new events, Israel will now know God in a different light as Yahweh who delivers his people from Egypt (Exod 6:2–8). It becomes evident, then, that depending on the context new aspects of God may be revealed as he takes further action.

The second observation is that the consistent refrain demonstrates the desire of God to be known as he truly is (cf. Exod 3:6, 13–17; 6:2–8). So Pharaoh’s role in the drama of Israel’s redemption is to oppose Yahweh, for the express reason that Yahweh’s “name may be proclaimed in all the earth” (Exod 9:16). This desire is not simply that Egypt will recognize Yahweh as supreme above all others (e.g. 8:6; 9:14) but that aspects of who Yahweh is will be revealed. This explains the logic of Moses’s intercession when he appeals to how others will view Yahweh’s judgment upon Israel and to Yahweh’s own promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Moses is appealing to what he knows of God’s character, for he understands Yahweh desires to be known in accordance with his character (32:11–14).

The two observations above have bearing on Exodus 32–34 because new characteristics of God are now put on display through the incident of the golden calf. God desires to make himself known as he truly is and he will do so through another action

---

activities of 34:7, providing an explanation within the self-revelation itself of how God’s attributes are expressed in his activity, in *The Heartbeat of Old Testament Theology: Three Creedal Expressions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017), 36–37. Moberly also detects this distinction between 34:6 and 34:7, in Moberly, “How May We Speak of God?,” 199.

<sup>95</sup> This is in reference to use of the specific verb יָדַע with כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה (sometimes with אֱלֹהֵיכֶם added). The Egyptians: Exod 7:5, 17; 8:18; 14:4, 18. The Israelites: 6:7; 10:2; 16:12; 29:46. There are six additional similar statements: 8:6; 9:14, 29; 11:7; 16:6; 31:13.

toward his people. It is a new action, within a new context, and thus new aspects of who God is will be demonstrated. This new revelation of God, even in Exodus, has bearings on how we may understand the new revelation of God through Jesus in the Gospel of John. Previously in Exodus God's glory had been tied to glorious acts for his people while punishing their enemies (cf. 15:13). But in Exodus 33–34 God's glory transcends what has come before because it is now tied to the forgiveness of sins. Israel's understanding of God from this point is defined not just by acts of power toward the enemy but by a demonstration of mercy, compassion, and forgiveness of sin. Prior to Exodus 33–34, God has never been explicitly defined as one who is forgiving and compassionate.

In the context of Exodus 33–34, at stake for the Israelites is the forgiveness of sins, the continuation of covenant relationship, and the presence of God.<sup>96</sup> The lack of his presence is a sign of God's displeasure and the issue of forgiveness remains unresolved (32:30–33, 34; 33:2–3).<sup>97</sup> Precipitated by Israel's egregious sin, Moses's plea for God to reveal his glory was about assurance regarding the character of God and whether he would act in accordance with it.<sup>98</sup> In response, Yahweh reveals himself in an unprecedented way. The descriptions of Yahweh both in the preview (33:19) and in the revelation itself (34:6–7) are mostly new. I have included a select number of them in the following table:

---

<sup>96</sup> "A central concern of Exod. 32–34 is sin and forgiveness," Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 90. Brueggeman identifies Exodus 33 as the "most sustained and delicate attempt to deal with the problem of Yahweh's presence/absence in Israel," and that "by the beginning of 33, everything is in danger," in Brueggemann, "The Crisis and Promise of Presence in Israel."

<sup>97</sup> For an analysis of the buildup of tension through the open question of whether Yahweh will forgive, see Dale Ralph Davis, "Rebellion, Presence, and Covenant: A Study in Exodus 32–34," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 44, no. 1 (1982): 75–79.

<sup>98</sup> Note the repetition of ידע as used by Moses in Exodus 33:12, 13, and 16. As Brueggeman noted, Moses "wants to be an active agent of knowing," in "The Crisis and Promise of Presence in Israel," 50.

Table 3. Self-descriptors of Yahweh in Exodus 33–34

Terminology <sup>99</sup>	Previous use in ref. to God
טוב (33:19 “goodness”)	n/a
חנן (33:19, “be gracious”)	Gen 33:5, 11; 43:29
רחם (33:19, “be merciful”)	n/a
רחום (34:6, “merciful”)	n/a
חַנוּן (34:6, “gracious”)	Exod 22:26
אָרֶךְ אַפַּיִם (34:6, “slow to anger”)	n/a
חֶסֶד (34:6, 7, “steadfast-love”) <sup>100</sup>	Gen 19:19; 24:12, 14, 27; 32:11 [ET 32:10]; 39:21; Exod 15:13; 20:6
אֱמֶת (34:6, “faithfulness”)	Gen 24:27; 32:11
נָשָׂא עֲוֹן וּפְשָׁע וַחֲטָאתָּה (34:7, “forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin”) <sup>101</sup>	n/a

Exodus 34:7 is the first explicit affirmation in the Pentateuch that God forgives sins. Additionally, five of the above nine descriptors of God are never used of him before. The remaining four, חנן, חַנוּן, חֶסֶד, and אֱמֶת, are previously used in radically different contexts than forgiveness. The verb חנן was used in the context of God granting Jacob material possessions (Gen 33:5, 11) and of an invocation by Joseph that God be gracious to Benjamin (Gen 43:29). The noun חַנוּן was used with the revelation of God at Sinai and in the context of God showing compassion to a neighbor whose cloak is taken in pledge (Exod 22:26).<sup>102</sup> Of the eight prior instances of חֶסֶד, only Exodus 20:6 may be read in the

<sup>99</sup> Out of the descriptions of Yahweh in Exodus 33:19 and Exodus 34:6–7 I have only left out “but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children . . .” Additionally, I combined “abounding in steadfast love” and “keeping steadfast love” together in the table under “steadfast love.”

<sup>100</sup> Neither the phrase רַב חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת or רַב חֶסֶד has occurred previously.

<sup>101</sup> The lack of occurrences is not limited to this specific phrase. God is never described prior to Exodus 34:7 as one who forgives sin. Although it is maybe implied in the covering of skins God provided for Adam and Eve or in the sacrifices of the patriarchs, Exodus 34:7 is the first explicit affirmation that God forgives sins.

<sup>102</sup> Gentry notes this with interest as he discusses how the ten words themselves may be revelatory of Yahweh’s name, see Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A*

context of forgiveness since there is a contrast between those to whom God demonstrates steadfast love and the guilty whom God punishes (and forgiveness is implied, rather than explicit). But even then those whom God favors are those who keep his commandments.<sup>103</sup> Lastly, prior demonstration of אָמַת was paired both times with חֶסֶד (Gen 24:27; 34:11) and thus also does not occur in the context of forgiveness. Therefore the four previously used descriptors are now invested with a depth of meaning previously unexplored as Yahweh declares them about himself in the context of the golden calf. Paired with five new descriptors never before used of God it becomes clear that God is revealing new aspects of his glory.<sup>104</sup>

All the descriptors of Yahweh in this revelation are affirming his character as one who will *forgive*, especially highlighted with the accumulation of the nouns in the phrase “forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin” (נָשָׂא עֲוֹן וּפָשַׁע וְחַטָּאָה, 34:7). The repetition and singling out of חֶסֶד indicates a prominence to the term, since none of the other terms are repeated and elaborated. Only חֶסֶד is heightened with “abounding” (רַב), repeated (“one who keeps steadfast love,” נֹצֵר חֶסֶד), and further elaborated with God as “forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.” Although the forgiving character is followed immediately by a statement of judgment—“but who will by no means clear the guilty”—the contrast between showing steadfast love to thousands [of generations] and visiting iniquity upon children to the fourth generation is clear: Mercy triumphs over judgment.<sup>105</sup> Whereas previously Yahweh has shown his steadfast love [חֶסֶד] in acts of

---

*Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 345.

<sup>103</sup> Moberly makes three helpful comparisons between Exodus 20:5–6 with 34:6–7: (1) The sequence between the two poles of judgment and mercy is reversed, mercy being put first in Exodus 34; (2) The mercy theme is greatly expanded in Exodus 34 over the statement in 20:6; (3) The stipulation of an obedient response on the part of Israel is absent from 34:6–7. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 87–88.

<sup>104</sup> Additionally, the repetition of the divine name, יהוה יהוה (34:6) and the unique circumstances of the revelation (God placing Moses in the cleft of the rock, covering Moses with his hand, and allowing Moses to see his “back”) all heighten the sense of this unique revelation that transcends previous displays of glory. See also Garrett, *A Commentary on Exodus*, 651.

<sup>105</sup> So Paul R. House, “God’s Character and the Wholeness of Scripture,” *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 4–17. *Contra* Dentan, who writes that in Exodus 34:6–7 we

power to save his people (Exod 15:13), now his steadfast love is for the first time linked with forgiveness of sins. The re-writing of the tablets (Exod 34:1–4), revelation of God’s glory (Exod 34:5–8), Moses’s renewed plea for forgiveness (Exod 34:9), and subsequent making of the covenant (Exod 34:10) together indicate that God has indeed forgiven. The disclosure of God functioned to reassure Moses of God’s character and demonstrated that he will accede to Moses’s request for forgiveness.<sup>106</sup>

Therefore, there is a strong soteriological context to the self-revelation of Yahweh in Exodus 33–34. New aspects of God’s glory are revealed. Specifically, God demonstrates steadfast love and faithfulness to continue in covenant with his people even when they have greatly sinned—He is a God who forgives.

The link between Exodus 34:6–7 and forgiveness remains strong throughout the Hebrew Bible and into the literature of the Second Temple period.<sup>107</sup> If this can be demonstrated, it provides a basis for which we can suggest that the revelation of God’s

---

have a “beautifully balanced statement with regard to the two most basic aspects of the character of God—His love and His justice,” in Robert C. Dentan, “Literary Affinities of Exodus 34:6f,” *Vetus Testamentum* 13, no. 1 (January 1963): 34–51. In this context the emphasis is on mercy and grace. Dentan’s analysis comes as a result of examining God’s self-revelation apart from the literary context. For “thousands” as referring to generations, see Deut 7:9. For a more recent analysis of this passage that points to both the forgiving and punishing activities of God, yet rightly recognizes the emphasis on mercy, see Boda, *The Heartbeat of Old Testament Theology: Three Creedal Expressions*, 40–41.

<sup>106</sup> This explains Moses’ renewed plea for forgiveness *after* God’s revelation. In light of the goodness of Yahweh just revealed, Moses appeals for God to act according to his character. A similar account occurs in Numbers 14:13–19. There Moses pleads for forgiveness once again on the basis of God’s character, quoting from Exodus 34:6–7, and affirms that God has indeed been forgiving the people since Egypt until now (Num 14:19). See also Moberly, who interprets the פָּ in 34:9 as “for” indicating that the people have not changed from their stiff-necked ways, thus it is God who is showing himself to be gracious. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 89–90.

<sup>107</sup> Various studies have explored the allusions and quotations of Exodus 34:6–7 throughout the OT canon. For a list of possible passages through the Law, Prophets, and Writings see James M. Hamilton, *God’s Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 133–37. The passage is most heavily quoted in Num 14:18; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Neh 9:17. Joseph Kelly provides a helpful chart comparing the terms between these passages, see Joseph R. Kelly, “Joel, Jonah, and the YHWH Creed: Determining the Trajectory of the Literary Influence,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132, no. 4 (2013): 807. A recent canonical analysis is found in Lane, *The Compassionate, but Punishing God*. For other studies see Gordon J. Wenham, “The Golden Calf in the Psalms,” in *God of Faithfulness: Essays in Honour of J. Gordon McConville on His 60th Birthday*, ed. Jamie Grant, Alison Lo, and Gordon J. Wenham (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 169–81; J. P. Bosman, “The Paradoxical Presence of Exodus 34:6–7 in the Book of the Twelve,” *Scriptura* 87 (2004): 233–43; House, “God’s Character and the Wholeness of Scripture.”

character in Jesus, as presented in the Gospel of John, may also have strong links to God's character as forgiving and compassionate. Although not every passage can be addressed here it can be demonstrated that quotation or allusion back to Exodus 34:6–7 is very often used in contexts of sin and the need for forgiveness.<sup>108</sup> I will briefly provide an overview of some of these passages.

Numbers 14 recounts a similar incident as that of the golden calf, because the people are once again put in jeopardy due to their sin and Yahweh again threatens to start anew with Moses (14:12). Moses intercedes for the people and refers back to God's self-revelation in Exodus 34:

And now, please let the power of the Lord be great as you have promised, saying, 'The LORD is slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love, forgiving iniquity and transgression, but he will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, to the third and the fourth generation.' (Num 14:17–18).

Just as in Exodus 34:9, in light of who Yahweh has revealed himself to be, Moses then asks for pardon. God then declares that he has pardoned their iniquity (14:20):<sup>109</sup>

Please pardon the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of your steadfast love, just as you have forgiven this people, from Egypt until now. Then the LORD said, "I have pardoned, according to your word."

Both Moses's statement to Yahweh, "just as you have forgiven this people, from Egypt until now" and Yahweh's response of forgiveness confirms my earlier interpretation that in Exodus 33–34 Yahweh forgave the people for their idolatry. Additionally, the singling out of the greatness of Yahweh's steadfast love (כְּגִדְלֹת חַסְדֶּךָ) in Moses's appeal may imitate Yahweh's own declaration where he singles out his חַסֶּד and links it with forgiveness. It may also be evidence that it functions as shorthand to include the other

---

<sup>108</sup> See Boda for other contexts Exodus 34:6–7 is used, in *The Heartbeat of Old Testament Theology: Three Creedal Expressions*, 50.

<sup>109</sup> It is also interesting that Moses' plea for forgiveness is a request to let the power of the Lord be great (Num 14:17).

attributes.<sup>110</sup> The most significant observation to draw, however, is that the character of God as revealed to Moses is once again utilized in a context of forgiveness.

In Nehemiah 9:16–19, the character of God as revealed in Exodus 34:6–7 is recounted in order to show that God forgave even the hard-hearted and stiff-necked rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness. It was a demonstration of how God was faithful while the people were wicked (Neh 9:33). Right after recounting God’s character in 9:17, the incident of the golden calf is remembered:

But you are a God ready to forgive, gracious and merciful, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love, and did not forsake them. Even when they had made for themselves a golden calf and said, ‘This is your God who brought you up out of Egypt,’ and had committed great blasphemies, you in your great mercies did not forsake them (Neh 9:17b–19a).

There are two important observations relevant for our discussion. First, forgiveness is fronted in the recollection of his character, whereas forgiveness came almost last in the line of characteristics in Exodus 34:6–7. This confirms that remembrance of God’s forgiving character holds primary importance for this context. Second, the recounting of God’s character in history was for the purpose of appealing to God in the present need. God’s character was recounted in response to the Israelites’ characteristically rebellious nature (Neh 9:16–17).<sup>111</sup> God’s mercy in not forsaking the people after repeated warnings is rooted in how he is a “gracious and merciful God” (9:31, אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְרַחֵם). The character of God as revealed to Moses is thus the basis for the confession and trust that God will still deal graciously even though they are wicked (9:31, 32, 33).

---

<sup>110</sup> The variation in terminology may prove significant as well. The actual verbiage in Yahweh’s self revelation is רַב־חֶסֶד (Exod 34:6, Num 14:18) while Moses appeals with, כְּגִדְלֵי חֶסֶד. The unprecedented translation in John 1:14 of רַב as *πλῆρης* is not so strange if the Hebrew uses a variety of expressions, which Tsutserov demonstrates that it does, see Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 55–59.

<sup>111</sup> Only afterwards is it tied to the golden calf. There is reason to see 9:16 as not necessarily specifying the incident of the golden calf, but more generally to the wilderness wanderings, and then 9:17 as referring to Numbers 14:4 where they sought to appoint a “head” (רֹאשׁ + נֹתֵן). In the context of the prayer as a whole (Neh 9:5–38) the Israelites stiffening their neck and refusing to obey is the continual pattern and thus the reason for the peoples’ confession (cf. 9:29, 33), while the character of God as recounted in 9:17 is the basis for confession (9:31, 32, 33).

Gordon Wenham studied several psalms in connection with Exodus 34:6–7 and concluded:

Psalms about God’s gracious forgiveness are thick with terms drawn from Exodus 32–34 . . . . For the psalmists the Golden Calf episode shows the depth of God’s love and his strength of commitment to his people Israel.<sup>112</sup>

As Wenham states, the incident of the golden calf was a “paradigm of God’s grace and mercy to Israel.”<sup>113</sup> Thus when the Psalmist alludes to Exodus 33–34 and recounts God’s mercy and grace it is in the context of praising God for the forgiveness of sins (Ps 103:8, 9, 13). Jonah’s reference to Exodus 34:6–7 as evidence for Yahweh’s compassion to forgive even the Ninevites is emblematic (Jon 4:2; cf. Joel 2:13; Ps 86:15; 103:8).<sup>114</sup>

In terms of Second Temple Literature, there is a glaring omission by Josephus when he fails to include the account of the golden calf and God’s resultant mercy towards Israel (cf. *Ant.* 3). While there may be apologetic or political reasons, Barclay suggests an additional reason for its omission is that God’s mercy in response to Israel’s egregious sin did not fit Josephus’ theology of history “which is shaped by the notion of moral reward.”<sup>115</sup> Barclay also observed how Philo and the author of Wisdom of Solomon only refer to particular elements of the golden calf narrative. Philo discusses the idolatrous episode but leaves out the revelation of divine mercy (*Mos.* 2.159–173, 270–274). Conversely, the Wisdom of Solomon echoes Exodus 34:6–9 (Wis 15:1–6) but leaves out the incident of the golden calf. It seems that for the author, the golden calf was an incident of such egregious idolatry that it was incongruous with the presentation of the people of God as those who would not commit idolatry. In the examples of Philo and the

---

<sup>112</sup> Wenham, “The Golden Calf in the Psalms,” 181.

<sup>113</sup> Wenham, “The Golden Calf in the Psalms,” 179.

<sup>114</sup> For a specific study on Jonah 4:2 and Joel 2:13 in connection with Exodus 34:6–7, see Thomas B. Dozeman, “Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh’s Gracious and Compassionate Character,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 2 (1989): 207–23.

<sup>115</sup> J. M. G. Barclay, “‘I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy’: The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism,” *Early Christianity* 1, no. 1 (2010): 88.



Wisdom of Solomon, the display of divine mercy in the forgiveness of idolatry did not fit their agenda and so it is either omitted or selectively recounted. In contrast, as Barclay documents, Pseudo-Philo's *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* fully recounts the incident (*L.A.B.* 12). Barclay concludes that although there is no particular focus on the divine name (Exod 34:6–7), Pseudo-Philo identifies God's exercise of mercy as the means by which God “ensures the continuation of Israel's history.”<sup>116</sup>

A passage in *Joseph and Aseneth* alludes to Exodus 34:6–7 in a context of forgiveness.<sup>117</sup> The pseudipigraphal work revolves primarily around Aseneth, the daughter of Pentephres, the priest of Heliopolis. Aseneth, presented as a prototypical proselyte, forsakes her idols and seeks refuge with the God of Joseph. Chapter eleven of the long text describes her conversion experience. She finds the courage to confess her sins to God because she has heard of his character, that he is “a God who is merciful, compassionate, long-suffering, full of mercy, gentle, and does not count the sin of a humble person” (11:10).<sup>118</sup> Thus *Joseph and Aseneth* presents the conversion of a Gentile as tied to her remembrance of God's character with the language of Exodus 34:6–7.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Barclay, “I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy,” 97. See Barclay's surveys of Josephus, Philo, Wisdom of Solomon, and Pseudo-Philo, 88–97.

<sup>117</sup> When Christoph Burchard wrote his introduction in Charlesworth's *OTP* a consensus was forming that *Joseph and Aseneth* was written by a Hellenistic Jewish writer between 100 BC and 115 CE. The time of its composition is still disputed, for a recent overview of provenance and dating see Edith M. Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 28–38. For a concise overview of the work in general see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 332–38.

<sup>118</sup> My translation. In the Greek: “Θεὸς ἐλεήμων καὶ οἰκτίρων καὶ μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἐπιεικής καὶ μὴ λογιζόμενος ἁμαρτίαν ἀνθρώπου ταπεινοῦ.” Emphasis added. The underline shows verbal agreement with LXX Exodus 34:6–7. From the critical text in Christoph Burchard, Carsten Burfeind, and Uta Barbara Fink, eds., *Joseph und Aseneth*, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2003). This account is not found in the short text. Most scholars have held to Burchard's long text as found in his *OTP* translation. For an argument for the short text see Ross Shepard Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998). For an overview of issues see Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*.

<sup>119</sup> For further tracing of Exodus 34:6–7 in Jewish literature see Cilliers Breytenbach, “‘Charis’ and ‘Eleos’ in Paul's Letter to the Romans,” in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 226 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 247–77; Barclay, “I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy,” 88–97; Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach, “The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 39 (1968): 91–116; Karla R. Suomala, *Moses*

In sum, the revelation of God to Moses in Exodus 34 is an unprecedented proclamation of Yahweh's forgiving character. Its original context in Exodus is a defining event in Israel's history. Although the revelation itself is a special revealing of God's character in theophany, it relates to the context of the actions of forgiveness, of covenant renewal, and of the promise of his presence. Later recollection of and allusion to the account informs us that we should not easily separate this revelation from its soteriological context. Interpretation of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 1:14 frequently recognizes allusion to Exodus 34:6 yet fails to take into account its context. When this is done the manifestation of God's power and glory is sometimes recognized, or a general notion of his covenant faithfulness, rather than his gracious forgiving character as contextualized in Exodus 33–34.<sup>120</sup> This affects interpretation of John 1:16–18 in exploring what is being compared and transcended.

Some have suggested that the seeing of glory in John 1:14 refers to the transfiguration of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 17:1–13; Mark 9:2–8; Luke 9:28–36).<sup>121</sup> It would be difficult to decide one way or the other whether such an impressive event was in John's mind or not—but the text that was written refers directly back to Moses, the law, and other elements of Exodus 33–34. It is more reasonable, therefore, to relate John's vision of glory in the prologue to the revelation of glory narrated in his Gospel, with the background of Exodus 33–34 in mind, rather than the

---

*and God in Dialogue: Exodus 32-34 in Postbiblical Literature* (New York: P. Lang, 2004).

<sup>120</sup> E.g., among others, Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:35; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 126–29; Klink, *John*, 109–11; Thompson, *John*, 34–35; Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 72–74, 520–25.

<sup>121</sup> Boismard, *St. John's Prologue*, 51, 138–39. See the short discussion in Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:34. See also Susan Humble who tries to relate (unsuccessfully) the glory of the transfiguration in the Synoptic Gospels with glory in John, Susan Elizabeth Humble, *A Divine Round Trip: The Literary and Christological Function of the Descent/Ascent Leitmotif in the Gospel of John*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 79 (Leuven: Peeters, 2016), 98–101. Among other points of contact, she proposes that Mary Magdalene's attempt to cling onto Jesus (20:17) is a functional equivalent to Peter wanting Jesus, Moses, and Elijah to remain with them permanently (Luke 9:33; Matt 17:4; Mark 9:5).

transfiguration. What, then, may John be referring to when he states “we have seen his glory”? Seeing glory in Jesus’s flesh is referring not to one specific moment such as the transfiguration, but following the pattern of Exodus, the revelation of God in Jesus should be tied to concrete action and should be interpreted as comment on the events in the narrative to follow. In light of all that Jesus has accomplished the author can now say, “we have seen his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth” (John 1:14).<sup>122</sup> This witness to glory is tied to 1:12-13 where people who believe in Jesus become children of God, and more directly to 1:14, “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.” Additionally, soon after the prologue the first title given to Jesus is that he is the “Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world” (John 1:29). Therefore a new revelation of God’s glory is now seen in Jesus, and it is tied to the presence of God with man, people becoming children of God, and Jesus being one who takes away the sins of the world. In view of the narrative as a whole, this glory is tied to the event of the glorification of the Father in the Son, when the Passover lamb is slain to take away the sins of the world, ensuring God’s presence with his people through the Spirit.<sup>123</sup> Therefore it is probable that John, in referring back to Exodus 33–34, intends to evoke its soteriological context. When J. Terence Forestell sought to uncover a distinctly Johannine view of salvation he stated that the Gospel of John “pays very little attention to the

---

<sup>122</sup> Jörg Frey argues that all the instances of glory and glorification must be viewed from the perspective of a post-Easter Spirit-remembered perspective, see “The Glory of the Crucified One,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 237–58. Frey writes that the glory of John 1:14 is “the glory of the glorified crucified one, who brings his ‘history’ with him and whose glory is no longer conceivable without his earthly history, indeed without his cross,” in Frey, “The Glory of the Crucified One,” 251. I agree insofar as John, as the writer, likely has the whole of Jesus’ ministry (inclusive of his death and resurrection) in mind when he states that he bears witness to Jesus’ glory. Thus I can affirm with Frey that the Gospel of John is *written* from this post-Easter, Spirit-remembered perspective. But that does not do away with notions of narrative development as John introduces his readers to Jesus pericope by pericope. It is another thing to demonstrate that the Gospel of John must be *interpreted* from this perspective, without any notion of narrative development. In the prologue there is no mention of glorification, nor of the cross, nor of Jesus’ death. How could the reader pickup on a crucified glorified glory in John 1:14, or 2:11, or other instances of glory? Perhaps on repeated readings we can make this case.

<sup>123</sup> The glorification of the Son and the Father will be discussed in chapter 4.

forgiveness of sins.”<sup>124</sup> I would suggest that by paying very great attention to how John refers back to the OT, we can detect how John intentionally recalls the gracious character of God and thus anticipates a context of forgiveness.

### **Glory New: Ως μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός**

The first description of δόξα in John 1:14 designates for the first time the λόγος as the μονογενής, the “only begotten.” This designation introduces a new dynamic into the λόγος/θεός relationship and further explains how the λόγος is God, yet distinct from God (John 1:1). The designation speaks to his identity and nature, *who he is*, and therefore explains the kind of δόξα he exhibits.<sup>125</sup> My reading of John 1:14 depends, partly, on understanding the meaning of the lexeme μονογενής as “only begotten” rather than “unique” or “beloved.” Since most modern scholars have moved away from the traditional “only begotten” view the rest of this section will argue for it as the best reading of the text.

Historically μονογενής has been understood to mean “only begotten” (KJV; Vulgate, *unigenitus*), but the trend in modern scholarship is to understand it as “one of a kind” or “unique.”<sup>126</sup> The argument, broadly conceived, is as follows: (1) etymologically,

---

<sup>124</sup> J. Terence Forestell, *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, *Analecta Biblica* 57 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 148.

<sup>125</sup> The first phrase modifying δόξα begins with ὡς. The particle does not draw a simple comparison, that the glory of the λόγος is “in comparison to” μονογενοῦς, for later in John Jesus is said to actually be τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ (3:16; cf 1:18). Rather, ὡς is describing the “characteristic quality” of δόξα. Thus the phrase, ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, is an elaboration as to what this glory is. See T. C. de Kruijf, “The Glory of the Only Son (John I 14),” in *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr. J. N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, *NovTSup* 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 120. See BDAG’s third category under ὡς; “marker introducing the perspective from which a pers., thing, or activity is viewed or understood as to character, function, or role, *as*.” *BDAG* s.v. “ὡς.”

<sup>126</sup> In terms of translations, the RSV led the way with the publication of the NT in 1946. Later in 1978 the NIV followed suit. In 1953 Dale Moody defended the decision of the RSV, and Richard Longenecker for the NIV in 1986, Dale Moody, “God’s Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72, no. 4 (December 1953): 213–19; Richard N. Longenecker, “The One and Only Son,” in *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 119–26. For a brief history of interpretation see Charles Lee Irons, “A Lexical Defense of Johannine ‘Only Begotten,’” in *Retrieving Eternal Generation*, ed. Fred Sanders and Scott R. Swain (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), 99–101. See also Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:13–14; Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:412–16.

μονογενής is not from μονός + γεννάω but rather μονός + γένος, although usage still determines meaning; (2) historically, Jerome mis-translated μονογενής with *unigenitus* (only begotten) rather than following the OL *unicus* (only) due to theological motivations; (3) semantically, instances where μονογενής clearly means “unique,” “only,” or “the only one of its kind” demonstrate the error of the traditional meaning of “only begotten.”<sup>127</sup> We will consider each of these in turn.

As to etymology, in Carson’s widely utilized *Exegetical Fallacies*, he notes the rendering “only begotten” as an example of a root fallacy, historically understood to be from μονός + γεννάω.<sup>128</sup> He states it is more likely to be from μονός + γένος, meaning “only one of its kind.” However, as Pendrick noted, even if this is the correct etymology, γένος itself traces back to γίγνομαι and can be connected with the notion of birth (note other – γενής adjectives such as εὐγενής “well born”).<sup>129</sup>

Historically, Justin Martyr and Tertullian in the second century understood μονογενής as “only begotten,” so the charge that this understanding arose from Jerome and contemporary Christological debates around his time does not hold.<sup>130</sup> Neither etymology nor history is decisive, usage must settle the issue.

The word μονογενής (including an earlier form μουνογενής) occurs 91 times from the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE until the first century AD according to the *TLG* corpus. The

---

<sup>127</sup> In addition to Longenecker and Moody mentioned above, see also: Frederick C. Grant, “‘Only-Begotten’: A Footnote to the New Revision,” *Anglican Theological Review* 36, no. 4 (October 1954): 284–87; Gerard Pendrick, “Monogenes,” *New Testament Studies* 41, no. 4 (1995): 587–600. For a defense of the traditional view, see F. Büchsel, “Μονογενής,” in *TDNT*, 2:233–54; James M. Bulman, “The Only Begotten Son,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 16, no. 1 (April 1981): 56–79; John V. Dahms, “The Johannine Use of Monogenēs Reconsidered,” *New Testament Studies* 29, no. 2 (April 1983): 222–32; Irons, “A Lexical Defense of Johannine ‘Only Begotten.’”

<sup>128</sup> D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 30–31.

<sup>129</sup> Pendrick, “Monogenes,” 587–88. Irons performed a *TLG* search and found numerous adjectives built upon the –γενής form. When checked with LSJ, many of them are glossed with words such as “born” or “produced.” The examples Irons provides include νεογενής, “newly produced,” and θεογενής, “born of God.” Only a small sample of them were related to “kind.” Irons, “A Lexical Defense of Johannine ‘Only Begotten,’” 104.

<sup>130</sup> Dahms, “The Johannine Use of Monogenēs Reconsidered,” 225–27; Bulman, “The Only Begotten Son,” 59–63.

earliest occurrence is in Hesiod's *Theogony* in the eighth century BCE and carried the meaning "only child,"<sup>131</sup> as it does in later occurrences by different authors (e.g. Herodotus, *History* 2.79.3; 7.221; Plato, *Critias* 113d). There are also instances where it does not contain a biological meaning, but means something along the line of "unique" or "one of a kind" (e.g. Plato, *Timaeus* 31b).<sup>132</sup> Pendrick surveyed the extra-biblical literature and concluded that when the word is applied to non-humans it means "only one of its kind" and when it designates offspring it meant "only" or "single" without necessarily providing connotations of birth or derivation.<sup>133</sup> This consensus view of scholarship has been recently challenged by C. Lee Irons. Irons' survey produced different results. Whereas Pendrick sought to find the meaning that would account for every usage and concluded that in every case it must be "only," or "unique," Irons looked for the basic literal meaning which may then account for the variations. He concluded that there is a basic biological meaning (the majority of instances) which is then extended out in other uses. He claims that *μονογενής* is "used most basically and frequently in reference to an only child begotten by a parent, with the implication of not having any siblings."<sup>134</sup> Irons argues that because the word most frequently modifies nouns such as "son," "daughter," or "child," (words involving the concept of being begotten or an offspring) and is not found modifying other nouns such as "wife," "friend," "foot," "sword," and so on (which we may expect if the adjective means "only"), the literal most basic meaning is the straight-forward biological meaning of "only begotten," or "without

---

<sup>131</sup> Hesiod describes the goddess Hecate as the "only child" (*μονογενής*) in line 426 and again in 448.

<sup>132</sup> See the examples given in Longenecker, "The One and Only Son," 121; Pendrick, "Monogenes," 588–92.

<sup>133</sup> Pendrick, "Monogenes," 592. Although he notes occasionally there are instances that do connect the adjective with birth or derivation.

<sup>134</sup> Irons, "A Lexical Defense of Johannine 'Only Begotten,'" 106. Paul Rainbow also makes a brief but strong case for "only-begotten," Paul A. Rainbow, *Johannine Theology: The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 100–105.

siblings.” This basic meaning, then, is also gradually extended into non-literal metaphorical meanings, which is how Irons explains the instances of “unique” or “one of a kind.”<sup>135</sup>

What difference does this make for our discussion of *δόξα*? According to the prevailing view, if *μονογενής* means “one and only” this highlights Jesus’s special relationship to the Father. It does not carry any biological or metaphysical meaning. As Leon Morris writes, the “Greek term means no more than ‘only,’ ‘unique.’”<sup>136</sup> Jesus’s special relationship to the Father is that he is the unique Son of God, “no other is or can be the Son of God as he is.”<sup>137</sup> With this view scholars tend to discard notions of generation or derivation, denying any sort of biological metaphor indicated by *μονογενής*.

Weinrich asserts that *μονογενής* “in this context does not refer to the eternal origin of the Word, but to the status and function the Word possesses in the economy of salvation.”<sup>138</sup> Likewise Longenecker argues that *μονογενής* is an adjective stressing quality, “rather than derivation or descent.”<sup>139</sup> It is not within the scope of this study to determine whether the notion of derivation is conveyed with the lexeme, but I think Irons’

---

<sup>135</sup> Irons identifies three non-literal extensions of meaning: (1) concern for an heir (e.g. Isaac as Abraham’s “only son” [Heb 11:17] *as if* he were an only begotten son, still retaining biological connotations); (2) metaphorical begetting, such as Plato describing God making one *μονογενής* universe; and (3) philosophical or scientific usage, where the relationship between a genus and a species is viewed with analogy to a father and his offspring, which in such cases the word means “one of a kind.” The third usage is where the biological connotations may drop out, such as 1 Clement 25:2 and the *μονογενής*, “one of a kind” phoenix. Irons further explains, “The directionality of this flow from biological to metaphorical to scientific is the best explanation for all of the data . . . It is precisely backwards to start with the latter set of data and attempt to reinterpret the former set of data so that it fits into a non-biological mold. One can only do this by getting rid of the notion of ‘begetting.’ But the fundamental biological concept of ‘begetting’ is surely present in the word when used in literal or metaphorical familial contexts,” in Irons, “A Lexical Defense of Johannine ‘Only Begotten,’” 108–12, esp. 112.

<sup>136</sup> Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 93. Also J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 80–81; Rodney A. Whitacre, *John*, IVP New Testament Commentary Series (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 58–59.

<sup>137</sup> Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 93.

<sup>138</sup> Weinrich, *John 1:1-7:1*, 111.

<sup>139</sup> In addition to his lexical analysis, Longenecker refers to the conceptual framework of Judaism for “Son” as one in a loving obedient relationship with God, thus Jesus being designated “son” in relation to the Father is functional rather than derivational. Longenecker, “The One and Only Son,” 123–24.

study, at the very least, calls attention to how the stream of recent scholarship may have been too quick to eliminate a biological metaphor at play.

All of the non-Johannine occurrences of *μονογενής* in the NT are in the context of parent/child relationships (Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38; Heb 11:17). Several occurrences in the LXX also are in this same context (Judg 11:34; Tobit 3:15; 6:11; 8:17; Pss. Sol. 18:4), although there are instances of *μονογενής* in non-biological contexts (LXX Psalm 21:21; 24:16; 34:17; Wis 7:22). The occurrences in Johannine contexts all take place in proximity with familial language (John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9). In 1:14, even if “unique” or “only” is the correct meaning of the lexeme, the context itself pushes us to supply “son” (as evident in many translations, cf. ESV, RSV, NRSV, TNIV, HCSB, CEV) and recognize a biological metaphor at play.<sup>140</sup> If Irons is correct, the lexeme itself contributes to this metaphor and sharpens it.

If, as most scholars argue, *μονογενής* is devoid of biological connection and means “only” or “one and only” then the instance in John 1:14 is a bit awkward. Michaels tacitly acknowledges the abruptness of this view, asking “*whose* One and Only?” and answers with, “a father’s One and Only.”<sup>141</sup> It is notable again that a proponent of this view assumes familial relations. I believe Michaels is asking the wrong question, it is not naturally “*whose* One and Only,” but “One and Only *what*?” If *μονογενής* simply means “only” without biological connotations, it is an adjective in search of a noun. When Michaels, and others who hold to the current view, assume that it is a Father’s “one and only *Son*,” it is difficult to see how they are stating anything meaningfully different than “the only begotten of the Father.”<sup>142</sup> It would be more

---

<sup>140</sup> See also 1 John 5:18. Ridderbos acknowledges the tide of scholarship against “only begotten” and so does not comment further on the lexical debate. But referencing 1 John 5:18, he says it “proves that there is every reason to assume that here, too, ‘only begotten’ means more than simply ‘only’,” Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 53.

<sup>141</sup> Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 80.

<sup>142</sup> James M. Bulman makes a similar point about the OL translation of *μονογενής* as *unici filii*, that this translation still provides an image involving derivation, “certainly for the thinking of those days



consistent for them to use the term “unique.” Additionally, what does it mean that the glory seen is that of the “One and Only” from the Father? Carson writes, “the glory displayed in the incarnate Word is the kind of glory a father grants to his *one and only, best-loved* Son – and this ‘father’ is God himself.” The logic of Carson’s statement is that because Jesus is the *one and only*, or is the *best-loved* Son, God has granted him glory.<sup>143</sup> A few issues can be raised. First, although John 17:22 describes a granting of glory from Father to Son, in 1:14, *παρὰ πατρὸς* should be taken with *μονογενής* and so does not describe glory from the Father but *μονογενής* from the Father: “glory, as of the only Son [who comes] from the Father.” Thus the *granting* of glory is not in the purview of this text, although it does not exclude it. Second, with Carson’s explanation the logic of John’s presentation is muddled, albeit slightly. The kind of *δόξα* Jesus exhibits is explained by referring to him as *μονογενής*. If the term means “best-loved” or “unique” the logic must be that as the “best-loved,” Jesus manifests a special kind of glory, but it is not evident at this point why being “best-loved” or “unique” leads to one having the glory of the Father. More likely, the emphasis is that as a *son* reflects the father, so Jesus as the *μονογενής* demonstrates the same glory as the Father in a way no other can. Because he is his Father’s *only begotten* to look upon him is to look upon the Father (14:9); he is the only one who can explain the Father who is otherwise unseen (as the *μονογενής* θεὸς 1:18). There is no other who by virtue of their being can reveal the Father in such a decisive way, for this one is described with language that includes derivation from the Father.

---

when ‘son’ as applied to Christ was assumed to refer to his generation,” Bulman, “The Only Begotten Son,” 60. See also Grant’s note defending the RSV’s translation of “only,” only to declare that the updated translation of “only Son” from “only begotten Son” says the *same* thing, “who ever heard anyone describe his son or daughter as ‘my only-begotten son’ or ‘my only-begotten’ daughter”? The truth is, modern English says the same thing—and better—with its clean, swift-moving, briefer and more pointed idiom.” Grant, “‘Only-Begotten,’” 287. Also see both Barrett and Dodd, who both hold to *μονογενής* as “one of a kind” yet in relation to a father they acknowledge it can “hardly mean anything other than only (-begotten) son,” Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 305; Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 166.

<sup>143</sup> *Μονογενής* is sometimes claimed to be synonymous with *ἀγαπητός* since both are used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew *יְהוָה* (e.g. OG Gen 22:2 translates with *ἀγαπητός* while Aquila with *μονογενής*, cf. Heb 11:17). But it does not necessarily follow that the two nouns are synonymous. See Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel*, 204.

Bernard, although affirming *μονογενής* as “unique,” in the end states “the glory of the Incarnate Word was such glory as the only Son of the Eternal Father would *derive* from Him and so could exhibit to the faithful.”<sup>144</sup> The logic of 1:14 goes beyond a mere granting of glory to a beloved, and as Bernard recognizes it is precisely because of who Jesus is as the only begotten son (and thus drawing on the biological metaphor) that he is able to reveal the Father’s glory.<sup>145</sup> To remove the biological notion is to undercut the metaphor.

Therefore the glory of God the Father is revealed in the only begotten Son, and it is no less than the glory of the God who revealed himself to Moses. Yet by using the designation *μονογενής* John implies Jesus reveals more fully the glory of God than what Moses had seen and passed on in his Law. John sets the reader up for 1:16–18 where Jesus the *μονογενής* will be compared with Moses, who only received a partial glimpse of God. Jesus reveals something unique and different, as *the only begotten Son*, and in 1:18, as *the only begotten God*.

### **Glory Old: Πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας**

The second description specifies particular characteristics and gives content to the *δόξα*. Just like the second verbal clause in 1:14, “and he dwelt among us,” grounded the first clause, “the word became flesh,” in the OT, this second description of *δόξα* grounds the first description in the OT as well. This new vision of *δόξα* manifested by the *μονογενής* is glory “full of grace and truth,” which invites comparison and contrast to Yahweh’s glory as revealed in the OT. This particular reading of the text depends on

---

<sup>144</sup> Emphasis mine. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, 1:23–24.

<sup>145</sup> Chibici-Revneanu understands the accent of the term to be on “unique” while leaving room for the idea of generation, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 70–71. The emphasis on the *μονογενής* being able to reveal the Father is confirmed later in 1:18 where Jesus is the *μονογενής θεός*. In 1:18, as Irons has pointed out, to render it as the “only God” is problematic, see Irons, “A Lexical Defense of Johannine ‘Only Begotten.’”

recognizing (1) that πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας is an allusion to Exodus 34:6 ( רַב־חַסֵּד וְאֱמֻנָה), and recognizing (2) that the allusion functions to evoke the wider context of Exodus 34:6.

Table 4. Comparison of Exodus 34:6 MT, LXX, and John 1:14

Exodus 34:6 (MT)	רַב־חַסֵּד וְאֱמֻנָה
Exodus 34:6 (LXX)	πολύελεος καὶ ἀληθινός
John 1:14	πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας

The allusion to Exodus 34:6 is widely recognized yet it requires explanation.<sup>146</sup> John deviates from the LXX rendering. A. T. Hanson presented an article on the matter in 1976, speculating that the author of the Gospel of John translated it “for himself direct from the Hebrew.”<sup>147</sup> Recently Alexander Tsutserov followed up Hanson’s article with what Richard Bauckham called “a full and thorough lexical and literary study that demonstrates the allusion conclusively.”<sup>148</sup>

Tsutserov has contributed significantly to the discussion by way of strengthening a conclusion that is widely assumed but rarely proven. He establishes

---

<sup>146</sup> Modern scholars have detected in this phrase an echo or allusion to Exodus 34:6. See the list of commentators and other studies in Evans, *Word and Glory*, 81n2. Many studies do not take the time to adequately justify the allusion or explain its significance for the interpretation of δόξα.

<sup>147</sup> Hanson, “John 1:14-18 and Exodus 34.”

<sup>148</sup> Richard Bauckham notes this in the foreword to Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, ix.

plausibility for the translation of πλήρης from רַב,<sup>149</sup> of χάρις from חֶסֶד,<sup>150</sup> and proffers a credible argument for why the author would have used χάρις.<sup>151</sup> Additionally, he brings clarity to the discussion by providing evidence for understanding χάρις and ἀλήθεια as separate attributes rather than as a *hendiadys* (eliminating options such as Moloney’s proposal “fullness of a gift which is truth”).<sup>152</sup> Any further study claiming otherwise will now have to reckon with Tsutserov’s thorough arguments.

If John intends for πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας to allude to the phrase חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת from Exodus 34:6, then what is the purpose? The simple answer seems to be that he intends to focus on two specific attributes, חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת. Although John’s Greek parallels the Hebrew very well structurally and semantically,<sup>153</sup> I will argue that when John uses χάρις

---

<sup>149</sup> Tsutserov points out the following, with numerous examples, to demonstrate plausibility for how John could have legitimately translated רַב of Exodus 34:6 with πλήρης in John 1:14: (1) there was no uniform way of translating חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת in the LXX, which used both πολυ or πλήθος to convey רַב; (2) the extent of God’s חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת was expressed in other parts of the HB by various terms, phrases, and strategies, other than רַב (e.g. Num 14:18, 19 where 14:19 uses חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת right after 14:18 has חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת); (3) Exodus itself elaborates the extent of God’s חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת in 34:7 differently; (4) the Evangelist’s own tendency to use excessive language; (5) other NT authors use extraordinary degrees and employ different terminology from that of the standard LXX renderings when speaking of divine χάρις. Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 55–59.

<sup>150</sup> On how John could have legitimately translated חֶסֶד with χάρις: It is translated with χάρις by the LXX and its recensions. Tsutserov provides the following examples and discusses them. For the OG χάρις was used to translate חֶסֶד in Esth 2:9; 2:17; Sir 7:33; 40:17. Tsutserov discusses these specifically in response to Harris’ objections that these instances do not provide evidence that John could have used χάρις for חֶסֶד, see Harris, *Prologue and Gospel*, 66. For the recensions: Theodotion uses χάρις for חֶסֶד in Prov 31:26; χάρισμα for חֶסֶד in Ps 31:22 [MT, as the other Psalm references in this note]. Aquila, as attested by the Syro-Hexapla, uses χάρις for חֶסֶד in Ps 106:7. Symmachus also utilizes χάρις for חֶסֶד in 2 Sam 10:2; Ps 31:8; 40:11; 89:25; Lam 3:32; and Ps 40:12 [attested by Syro-Hexapla]. Quinta uses χάρις for חֶסֶד in Ps 33:5, and Sexta does so as well in Ps 31:18. Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 60–63.

<sup>151</sup> Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 54–81.

<sup>152</sup> Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 90–139. Whether χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας constitute a *hendiadys* describing one attribute rather than two is related to whether the Hebrew phrase from Yahweh’s self-characterization, חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת, is a *hendiadys*. Tsutserov demonstrates how subjective previous claims have been and provides some textual evidence for why grace and truth should be viewed as separate attributes. See also Rosemari Lillas’ investigation on *Hendiadys* in the Hebrew Bible, which is not accounted for by Tsutserov but would strengthen his critiques of previous scholarship. Lillas demonstrates that there is no clear consensus on what *hendiadys* is, no agreement on criteria for identifying *hendiadys*, nor on what identification of *hendiadys* means for interpretation. Rosmari Lillas, “*Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible: An Investigation of the Applications of the Term*” (PhD diss., University of Gothenburg, 2012). See especially pp. 192–93, 277–78, 279–81. I want to thank Professor William Varner for pointing me to Lillas’ work. For suggestions of “grace and truth” as *hendiadys*, see Francis J. Moloney, “The Fulness of a Gift Which Is Truth,” *Catholic Theological Review* 1 (1978): 30–33; Kuyper, “Grace and Truth,” 6–7.

<sup>153</sup> Tsutserov and Lindars both note how πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας actually reflects a better translation than the LXX rendering of πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός. Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 81–82, 88; Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 95.

καὶ ἀλήθεια he does not intend to focus on two specific attributes but rather he uses these terms to allude to the Hebrew phrase in particular (רַב־חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת) with the intention of evoking the self-characterization of Yahweh as a whole, calling to mind also the wider context of Exodus 33–34. This makes the best sense of John’s logic in 1:14–18, as he goes on to explain how the “grace and truth” that comes through Jesus replaces what had come before in Moses. It is not simply that those specific attributes are now heightened in their display through Jesus, but it is that one’s understanding of God’s character has a new reference point and context, Jesus Christ glorified.<sup>154</sup> Because John will make multiple allusions to the greater context of Exodus 34:6 in John 1:14–18, and here in 1:14 he makes use of the term χάρις, I believe he is leading us to widen out the lens to include the other attributes and consider the greater context of Exodus 34:6.

Discussion of the other allusions to Exodus 33–34 has already taken place above and will be further fleshed out below, so we turn our attention to why John used the term χάρις. Menken and Schuchard argued that the LXX is a major source for John’s quotations of OT Scriptures and that when he deviates from the LXX there is a theological purpose.<sup>155</sup> Tsutserov provides a credible explanation, from which I will build upon in the next few paragraphs.

---

<sup>154</sup> I defend this particular reading below.

<sup>155</sup> Freed concluded that John’s quotations of the OT can rely on the LXX, the MT, and the tradition of the Targums. Menken argued that the LXX predominates along with infrequent influence from Hebrew sources, while Schuchard saw no evidence for reliance upon a Hebrew text and contended that John relied upon the Greek OT (whether the OG or corrected forms, see Bynum’s work). Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 11 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 127–30; Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 205–6; Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBL Dissertation Series 133 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 152. See also Bruce G. Schuchard, “Form versus Function: Citation Technique and Authorial Intention in the Gospel of John,” in *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, ed. Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 23–46; William R. Bynum, *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2012). Schuchard and Menken both argue that when the author deviates from the LXX it is purposeful and theological. For a helpful chart outlining OT quotations in John and their textual alignment including a brief analysis see Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 417–18.

While previous studies have also explored the suitability of *χάρις* as a translation for *חֶסֶד*, Tsutserov goes a step further to claim that *χάρις* actually stands in for several attributes from Exodus 34:6, referring to “merciful [*רחום*],” “gracious [*חנּוּן*],” and “steadfast love [*חֶסֶד*].” Tsutserov presents his case on several levels,<sup>156</sup> but I will note aspects of Tsutserov’s argument which are particularly helpful. He produced a host of a texts to demonstrate that the adjectives *רחום*, *חנּוּן*, *חֶסֶד*, and their cognates were translated with a variety of similar terms. I reproduce his data here in the following chart:

---

<sup>156</sup> First, following Menken, he notes that when John deviates from the LXX he does so intentionally. Second, he states that the difference in meaning between the three Hebrew descriptions (*רחום*, *חנּוּן*, *חֶסֶד*) are “rather elusive” (cf. Exod 11:3; Gen 43:14; Ezra 9:9; similarly 7:28; Dan 1:9; he also references Bultmann, Zimmerli, and Conzelmann, appealing also to usage at Qumran and in Rabbinic writings). Third, he points out that by the time of the Gospel’s writing, terms such as *רחום*, *חנּוּן*, and *חֶסֶד* did not retain clear distinctions in meaning and that these terms were used to convey similar ideas. Fourth, the distinction between the Greek terms used to translate the three attributes were blurred as well. Fifth, the meaning of the terms *ἔλεος* and *χάρις* had “virtually merged” by the time of the Gospel. Sixth, there are theological reasons to avoid the terms *οἰκτίρμων*, *ἔλεος*, and *ἐλεήμων* (terms the LXX used) in referring to the attributes. Seventh, *χάρις* was used due to its positive theological associations, whether with the eschatological reward for the elect (e.g. Wis 3:9; 4:14; 1 En. 99:13), blessings of end-time salvation (1 En. 5:4–8), or emphasis on the notion of a free gift. Eighth, and finally, if the author used any of the terms the LXX used to translate the attributes then the reader may have the wrong impression that a particular term is alluded to. Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 75–81.

Table 5. LXX translations for the adjectives רחום, רחם, and רחמים

Term Cognates	LXX Translations
רחום. <sup>157</sup>	οἰκτίρμων, ἐλεήμων
רחם	ἐλεέω, οἰκτείρω
רחמים	ἔλεος, οἰκτιρμός, χάρις
רחם. <sup>158</sup>	οἰκτιρμός, ἐλεήμων
רחם	ἐλεέω, ἔλεος, οἰκτείρω, οἰκτίρμων
רחמים	οἰκτιρμός
רחם	ἔλεος, χάρις
רחם. <sup>159</sup>	ἔλεος, ἐλεημοσύνη, ἐλεήμων, οἰκτίρημα, χάρις, +

There is significant overlap in how the LXX rendered the three Hebrew terms and their cognates, lending weight to Tsusterov's claim that the terms did not have easily distinguishable meanings. The fact that χάρις has been used to translate the cognates of רחום and רחם, but not for the terms themselves (including רחם in Exod 34:6) strengthens Tsutserov's conclusion that χάρις was used to allude to all three but in a way that does not single out one over the other. Tsutserov presents a strong case for how χάρις could evoke multiple terms in Yahweh's self-characterization, not just רחם.

<sup>157</sup> רחום: οἰκτίρμων (Exod 34:6; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Pss 86:15; 103:8), ἐλεήμων (Ps 145:8; Sir 50:19). רחם (verbal cognate): ἐλεέω (Deut 13:17; Isa 54:8), οἰκτείρω (Mic 7:19–20). רחמים (noun cognate): ἔλεος (Deut 13:17; Isa 63:7; Sir 16:11), οἰκτιρμός (Pss 40:12; 51:3; 69:17 103:4; Hos 2:19; Zech 7:9; Sir 5:6), χάρις (Gen 43:14; Dan 1:9)

<sup>158</sup> רחם: ἐλεήμων (Exod 22:26; 34:6; Pss 86:15; 103:8; 111:4; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2), οἰκτιρμός (Pss 109:12; 145:8). רחם (verbal cognate): ἐλεέω (Gen 43:29; Ps 51:3), ἔλεος (Judg 21:22), οἰκτείρω (Pss 4:2; 37:21; 59:6; 67:2; 102:14, 15; 112:5; 123:2; Isa 30:18), οἰκτίρμων (Ps 109:12). רחמים (noun cognate): οἰκτιρμός (Zech 12:10). רחם (noun cognate): ἔλεος (Gen 19:19), χάρις (Gen 18:3; as well as multiple other examples)

<sup>159</sup> רחם: ἔλεος (the most common trans.), ἐλεημοσύνη (Gen 47:29; Prov 3:3; 16:6; 19:22; 20:28; 21:21), ἐλεήμων (Prov 11:17; 20:6), οἰκτίρημα (Jer 31:3 [LXX 38:3]) (listed in LSJ under οἰκτείρημα), χάρις (Sir 7:33; 40:17; Esth 2:9, 17), + symbol to indicate there are more but they are not relevant for the issue in question (e.g. δικαιοσύνη).

Tsutserov's conclusion is not simply that *χάρις* evokes multiple terms but that the phrase *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας* in John 1:14 is alluding to Yahweh's self-characterization of Exodus 34:6, *רַחוּם וְחַנוּן אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם וְרַב־חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת*, but excludes *אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם*.<sup>160</sup> There is, however, simply no need to eliminate *אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם* from the equation. Tsutserov argues that *אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם*/*μακρόθυμος* (LXX) is not included because its absence "warns that God's longsuffering nature has come to an end."<sup>161</sup> He explains that since this attribute is left out in John 1:14 it "stresses the notion that the time of judgment has finally come" (he cites John 3:36 as well). This is a strange argument in light of John's use of *χάρις* to evoke attributes such as mercy and compassion. Tsutserov's reference to John 3:36 is puzzling, since John 3:36 states that God's wrath remains (*μένω*) on those who reject Christ, implying that they stood under judgment already, not that judgment has now come (cf. also 3:17). Additionally, the present mission of Jesus is to bring salvation, not judgment (cf. John 3:16–17; 20:31).<sup>162</sup> Tsutserov's claim of God's longsuffering coming to an end also ignores the fact that the attributes in their original context (Exod 34:6) are in the context of forgiveness. Used in that original context all the attributes point to the forgiveness of God offered in light of Israel's egregious sin.<sup>163</sup> It would be better to affirm that John seeks to evoke the whole of Yahweh's self-characterization by using a term that encompasses several of the attributes.

The characterization of God in Exodus 34:6 is embedded in the context of his actions toward Israel in the forgiveness of sins, the renewal of the covenant, and the promise of his presence. As later allusions to Yahweh's self-characterization of Exodus

---

<sup>160</sup> Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 73–74, 87.

<sup>161</sup> Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 73–74, 87.

<sup>162</sup> Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:571. Although there are statements of Jesus that affirm a place for judgment in his mission (e.g. 9:39), the overall presentation is one that emphasizes his offer of life.

<sup>163</sup> This is not to say every attribute is the same and that their unique semantic contributions flatten into one.



34:6 demonstrate a persistent connection to the forgiveness of sins, John's allusion to the account may generate an expectation of another act of grace and forgiveness which will reveal God's glory.

In sum, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας recalls the self-characterization of God as he revealed his δόξα to Moses. This allusion affirms that indeed God has revealed himself once again among men, the δόξα witnessed by John is the δόξα of the God of the OT. This allusion is striking because the very attributes that God revealed about himself at Sinai are now predicated about Jesus. John intends for us to understand the glory of Jesus *is* the glory of Yahweh. The description gives content to what is revealed about God and it is not simply a vision of brightness, but entails understanding his character, therefore δόξα is the radiance of God's character. In Exodus 33–34 the characteristics listed highlight his compassion and mercy, the very revelation of which demonstrates Yahweh's willingness to forgive their sins. Coupled with the first description of Jesus as the μονογενής, the reader must understand this new revelation of God's glory in light of the old, and as John will go on to explain, this new revelation will replace the old as the fundamental way one should understand God's character.

### **John 1:15–18 New Δόξα Replaces the Old**

The rest of John's prologue will continue to explain the significance of the incarnation and resulting vision of δόξα. John himself stands as witness to the incarnation and he summons another one to testify, John the Baptist (John 1:15), providing further historical confirmation that Jesus is indeed divine. The resumption of the first person perspective in 1:16 (ἐλάβομεν) along with verbal connections back to the attributes of God (πληρώματος, 1:16; ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, 1:17) shows that John is elaborating on the vision of δόξα. This new δόξα brought about by the μονογενής, John will explain, is indeed a *divine* δόξα (1:15), and it eclipses the previous revelation of divine δόξα as delivered through Moses in the Law (1:16–18). If one desires to see God, to know God, then one

should no longer look to the previous revelation of divine δόξα, but to what has now been revealed in Jesus Christ the μονογενής θεός.

### **1:15: The Baptist Testifies to Divine Δόξα**

John the Baptist is known for his witnessing in the Gospel of John. There is some debate as to when his testimony in the prologue ends. Does John the Baptist's statement end with "because he was before me" (ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν) at the end of 1:15 or continue into 1:16? The solution needs to explain the function of the ὅτι that opens 1:16 and whether it is best to link it with 1:15 or 1:14. Does it logically cohere best with the Evangelist's statement in 1:14 or with the Baptist's statement in 1:15?

Elizabeth Harris provides a brief selective survey from church history showing Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin among those that held verses 16–18 as from the Baptist. The prevailing view, though, since Chrysostom is that verses 16–18 are to be attributed to the Evangelist.<sup>164</sup> Harris prefers to understand 1:16–18 as part of the Baptist's testimony. She finds two advantages for this view. First, the verb κέκραγεν which introduces John's testimony is elsewhere used in John to introduce "solemn, oracular utterances of Jesus of some length." She refers to 7:28, 37 and 12:44, and states that "inspired speech is one of [the verb's] meanings."<sup>165</sup> Second, the dual occurrence of ὅτι (opening 1:16, and 1:17) can be seen as instances of recitative ὅτι, which is a "more reasonable explanation" than the difficult alternatives.<sup>166</sup>

As to her first argument regarding the verb κράζω, that κράζω elsewhere in the Gospel of John introduces "solemn, oracular utterances of Jesus of some length," is true, but it does not lead to the conclusion that the Baptist's statement should be extended

---

<sup>164</sup> Harris, *Prologue and Gospel*, 31–34.

<sup>165</sup> Harris, *Prologue and Gospel*, 35.

<sup>166</sup> She actually does not provide arguments for why 1:16–18 should continue the Baptist's testimony, but adduces these advantages so I assume these advantages function as her arguments.

through to verse 18. In no way does the use of *κράζω* require what comes after to be of any considerable length.<sup>167</sup> Just because the other occurrences of *κράζω* have subsequent lengthier statements does not require what follows in 1:15 to follow suit.<sup>168</sup> The verb *κράζω* itself cannot bear the weight Harris assigns it, neither does it signify that what follows must be “inspired.”<sup>169</sup>

Second, Harris claims that understanding the *ὅτι* which opens 1:16 and also 1:17 as instances of recitative *ὅτι* is a more reasonable explanation than other proposals. The verb *κράζω*, however, is highly unlikely to introduce discourse with *ὅτι*, let alone in the manner she describes. In the NT, discourse follows *κράζω* 41 times out of 55.<sup>170</sup> Only in one of those occurrences is a recitative *ὅτι* employed (Mark 3:11), and it is *directly* after *λέγω* and *κράζω*.<sup>171</sup> In contrast, John 1:15 has the speech already given directly following *λέγω*: Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν λέγων οὗτος ἦν ὁν . . . Why would there be a recitative *ὅτι* introducing speech eleven words after *λέγω*, when the

---

<sup>167</sup> Using her logic we can also identify another common thread in the passages she cites, they all occur in public settings. In John 7:28 Jesus is in the temple, publicly speaking. John 7:37 continues within this same context, and on the “last day of the feast, the greatest day,” Jesus stood and cried out (*ἔκραξεν*). John 12:44–50 occurs right at the major shift in the gospel from Jesus’ public ministry to private ministry, where in 13:1ff he is shown speaking only with his disciples (13:1ff). His words in 12:44, introduced by *ἔκραξεν* again are public, speaking to “whoever” believes (*ὁ πιστεύων*) in him. Similarly, in John 1:15 the Baptist’s ministry is to publicly bear witness to the one who comes after him. This does not require, however, that the verb itself carries this notion of public proclamation just because those instances of *κράζω* share that aspect.

<sup>168</sup> A survey of the verb in the NT will quickly demonstrate that the use of *κράζω* can be followed with some variation, there can be no utterance indicated (Matt 9:26; 15:23) or a very short one (Acts 21:36; Matt 27:23, *ἔκραζον λέγοντες σταυρωθήτω*).

<sup>169</sup> Although the Baptist’s statement in 1:15 can surely qualify. The verb *κράζω* occurs 55x in the NT, and a cursory survey will demonstrate a variety of utterances can follow it, not necessarily what is solemn, oracular, or inspired.

<sup>170</sup> Twenty-six out of these forty-one times *κράζω* is paired with some form of *λέγω* followed with speech, as it is in John 1:15; Matt 8:29; 9:27; 14:30; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 27:23; Mark 3:11; 5:7; 9:24; 10:47; John 1:15; 7:28; 7:37; 12:44; Acts 14:14; 16:17; 19:28; Rev 6:10; 7:10; 18:2, 18, 19; 19:17. The remaining 15 instances of *κράζω* with speech following are without *λέγω*, and none of them use the recitative *ὅτι*: Mark 10:48; 11:9; 15:13, 14; Luke 18:39; Acts 7:60; 19:34; 21:28, 36; 23:6; 24:21; Rom 8:15; 9:27; Gal 4:6; Rev 14:15. There are also 14 occurrences of *κράζω* not followed by discourse: Matthew 14:26, 15:23; 27:50; Mark 5:5; 9:26; Luke 9:39; 19:40; Acts 7:57; 19:32; Jas 5:4; Rev 7:2; 10:3 (2x); 12:2.

<sup>171</sup> *Λέγω* with recitative *ὅτι* is common (e.g. Luke 15:2; John 6:42). The presence of the recitative *ὅτι* in Mark 3:11 is likely due to *λέγω*.

direct discourse is already underway? The great preponderance of evidence weighs against a recitative ὅτι used with κράζω in this instance. In light of this it is certainly not more reasonable to understand the occurrences of ὅτι which open 1:16 and 1:17 as recitative.

It is best, then, to understand the words of the Baptist as limited to 1:15, and to hold that 1:16 continues the thought of the author from 1:14 for the following reasons: (1) The statement of the Baptist, if limited to 1:15, mirrors the statement he makes in the following narrative account in 1:29–34. In 1:30 the Baptist bears witness, “after me comes a man who ranks before me, because he was before me.” Although not verbatim, it is essentially the same statement reported in 1:15, “He who comes after me ranks before me, because he was before me.”<sup>172</sup> It makes sense that John is taking the statement made by the Baptist in the narrative account and also utilizing it in his prologue for rhetorical or literary purposes. (2) The line of thought seems to be interrupted with 1:15, and resumed in 1:16. The first person plural verb form in 1:16 “we all have received” (ἐλάβομεν) resumes the perspective of “we have seen” (ἐθεασάμεθα) in 1:14. The verbal correspondences also suggest 1:16 resumes 1:14 (1:14, πλήρης, χάριτος; 1:16, πληρώματος, χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος). (3) The ὅτι in 1:16 also makes best sense with 1:14 rather than 1:15. The Baptist’s statement that “he who comes after me ranks before me” is already further explained with “because he was before me” (ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν). An additional explanatory phrase would seem redundant. Therefore, the ὅτι which opens 1:16 is either marking causality or further explaining the latter part of 1:14, “we have seen his glory, glory as the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth.”<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Compare the Greek:

ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν (1:15)  
ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν (1:30)

<sup>173</sup> Klink reacts against seeing 1:15 as an “awkward insertion or parenthesis” and so claims 1:16–18 serves as an exposition of the basic statement of 1:15, in Klink, *John*, 112–13. In doing so he neglects the links between 1:14 and 1:16, and fails to recognize how 1:16–18 is actually further elaborating

If the Baptist's words are limited to 1:15, we need to also ask, how does it function within the prologue? Morna Hooker makes a good argument that one of the functions of the Baptist sections in the prologue (1:6–8; 1:15) is to set up for the following narrative accounts regarding the witness of the Baptist (1:19–28; and 1:29–34, respectively).<sup>174</sup> More relevant for this study is how Hooker argues that another function of 1:6–8 and 1:15 is that each “refers to John as the witness who confirms the truth of what has just been said, that light is shining in the darkness, and that we have seen the glory of the incarnate Logos.”<sup>175</sup>

The intentional parenthetical remark of 1:15 contributes, then, to how John is presenting the glory of the λόγος. In 1:1–13 the λόγος has been described in general terms at least in relation to 1:14–18. A shift occurs in 1:14 when this pre-existent λόγος takes on flesh and dwells among men, and the verb form changes from third to first, “we have seen his glory” (ἐθεασάμεθα). In 1:6–8 the Baptist's function is described whereas in 1:15 it is shown, his actual testimony is given. Carson rightly observes that 1:15 “grounds the glory of the incarnate Word in a concrete individual, a concrete ‘he’ attested by another individual.”<sup>176</sup> The value of his actual testimony is that the Baptist, within history, attests to the one who is outside of history, proclaiming that though Jesus chronologically comes after (“He who comes after me”), he is ontologically no mere man, he actually “ranks before me, because he was before me.” In this way, the pre-existence of the λόγος is emphasized anew in order to lend weight to the truthfulness of 1:14.<sup>177</sup> John saw fit to

---

1:14, not 1:15.

<sup>174</sup> John 1:6–8 shows that the Baptist is himself not the light, but comes to bear witness about another, who is the light. This points to the opening narrative scene in 1:19–28 where the Baptist denies he is the Christ and emphasizes the greatness of the one to come. The connection between 1:15 and 1:29–34 is clear by the Evangelist recording the same statement made by the Baptist. In the narrative account, although Jesus comes after John, and is baptized by him, Jesus is the Son of God who existed before him.

<sup>175</sup> Morna D. Hooker, “John the Baptist and the Johannine Prologue,” *New Testament Studies* 16, no. 4 (July 1970): 357.

<sup>176</sup> Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 130.

<sup>177</sup> Brown, calling 1:15 a parenthetical statement inserted by the redactor, understands the verse

include this parenthetical remark in order to strengthen the fact that the glory the author bears witness to (“we have seen”) is indeed *divine* glory.

### **1:16–18: The Gift of Revelation in Jesus Christ**

The key to understanding 1:16–18 is discerning the meaning of the phrase *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος* in 1:16, and as a result how that impacts the interpretation of 1:17–18. John conveys that from the fullness of Jesus, *χάριν* has been received, in fact it is *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος*, and there is debate as to what the preposition *ἀντὶ* communicates. A widely held view is that it means “upon” or “in addition to,” with *ἀντὶ* conveying the meaning of accumulation; thus “grace upon grace” meaning an accumulation of or inexhaustible bounty of God’s grace (cf. ESV, NRSV, NASB, HCSB, NIV84, NET).<sup>178</sup> M. E. Boismard pointed out how such a translation “disregards the fundamental sense of the preposition ‘anti’ which should indicate either opposition or the substitution of one for another, but not an accumulation.”<sup>179</sup> Ruth Edwards has since followed up with a persuasive article showing why “upon” is untenable and argues for *ἀντὶ*’s more attested meaning “in the place of,” or “instead of.”<sup>180</sup> There is simply no evidence in Greek

---

to function as a polemic against any suggestion that the Baptist might be greater than Jesus, and also that it is “useful here to emphasize the theme of pre-existence.” Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:35. Barrett, however, understands the significance of John’s testimony not simply as a statement of pre-existence, but as a statement of glorification, this is problematic because John the Baptist did not bear witness post-resurrection but only pre-resurrection. Barrett, *The Prologue of St. John’s Gospel*, 26.

<sup>178</sup> Among commentators, see Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:420-21; Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 56; Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 97; Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1:275-76; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 78.

<sup>179</sup> Boismard, *St. John’s Prologue*, 60.

<sup>180</sup> Ruth B. Edwards, “XAPIN ANTI XAPITOS (John 1:16): Grace and the Law in the Johannine Prologue,” *JSNT* 32 (1988): 3–15. Edwards outlines the proposed options in this way: (1) locally, “in front of,” “opposite”; (2) one thing replacing another, “in the place of,” “instead of,”; (3) one thing received in exchange of another, “in return for”; (4) “corresponding to,” as effect corresponds to cause; (5) “upon,” “in addition to.” Edwards evaluation can be summarized as follows: The first option is never found in the NT or LXX; the second is most commonly attested and makes most sense in the Johannine context; the third brings theological difficulty (how is one grace given in *return* for another); and the fourth and fifth proposals do not have any linguistic backing, they are unattested meanings. See also the more recent discussion by Phillips, concluding similarly, Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel*, 211–14. Murray J. Harris lists three possible NT meanings for *ἀντὶ*: equivalence, exchange, and substitution. He

literature for ἀντί meaning “upon.” Philo’s *Posterity* 145 is often asserted as support but as Edwards demonstrated, on closer inspection Philo uses the word to mean “in place of” rather than “upon.”<sup>181</sup> Therefore the preposition ἀντί should be understood with its most common meaning “in place of” and points to the succession of one χάρις in place of another.<sup>182</sup>

What does χάρις refer to? Hooker ties the term to Exodus 33–34 where it occurs in the LXX six times, always used to translate the Hebrew word חַן (33:12, 13 [2x], 16, 17; 34:9). Every usage is in the context of finding favor (χάρις) before God. Hooker specifically points to Exodus 33:13 where Moses prays, “if I have found favor [χάριν] before you, show yourself to me that I might know you clearly so that I might find favor [χάριν] before you.”<sup>183</sup> Hooker notes that favor is being given to one who has already received favor. With Exodus 33:13 as the background, she then concludes that for John 1:16, “those who have received the grace of being God’s own people receive also the grace of his presence among them.”<sup>184</sup> The connection that Hooker makes generally between χάρις in John 1:16 and its occurrence in LXX Exodus 33–34 is helpful. But her specific parallels and her conclusion regarding χάρις in 1:16 does not make best sense of the text.

---

asserts that in John 1:16 there is more than a simple substitutionary exchange since it is one blessing taking the place of another in succession. Because of this he allows for renderings such as “grace upon grace” even though he doesn’t recognize accumulation as a possible meaning. Unfortunately his explanation does not bring clarity to the discussion. Murray J. Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament: An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 49–50, 54–55.

<sup>181</sup> The NET Bible’s note on John 1:16 is an example of the argument for accumulation, “grace upon grace” or as the NET translates, “one gracious gift after another.” The note states that the meaning of accumulation is the best explanation and refers to Philo’s *Posterity* 145 for support, as well as Theognis’ *Elegiae* 344. Edwards discusses both.

<sup>182</sup> Among those who prefer “in the place of” see Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 131–32; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:35; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 40, 46; Köstenberger, *John*, 2004, 47; Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel*, 211–14; Klink, *John*, 113–14.

<sup>183</sup> My translation of the LXX.

<sup>184</sup> Hooker, “Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret,” 53.

Hooker’s analysis does not account for the close connection between John 1:16–17. The ὅτι, “for,” introducing John 1:17 immediately clarifies the end of 1:16 with parallel statements:

Table 6. Visual representation of χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος

1:16d	[A] χάριν ἀντὶ [B] χάριτος			
1:17	ὅτι	[B] ὁ νόμος	διὰ Μωϋσέως	ἐδόθη
		[A] ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια	διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	ἐγένετο

John 1:17 clarifies that the instances of χάρις correspond to “grace and truth” and “the law.” The [A] χάρις now received, explained as “grace and truth” (both articular because they refer back to 1:14)<sup>185</sup> has taken the place of [B] χάρις which has come before, explained as the law. Hooker’s conclusion that the first grace is of being God’s people and the second is his presence among them doesn’t accord with John’s explanation.

The fact that 1:17 is an explanation of the phrase χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος invites comparison and contrast between 17a and 17b, that is, between the law and “grace and truth,” and between Moses and Jesus Christ. But this comparison is specific rather than general. It is not as if the author desires, at least in this particular instance, to compare everything about Moses and everything about Jesus. He narrows the comparison by pointing us to “the law,” given through Moses, and “grace and truth,” which came through Jesus. Since “grace and truth” refers back to the vision of δόξα just attested (1:14)

---

<sup>185</sup> The article on the substantives (ὁ νόμος/ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια) differ in their function. The article with “law” is most likely signifying something along the lines of Wallace’s category of “well-known”; and the article with “grace and truth” is anaphoric, pointing back to 1:14. Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1999), 106; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 217–20, 25.



then the author desires his audience to compare the revelation of *δόξα* as given in the law of Moses (Exod 34:6) to the revelation of *δόξα* now given through Jesus Christ himself. Additionally, if this is “grace” (the revelation of God through Jesus) in place of “grace” (the revelation of God through Moses), then it implies that one is greater than the other, otherwise there would be no point to the exchange. That one is greater than the other is confirmed by recognizing how John 1:18 builds upon and corresponds to 1:17.

John makes the issue clear in 1:18: the revelation of God. As Catrin Williams notes, verse 18 also contains an implicit comparison and contrast between 18a and 18b, providing a correspondence to verse 17a and 17b.<sup>186</sup> Therefore when John follows with 1:18, further clarification is given to *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος*.

Table 7. Comparison of John 1:17 and 1:18

1:17	ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. “The law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus.”
1:18	Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. “No one has ever seen God, the only begotten God, who is at the Father’s side, he has made him known.”
1:17a	ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη “The law was given through Moses”
1:18a	Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε “No one has ever seen God”
1:17b	ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο “grace and truth came through Jesus”
1:18b	μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. “the only begotten God, who is at the Father’s side, he has made him known”

---

<sup>186</sup> Williams writes, “That the contrast between Moses and Jesus continues into v. 18 is suggested by the structural symmetry of his pair of verses: the law, on the one hand, may have been given (*ἐδόθη*) through Moses, but this did not bring about a direct vision of God; grace and truth, on the other hand, have come (*ἐγένετο*) through Jesus Christ because he is the definitive revelation of God” in Williams, “(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and Body of John’s Gospel,” 88.

1:18a's "no one has ever seen God" corresponds to "the law was given through Moses" (1:17a). This correspondence invites the audience to specifically recall that the vision of δόξα given to Moses was only of the backside of God after God indicated "man shall not see me and live" (Ex 33:20). 1:18b's "the only begotten God, who is at the father's side, he has made him known" (my trans.) fittingly parallels "grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (1:17b), which is the vision of δόξα attested to by the author in 1:14. Therefore 1:18 makes clear that when John refers to "the law" he intends to have his readers think of the revelation of God as found in the law, and how it is inadequate compared to the revelation of God in Jesus.<sup>187</sup> Furthermore, just as there is an implied antithesis between 17a and 17b, there is also one between 18a and 18b. "No one has ever seen God" (18a) sets up the expectation that 18b will introduce something contrary, implicitly acknowledging that Jesus Christ has seen God (cf. John 6:46), and 18b's attribution to Jesus of θεός affirms that only God can reveal God, and so Jesus does by virtue of being the μονογενής θεός.

The reiteration of μονογενής highlights the importance of this term for the theme of revelation. Because Jesus is the μονογενής παρὰ πατρός, the μονογενής θεός,<sup>188</sup> the

---

<sup>187</sup> What could "the law" refer to? Due to the close proximity of allusions to Exodus 33–34 it may most narrowly refer to how the Lord directed Moses to cut two tablets of stone like the first and then the Lord descended in the cloud and proclaimed his name (Ex 34:1–4). But it could also refer to the Pentateuch, which is the referent in the phrase "the law and the prophets" (John 1:45; for contemporary usage see Josephus *Against Apion* 2.175). It is in this law that the self-revelation of God is given. Additionally, Coloe points out that following the destruction of the temple, Jewish Rabbis sought God's revelation in the Torah. If John's gospel is post-70 AD then this can play a significant point of interaction with the synagogue of John's day. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 62–63. Severino Pancaro understands "the law" in 1:17 in "the most comprehensive sense—as the body of teaching revealed to Moses which constitutes the foundation of the whole social-religious life and thought of Israel," in *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 514.

<sup>188</sup> My preference for the text-critical choice of μονογενής θεός is clear from my previous translation choices. The alternative, μονογενής υἱός, is preferred by some and does not detract from any arguments I make concerning the usage of μονογενής. The main arguments in favor of (ὁ) μονογενής θεός is better manuscript evidence (P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & B C\* L 33 boh syr<sup>p</sup>) and that it is the *lectio difficilior*. Ridderbos admits it is the more difficult reading when he chooses μονογενής υἱός because of the difficulty of μονογενής θεός or ὁ μονογενής θεός. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 59n140. Schnackenberg asserts that the weight of external evidence favors μονογενής θεός, and affirms it as the more difficult reading, yet still prefers μονογενής υἱός. Schnackenberg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1:279–80. For more discussion favoring μονογενής θεός see Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 100; Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 92n78; and the brief but thorough explanation by Köstenberger, *John*, 2004, 50. See also the discussion in Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: United Bible

revelation he brings forth is greater than that found in the law given through Moses. God is disclosed not simply by someone who speaks his words like a prophet, but God the Father is disclosed in God the Son, who is God enfleshed, the only-begotten God. The revelation disclosed is specifically defined by reference to the attributes of Exodus 34:6. And just as those attributes had taken on specific connotations in the context of forgiveness in Exodus 33–34, these terms must now factor in the reality that God exists both as *πατρός* and *μονογενής*.

The phrase *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος* leads us to consider *how* the revelation of *δόξα* now revealed in Jesus takes the place of the revelation of *δόξα* revealed in the law of Moses. There has been much debate on John’s view of the Law and Judaism and certainly 1:16–17 is a pivotal verse within this discussion.<sup>189</sup> Keener rejects *ἀντί* as “in place of” because Christ fulfills rather than negates the Law (John 5:39, 45–47).<sup>190</sup> But it is not necessary to understand the phrase in terms of negation.<sup>191</sup> There is no absolute contrast for here John himself affirms that both “grace and truth” and the law corresponds to *χάρις*.<sup>192</sup> Additionally, John repeatedly alludes to the OT (whether through editorial

---

Societies, 1994), 169–70.

<sup>189</sup> See the different ways scholars have argued for the relationship between the revelation of God in Jesus and the revelation of God at Sinai, in Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 2–17. Tsutserov categorizes the major views as (1) replacement (subcategories: opposition to the law, denigration of the law, ongoing value of Moses/the Law); (2) fulfillment; (3) continuation; or (4) complexly related. John Ashton sees John 1:17 as “one of the best summaries of the ineradicable difference between the two religions,” in John Ashton, *The Gospel of John and Christian Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014). For different approaches to the parallelism of John 1:17 itself see Tsutserov, *Glory, Grace, and Truth*, 32–35.

<sup>190</sup> As does Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 56.

<sup>191</sup> One example is W. Loader’s analysis where he recognizes “replacement” while simultaneously affirming “replacement does not imply abandonment or disparagement. The Law remains. It was God’s gift, but now that the true source of eternal life has come, to which the Law through its prescriptions as well as its predictions pointed, fulfilling its prescriptions may be left behind. Its temple and its rites have been replaced. Their interim function is over except now to be shown for what they were: pointers to the one who has now come,” William R. G. Loader, “Jesus and the Law in John,” in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. Gilbert Van Belle, P. Maritz, and J. G. van der Watt, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 150.

<sup>192</sup> *Contra* Barrett, who said, “John can define it only as Paul defined it, in contrast with law,” Barrett, *The Prologue of St. John’s Gospel*, 27. As Edwards pointed out, “if . . . this verse refers to the Law itself as God’s gracious gift, then the Fourth Evangelist may be seen to be offering a more positive view of

comments or through the characters) positively, as it points to and explains the phenomenon of Jesus and the responses to him. The recurring images, allusions, and references to the OT are evidence that there is not a polemical motive to undermine the Law or other OT writings but rather to highlight their true aim, Jesus Christ (1:41, 45). Although a strong polemic against the Jews can be demonstrated, the polemic includes the fact that they misread their texts (John 5:39–40), not that their texts are negated. They misread them because they do not come to Jesus and accept him. Therefore, Moses himself, who wrote the Scriptures, stands alongside Jesus in accusation against the Jews for their disbelief (5:45).<sup>193</sup> In light of this the lack of a disjunctive between the parallel phrases in John 1:17 is telling. The relationship between “the law” and “grace and truth,” and between the agents through whom they came, “Moses” and “Jesus Christ” is not only one of contrast but of continuity and fulfillment. The very terms “grace and truth” alluding to the attributes of Yahweh revealed to Moses come *from* the Law given through Moses. They are the revelation of God’s character as reported by Moses and written in

---

the law than is often supposed.” Edwards, “XAPIN ANTI XAPITOS (John 1:16),” 9–10. Ashton ignores this relationship between 1:16 and 1:17, and so follows Barrett by concluding “this sentence from the Prologue, with its stark opposition between Moses and Christ, is a denial that the gift was a grace,” in Ashton, *The Gospel of John and Christian Origins*, 21.

<sup>193</sup> *Contra* John Ashton, who argues that the Gospel of John depicts Jesus as replacing Moses and setting up a new religion. Ashton in his new work *The Gospel of John and Christian Origins* argues that the “Gospel represents a deliberate decision to supplant Moses” in Ashton, *The Gospel of John and Christian Origins*, 3. He understands 5:31–47 very differently than what I have just described. Instead of the gospel presenting Moses in a positive light, Ashton argues that the evangelist is bringing Moses into the discussion in a sort of “*argumentum ad hominem*” to score a point with his opponents:

At this point he is relying on the authority of Moses to provide him with an argument his adversaries would be forced to accept. So the evangelist takes the opportunity of bringing Moses into the discussion in a sort of *argumentum ad hominem* that conceals a real opposition he is not yet prepared to disclose. (Ashton, *The Gospel of John and Christian Origins*, 14–15, see also 22.)

In other words, Ashton claims Moses isn’t actually on Jesus’ side, nor Jesus on Moses’. This is a problematic reading of John 5:31–47, where Jesus is plainly shown to marshal Moses as a positive witness who affirms Jesus’ claims. Either Jesus is doing so because it is true (that Moses wrote about Jesus), or Jesus is presented as facetiously utilizing Moses to score rhetorical points with the Jews. If the latter is true, as Ashton proposes, then Moses did not actually write about Jesus, and Jesus is portrayed as either incorrect or lying. Alternatively, if Moses actually did write about Jesus, then Jesus cannot be only scoring a rhetorical point but is stating a truth, and thus Moses actually witnesses on behalf of Jesus. If this is so, then there is much more continuity than Ashton admits. For a more positive reading of Moses in John see Christopher A. Maronde, “Moses in the Gospel of John,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 77 (2013): 23–44.

the Law, thus there is no denunciation of the Law but rather an affirmation of its significance in light of what has now taken place.<sup>194</sup>

What is the difference in the two revelations? Surely it is not that the law did *not* communicate “grace and truth,” since the terms themselves allude to the attributes of God as revealed in the written Torah. Therefore the revelation of Yahweh to Moses is related, not just in contrast, but in continuity with the revelation of the Father in Jesus.<sup>195</sup> The discontinuity is in how the former revelation was limited and mediated. Although in John 1:17 John desires his audience to recall the previous revelation of Yahweh to Moses, he doesn’t refer to the attributes “grace and truth” but refers to “the Law.” John fixates on the means of mediation by using the designation “the Law,” an external object, a written document passed down through the centuries. Moreover, Moses himself was only a passive recipient of revelation and did not see God fully (John 1:18). In contrast this new “grace and truth” comes directly through Jesus, who is at the Father’s side and is the *μονογενής θεός*.<sup>196</sup> “The Law” was an external object Moses passed along and was the means of mediating “grace and truth.” But now “grace and truth” come through Jesus himself, since he possesses these attributes by being the *μονογενής*. Thus John signals to his readers that a new, fuller revelation of Yahweh is available in Jesus Christ. The prologue leads us to see that the contrast is not so much between Jesus and Torah, as some may insist, but between Jesus and Moses, and the subsequent revelation of God that

---

<sup>194</sup> Harrison argues that the pre-existence of the *λόγος* answers the rabbinic claim regarding the Torah, and rightly states, “The intent here is not to depreciate Moses or the Torah. Rather, John is doing exactly what he has done with the Baptist (1:6–9), recognizing his service and then asserting the superior excellence of the one to whom the forerunner bore witness,” in Everett F. Harrison, “A Study of John 1:14,” in *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd*, ed. Robert A. Guelich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 35.

<sup>195</sup> Kerr fails to acknowledge this continuity when he states, “there is nothing in v. 17 that indicates that grace and truth have come via the law.” His statement is the basis upon which he critiques (unsuccessfully) Ruth Edwards’ proposal regarding the meaning of *ἀντί*. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, 115–16.

<sup>196</sup> For a discussion on the significance on the contrast between the verbs used, “was given” (*ἐδόθη*) versus “came” (*ἐγένετο*) see Klink, *John*, 114–16.

they have brought about.<sup>197</sup> This is an important point because John himself is taking pains to demonstrate that the new revelation is better because of *who* brings it. Therefore the relationship between “law” and “grace and truth” is one of replacement, yet we can go further and characterize it by progression rather than negation. How can it be progression yet also “replace” the old revelation? My answer will be in two parts.

First, we may find an analogy in the Exodus pattern of Yahweh revealing his glory. Exodus itself presents a pattern where new actions and contexts demonstrated new aspects of God’s glory, further revealing God’s name to Israel.<sup>198</sup> The patriarchs knew of Yahweh but not in such a way to know him as the Israelites would when Yahweh delivered them out of Egypt (Exod 6:2–7). Thus Yahweh revealed himself to Israel in a way that he had not to the patriarchs. There was no notion that later revelation of Yahweh’s would negate previous ones, rather it allowed his people to know Yahweh more fully, as he truly is. By analogy, now that Jesus has come, there is a fuller revelation of Yahweh that the previous people of God had not experienced. As I argued above, the revelation of Yahweh at Sinai to Moses was itself unprecedented. On the one hand the deliverance of Israel from Egypt demonstrated to them God’s *קִדְּוָה* in terms of power and strength (cf. Exod 15:11–13), his glory was revealed through signs, wonders, and acts of judgment (Exod 7:3–4). They saw God’s power at work when the Egyptians washed up dead on the seashore (Exod 14:4, 13, 18, 30–31; cf. 9:14, 16). Their subsequent idolatry in making the golden calf, however, led to God demonstrating his glory afresh, and this time in terms of forgiveness, compassion, and mercy (Exod 33:18–34:9). Later recollection of God’s self-characterization at Sinai was often accompanied with recognition of this context of forgiveness (Num 14:18; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Ps 86:15;

---

<sup>197</sup> For example, Pancaro follows Kittel in seeing the opposition in John 1:17 as between the Logos and the law, rather than between *ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια* and *ὁ νόμος*. The parallelism in 1:17, however, leads us to consider the opposition between *ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια* and *ὁ νόμος* in relationship with who brought them about, Jesus Christ versus Moses. Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*, 541.

<sup>198</sup> See the section above on how glory was manifested in Exodus.

103:8; 145:8; Neh 9:17; *Jos. Asen.* 11:10). Rather than a strict replacement of one revelation with another, it is more likely that John presents Yahweh's revelation of his *δόξα* in a way analogous to the pattern of glory in Exodus. Following the prologue, there are new circumstances and actions in which Yahweh has revealed new aspects of his glory.

Second, because the revelation of Yahweh at Sinai was foundational for a Jewish understanding of God in the OT, what is revealed in Jesus has now replaced it as the foundational understanding.<sup>199</sup> With the preposition *ἀντί* meaning "in place of," John presents the revelation of Yahweh in Jesus "in place of" the revelation of Yahweh at Sinai *as the defining reference point in understanding who God is*. Thus Catrin Williams is right when she describes the comparison between Jesus and Moses and states that the Law still offers testimony to Jesus "but, at the same time, is stripped of its significance as the *locus* of God's revelation."<sup>200</sup> The central reference point for identifying who God is was in the revelation at Sinai and in the wider circumstances of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. John takes this previous reference point and indicates that it is now to be replaced with the revelation of God in Jesus Christ through the events that the ensuing narrative will describe. This is analogous to the schema presented in Jeremiah 23:7–8:

Therefore, behold, the days are coming, declares the LORD, when they shall no longer say, "As the LORD lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt," but "As the LORD lives who brought up and led the offspring of the

---

<sup>199</sup> Boda identifies Exodus 34:6–7 as a "key rhythm" in the heartbeat of OT theology and favorably quotes Brevard Childs who writes, "The frequent use through the rest of the Old Testament of the formula in [Exod. 34:6] by which the nature of God is portrayed . . . is an eloquent testimony to the centrality of this understanding of God's person . . . the biblical tradition understood the formulation as a reflection of a considerable history of Israel's relation with her God." See Boda, *The Heartbeat of Old Testament Theology: Three Creedal Expressions*, 27–51, esp. 28.

<sup>200</sup> Emphasis added. The quote in context: "Consequently, the fourth evangelist's comparison of Moses and Jesus largely focuses on Moses' role as the giver of the Law (1:17; 7:19, 22–23; cf. 9:28–29), which offers testimony to Jesus but, as the same time, is stripped of its significance as the *locus* of God's revelation (cf. 9:28)," emphasis mine, in Williams, "(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and Body of John's Gospel," 98. For how the prologue might establish Jesus specifically in contrast to other Jewish texts that claim heavenly visions, see Warren Carter, "The Prologue and John's Gospel: Function, Symbol and the Definitive Word," *JSNT* 39 (June 1990): 43–45; Maronde, "Moses in the Gospel of John," 35–39.

house of Israel out of the north country and out of all the countries where he had driven them.” Then they shall dwell in their own land.

Jeremiah prophesied of a time when Israel would no longer characterize Yahweh as the one who redeemed them from out of Egypt (Exod 6:2–7) because a new, decisive act of redemption would have taken place. In the same way, the statement regarding the revelation of God’s glory in Jesus anticipates decisive new acts that would follow the prologue, whereby those who have believed in Jesus are made children of God and so identify their God in a new way. This in no way negates or rejects previous revelation, but the new revelation takes its place as the foundational characterization of Yahweh. In fact, in light of the incarnation and glorification of Jesus,<sup>201</sup> to understand the OT revelation of Yahweh apart from Jesus would be to miss its significance. Thus John also cautions that going to Moses and the Law for the revelation of God will no longer be enough, for something greater has come in place of it, the revelation of grace and truth through Jesus. The new surpasses the old.

### **Conclusion**

A close reading of John 1:14–18 provides the foundation towards interpreting the significance of *δόξα* in the Gospel of John in general thus the *δόξα* of Jesus in John 17:22. I will summarize my arguments and in the process draw out some implications for our interpretation of 17:22.

After explaining how the prologue functions as a hermeneutical key to the gospel, I argued from internal considerations that John 1:14–18 is a cohesive unit and proposed Exodus 33–34 as its primary conceptual background. Although it is difficult to argue that John is excluding reference to Greek or other Jewish backgrounds, what we can affirm is that in 1:14 John is asserting something radically new and different in the

---

<sup>201</sup> Recognizing the incarnation and resultant vision of *δόξα* as a response to Jesus’ whole ministry helps us from unduly separating the incarnation and the glorification of Jesus, as if these are completely unrelated events.



λόγος becoming flesh. In light of John's progression of thought from 1:14–18, previous conceptions of God are no longer sufficient in light of this new revelatory event.

The account of Moses requesting to see God's glory in the context of Israel's egregious sin significantly informs our interpretation of John 1:14–18. If John is alluding to the disclosure of God to Moses, then δόξα refers to the character of God (Ex 33:18, 19, 22; 34:6–7). In addition, the semantic value of the term כְּבוֹד as seen in its references to Yahweh in the OT led me to conclude that δόξα is the radiance of the character of God.

Jesus's δόξα is unique because he is the μονογενής, a term that John utilizes to emphasize the contrast between Moses and Jesus, and thus the revelation they provide. In order to strengthen this point I renewed the argument that μονογενής ought to be understood as “only begotten” rather than “unique” or “one of a kind.” If Jesus possesses δόξα by virtue of being “only begotten,” then this has implications for those who have believed and are now called “children of God” (1:12), giving a hint even within the prologue that those who believe in Jesus may also possess δόξα. There must be a distinction, though, since they *become* children through receiving the μονογενής and are not μονογενής themselves.<sup>202</sup> The giving of δόξα from Jesus to the disciples in 17:22 may also then be related to the new birth mentioned in John (1:13; 3:3–8).

The second description of δόξα as πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας evokes Yahweh's self-characterization of Exodus 34:6, and I provided a detailed explanation arguing for the plausibility of this allusion. In contrast to Moses, Jesus has these characteristics within himself. It is, after all, *his* δόξα (cf. John 2:11).<sup>203</sup> This contributes to the depiction

---

<sup>202</sup> Cf. 1 John 5:18 for a similar distinction between everyone who is born of God and the one who is born of God, although the term μονογενής is not used.

<sup>203</sup> In this way, δόξα as communicated by Moses was external and extrinsic. In contrast, Jesus possesses δόξα internally and intrinsically. Perhaps, in the transfer to the disciples, they may be said to possess glory internally and extrinsically. Internally since they too are children of God, yet extrinsically because they had to be given this glory, formerly not having been children and not possessing such characteristics. This external/internal and extrinsic/intrinsic distinction was first suggested to me by Daniel J. Stevens.

of the divinity of Jesus in the prologue, since the attributes predicated of God in the OT are now predicated of Jesus. I argued that the witness of John the Baptist should be limited to 1:15, and that it functions to confirm that John the author's vision is indeed one of divine *δόξα*. If Jesus's *δόξα* must be understood in light of the old—the OT *δόξα* of Yahweh—then the occurrence of Jesus's *δόξα* in John 17:22 should be understood accordingly. Therefore *δόξα* in John 17:22 should either be defined as the radiance of God's character as well, or at the very least defined in relation to Jesus's *δόξα* in 1:14.

I also provided a sustained reflection on the wider context of Exodus 33–34 and proposed how it helps our reading of John 1:14–18. Specifically, Exodus 33–34 reveals a new aspect of God's glory even within the book of Exodus itself. It is a revelation of God given at a historically significant occasion where the OT Scripture reveals for the first time that Yahweh is one who forgives sins. This new revelation of God's glory in no way negates previous revelation but reveals different aspects of his glory. By examining the logic of John 1:16–18 we saw that John presents the revelation of God in Jesus as one that replaces the revelation of God given to Moses (1:16–18), and concluded that the replacement of revelation can be characterized as fulfillment and progression, not necessarily a negation of the Law. Therefore when John heavily alludes to Exodus 33–34 and bears witness to a *δόξα* revealed in Jesus that replaces a previous revelation, he prepares his readers for a fresh manifestation of God's glory in Jesus in the narrative to follow, providing an anticipation for new historical acts of God that reveal his gracious character.<sup>204</sup> Additionally, the Exodus comparison may aid in explaining how Jesus is said to manifest God's glory during his ministry (John 2:11) yet there is further

---

<sup>204</sup> In Exodus the slaying of the Passover lamb was part of God revealing his power over the gods of Egypt in delivering his people out of slavery (Exod 12:12). His gracious character to forgive is revealed only later when Israel repents for their idolatry (Exod 33–34). In the narrative to follow the prologue Jesus is characterized as a paschal lamb and his death is part of the hour of glorification, whereby he reveals his gracious character. Whereas in Exodus God's glory (in ref. to power) is demonstrated in judgment in one event and then God's glory (with ref. to compassion/forgiveness) in another event, for John, it is one event demonstrating both the power of God and the compassion/forgiveness of God.

glory yet to be revealed in “the hour” (13:31–32; 17:1–5). God’s glory is revealed progressively in concrete acts. Jesus speaks not of different glories, but one and the same manifested in different aspects or degrees. And since the disciples’ possess Jesus’s glory (17:22) and are tasked to be sent into the world just as Jesus was (17:18), they may also likewise be expected to reveal Jesus’s glory in concrete acts.

Therefore, in John 1:14–18, John prepares the reader to understand the δόξα of Jesus in the context of the only begotten Son revealing the Father. Jesus’s δόξα is the radiance of God’s character, the same God who revealed his δόξα to Moses in the Law. John makes a stunning assertion. Not only has a new revelation of Yahweh come about, but it is one that replaces the previous revelation given through Moses. Right out of the gate, John testifies that one must know God through Jesus the only begotten Son. Thus, if the disciples possess this same δόξα, it must be situated within the framework of how the Son reveals the Father in a way that replaces the previous revelation to Moses, and we must explore in what way the disciples’ post-resurrection ministry as given by Jesus relates to his own revelatory ministry.

## CHAPTER 3

### JESUS'S GLORY IN HIS PUBLIC MINISTRY

In the prologue John bears witness to Jesus's  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , which should be understood as the radiance of God's character. Jesus's glory is presented within the larger framework of God's revelation of glory to Moses in the OT. Jesus, as the only begotten Son, brings a new revelation of grace and truth, transcending what has been revealed through Moses. The narrative of John continues this theme of glory. In this chapter I survey John's use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in the public ministry of Jesus and propose that John intentionally uses the term to frame the ministry of Jesus as one who exhibits the glory of Yahweh through signs. It is important to understand the use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , and thus the theme of glory in the Gospel of John, before we can interpret  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22 rightly.

#### Glory and the Structure of the Gospel

J. T. Nielsen humorously pointed out how tempting it would be to call 2007 a "glorious year in Johannine scholarship." Rainer Schwindt and Nicole Chibici-Revneanu published monographs on the Johannine concept of glory, and Jörg Frey followed with a keynote lecture at the SNTS conference on the retrospective character of glory in the Gospel of John.<sup>1</sup> Nielsen then goes on to critique the works of Schwindt and Chibici-

---

<sup>1</sup> Jesper Tang Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 3 (July 2010): 343–66. Nielsen was referring to Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Rainer Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*, Herders Biblische Studien 50 (Freiburg: Herder, 2007); Jörg Frey, "'... daß sie meine Herrlichkeit Schauen' (Joh 17,24). Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der  $\Delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  Jesu," *New Testament Studies* 54, no. 3 (July 2008): 375–97. Frey's work has been translated, see Jörg Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One," in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 237–58.

Revneanu for not analyzing the terms δόξα / δοξάζω in reference to the narrative plot of the Gospel. Frey, however, does so but argues that we ought to understand the δόξα of Jesus within John's narrative as that which simultaneously transcends the narrative structure. Nielsen believes Frey's analysis effectively collapses or dissolves the narrative structures themselves.<sup>2</sup>

Nielsen proceeds to analyze John according to classical narrative theory, drawing from Aristotle's *Poetics*. Aristotle described the construction of a good tragedy as one that had a whole and complete plot; one that had a beginning, middle, and end. In the course of this narrative there must be a turning point, which consists of a pragmatic turning point (περιπέτεια) and may also include a cognitive turning point (ἀναγνώρισις). Nielsen identifies the narrative plot as revolving around "God's wish to be recognized through Jesus," the turning point (περιπέτεια) as the crucifixion of Jesus, and the cognitive turning point (ἀναγνώρισις) as the point of full realization of Christ's identity in Thomas' confession.<sup>3</sup> Nielsen's goal was to "expose the structures that constitute the Fourth Gospel as a whole and complete narrative" in order to form a basis to interpret the Johannine use of δόξα / δοξάζω.<sup>4</sup> Nielsen finds that this plot structure gives concrete definition to δόξα / δοξάζω, which principally means divine identity and the recognition of this identity.

---

<sup>2</sup> Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel," 345, 365. Frey explains that the δόξα of Jesus is actually a retrospectively applied concept, understood only after the perspective of the "hour." Thus Frey asserts that the perspective that Jesus possesses δόξα from the beginning of his ministry, is one that is projected onto the story of Jesus. See also Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One."

<sup>3</sup> It is debatable whether the cognitive turning point in John's narrative is Thomas' confession, for the audience is not held to the same plight of whether one recognizes Jesus to be Lord and God, but already know from the prologue and other editorial comments the true identity of Jesus. For example, the audience would have had the same conclusion from the previous incident with Jesus' appearing to the other disciples.

<sup>4</sup> Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel," 345. Methodologically, Nielsen proceeded in three steps. First, he established the possible range of meaning for δόξα / δοξάζω. Second, he applied Aristotle's criteria for a good tragedy in order to describe the plot structure of the John. Third, he interpreted the use of δόξα / δοξάζω with its possible semantic range in the context of his proposed narrative structure.

I present Nielsen’s work in order to contrast with his method in a similar pursuit. I too wish to interpret John’s use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  /  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  in light of the narrative structure. However, rather than using criteria from Aristotle’s *Poetics*, I prefer to take John’s explicit purpose statement in John 20:31 and then ask how his use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  /  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  within his explicit narrative structure accomplishes that purpose. There is no consensus on the structure of John in the details, but there is enough agreement on a general structure: the prologue (1:1–18); Jesus’s public ministry (1:19–12:50); Jesus’s private ministry (John 13:1–17:26); Jesus’s passion (18:1 – 20:31); and epilogue (21:1–25).<sup>5</sup> The breakdown of occurrences of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  is as follows:

Table 8. Distribution of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  /  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  in John

	Prologue (1:1–18)	Public Ministry (1:19– 12:50)	Private Ministry (13:1– 17:26)	Passion (18:1–20:31)	Epilogue (21:1–26)	Total:
$\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$	2	14	3	0	0	19
$\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$	0	9	13	0	1	23

First I offer a few preliminary notes. After the noun  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  is introduced and explained in the prologue (1:14–18), save for the three occurrences in Jesus’s prayer (John 17:1–26), all other occurrences are within the narrative confines of Jesus’s public ministry (1:19–12:50). The use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha\zeta\omega$ , however, trends the opposite way. Although used several times in chapters 1–12, the use of the verb is more concentrated toward the end of Jesus’s

---

<sup>5</sup> For an array of different structural proposals, see George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987), 17–86. Although there is vast disagreement on particular divisions in John, the general structural breakdown presented in Table 8 is commonly acknowledged, although sometimes with slight variations, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John’s Gospel and Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 167–70.

public ministry and then most heavily utilized in Jesus’s private ministry, most notably in 13:31–32 (5 times) and chapter 17 (5 times). The use of *δοξάζω* is largely reserved as a label for the events of “the hour.” Curiously, in what is arguably the most important portion of John’s gospel, the passion, there are no occurrences of *δόξα* or *δοξάζω*. For a gospel known as the “gospel of glory,” this omission seems striking. Why is this? The theme of glory evoked by these two terms functions hermeneutically and provide the reader with a unique Johannine perspective on the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. John generally characterizes the life of Jesus with *δόξα*, while he describes Jesus’s “hour” with *δοξάζω*. Therefore when Jesus’s actual passion is narrated, the reader should already view it in relation to glory and glorification. To be more specific, I propose that John uses *δόξα* with reference to Jesus’s public ministry, to characterize it as one that reveals the *δόξα* of Yahweh in signs, while John describes the “hour” of Jesus with *δοξάζω* to underscore how the “lifting up” (from *ὑψόω*) of Jesus is his glorification, a climactic sign in which the glory of God is revealed and in which Jesus honors the Father.<sup>6</sup> This chapter will focus on *δόξα* and the next on *δοξάζω*. I will survey the occurrences of *δόξα* below and afterwards summarize how I understand John as framing Jesus’s public ministry with this term and why it is significant for the purpose of his gospel.

### Survey of *Δόξα* in John 1–12

The noun *δόξα* occurs nineteen times in John. This survey will focus on the occurrences of *δόξα* in John’s presentation of Jesus’s public ministry (14 times). The three occurrences in Jesus’s prayer will be examined in a later chapter dedicated to John 17. The prologue (2 occurrences, both in 1:14) was extensively analyzed in the previous

---

<sup>6</sup> So far as he seems to use the noun to describe the public ministry of Jesus and the verb for the “hour” of Jesus’ crucifixion, John makes a distinction between glory and glorification, but it is not necessary to make the distinction absolute. In some places the verb describes Jesus’ overall ministry (12:28, “I have glorified it”; 17:4, “I glorified you on earth”), see the discussion in the next chapter on the use of the verb.

chapter so I will begin with the miracle at Cana. We will walk through the occurrences of *δόξα* by examining each occurrence and comment on two items. First I will discern the meaning of *δόξα*, whether it is more appropriately under the category of appearance (and if so, whether consistent with the meaning argued for in the previous chapter, “the radiance of God’s character”) or whether it is under the category of status, as in the recognition of one’s status (“praise” or “honor”) or as in the status one has (“honor”).<sup>7</sup> Second I will interpret the significance of its use in reference to the wider narrative context, noting how it fits in with John’s narrative structure and how it contributes to the explicit purpose of the gospel.

### **John 2:11: Miracle at Cana**

*Ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐφάνέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. (John 2:11)*

“This, the first of his signs, Jesus did at Cana in Galilee, and manifested his glory. And his disciples believed in him.”

Jesus attends a wedding along with his disciples and the wine runs out (2:1ff). Jesus’s mother commands the servants to listen to Jesus. He tells them to fill six stone jars with water, to draw the water out, and to take it to the master of the feast. When the master of the feast tastes the water, John comments it had “now become wine.” John follows up the narration of this miracle by explaining its significance, “This, the first of his signs, Jesus did at Cana in Galilee, and manifested his glory [*ἐφάνέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*]. And his disciples believed in him [*ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*]” (2:11).

**Meaning of *δόξα*.** *Δόξα* is the object of the verb *φανερώω*, so the manifesting of *δόξα* leads us to understand its meaning under the category of appearance, thus *δόξα* as “radiance.” This seems consistent with what John bore witness to in 1:14–18. The sign at Cana manifested “his glory” (*τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*, 2:11), and John also bore witness to seeing

---

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion on the lexeme *δόξα* and its semantic range of meaning see my discussion in the previous chapter in my analysis of John 1:14.



“his glory” (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, 1:14). If John’s prologue primes us to understand Jesus’s δόξα in a certain way, then the δόξα seen in 2:11 ought to be consistent with what John described in 1:14. Therefore it is the radiance of God’s character; it is a revelation of Yahweh that transcends and replaces that which came through Moses. Δόξα falls under the category of appearance, yet as a metaphor—to see Jesus’s δόξα is to perceive the communication of God’s character. Additionally, the seeing of this δόξα and subsequent belief indicates that this communication of δόξα also imparts a recognition of status and thus belief in him.<sup>8</sup>

Following the lead of the prologue, we can also consider how Jesus’s glory transcends the glory previously revealed through Moses. We note at least two ways. First, Jesus’s signs do not simply validate him as sent from God<sup>9</sup> but also reveal *his* own glory.

---

<sup>8</sup> Beginning in 1:19, the first chapter has already assigned Jesus several significant titles: Lamb of God, Rabbi, Messiah, Christ, the Son of God, the King of Israel, the Son of Man (1:29, 36, 38, 41, 49, 51). In light of such claims, the resultant description of the miracle as the “first of the signs” (ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων, 2:11) that John provides in an editorial comment may well serve to validate those titles. That signs function not only to demonstrate glory but also to validate one as sent from God is affirmed when the Jews ask Jesus for a “sign” (σημεῖον) to prove his authority (cf. also 3:2). This dual function of a “sign” parallels with the function of signs in the Exodus account as well, see the discussion in my previous chapter. For a survey on the use of σημεῖον in the Septuagint and Graeco-Roman literature see Willis Hedley Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 186 (Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 18–45. After the time of Jesus, Josephus recounts a series of figures who promised σημεία “signs” to their followers as they went out into the wilderness and promised deliverance or liberation (an unnamed prophet in *J.W.* 2.258–60; *Ant.* 20.167–68; and Jonathan of the Sicarii in *J.W.* 7.437–50). They promised τέρατα καὶ σημεία (*Ant.* 20.168) and σημεία καὶ φάσματα (*J.W.* 7.438). These (and others, see Bauckham) were working with a new exodus typology, in going out to the desert, becoming like Israel in the period in the wilderness, most likely fashioning themselves as a prophet like Moses. See Richard Bauckham, “Jewish Messianism According to the Gospel of John,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 215–18.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Exodus 4:9 LXX, καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσίν σοι τοῖς δυσὶν σημείοις τούτοις μηδὲ εἰσακούσωσιν τῆς φωνῆς σου, λήμψῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ἐκχεεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ ξηρόν, καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὕδωρ, ὃ ἂν λάβῃς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, αἷμα ἐπὶ τοῦ ξηροῦ. (“And if they will not believe these two signs nor listen to your voice, you will take from the water of the river and pour it upon the dry ground and the water which was taken from the river will become blood on the dry ground,” my trans.). When Moses was appointed to lead God’s people, he feared that they would not believe that God had actually appeared to him. Thus God gave Moses miraculous signs so that “they may believe” that Yahweh had appeared to them (Exod 4:5). Moses was instructed that if the Israelites would not believe the first two signs (staff turning into a serpent; hand becoming leprous like snow) then he should take water from the river and it will turn into blood when poured upon dry ground (Exod 4:9). As John has already paralleled Moses with Jesus in the context of explaining Jesus’ δόξα (John 1:17), comparison of the two is most likely intended in John 2:11 as well. Thus like Moses was validated through the signs given to him, Jesus is validated as sent from God through the sign. As the people believed Moses because of the signs performed (Exod 4:30–31; see also 14:31), so Jesus’ disciples believed in him after his first sign (2:11). They perceived something about Jesus in the sign that led them to believe in him.

John has us understand that Jesus manifested “his glory” (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, 2:11). It is not mediated glory, but intrinsic to who Jesus is as the *μονογενής*.<sup>10</sup> The disciples in this moment of time did not understand the full implications of what they saw, yet they believed in him. In the context of the Gospel, John intends the readers to understand that Jesus’s glory is also the very glory of Yahweh, “as of the only begotten Son from the father, full of grace and truth” (1:14, my trans.).<sup>11</sup> He is demonstrating a glory greater than what Moses provided in the Law (1:16–18) and whether or not the disciples understand this, via the prologue John provides the readers with this perspective.<sup>12</sup>

The second way Jesus’s glory transcends previous revelation is found in the significance of the miracle.<sup>13</sup> Evidently the significance is already laid out by John’s editorial comment (2:11). But that only leads to the question of what this miracle reveals

---

<sup>10</sup> So also Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 87.

<sup>11</sup> Recognizing the connection between Jesus’ glory and the glory of the Exodus events, Chibici-Revneanu also interprets John as presenting the Cana and Lazarus miracles (John 2:11; 11:4–40) in the tradition of the Exodus glory manifestations, in particular she finds that the glory which manifested itself to the Israelites in the Exodus events is now present in Jesus and his miracles. See Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 524–25.

<sup>12</sup> Frey is correct in that there is a certain “retrojection” of post-resurrection glory here. So far as the prologue bears witness to what the author had seen in Jesus, it colors and informs the ensuing narrative. On one level, in 2:11 the disciples witnessed something of the glory of Jesus and believed in him, and on the narrative level introduced by the prologue, a greater context is provided for the manifestation of Jesus’ glory that John himself purposefully interjects into the narrative. However, *contra* Frey, I would deny that it can rightfully be interpreted as a glorified crucified glory so early in the narrative. See Frey, “The Glory of the Crucified One.”

<sup>13</sup> There are a variety of interpretations. I will mention just a few. Geyser interprets the miracle to have been constructed as an anti-John the Baptist polemic, and reads each detail in that manner, A. Geyser, “The Semeion at Cana of the Galilee,” in *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr. J. N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, NovTSup 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 12–21. Haenchen sees in this particular miracle a picture painted by the Evangelist of God who is a great giver, appearing in power, in Ernst Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Robert W. Funk, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 179. Brodie centers his interpretation on the meaning of wine and how Jesus releases on the world “an extraordinary *joie de vivre*,” in Thomas L. Brodie, *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 172–74. Lindars understands the meaning of the miracle not in Jesus’ power to change water into wine, but that it reveals the unique position of Jesus in salvation history, in Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1972), 132. Morris asserts that the sign at Cana sets forth the life-giving power of Christ “over against the ritualism of Judaism,” in Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, Revised edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 610. Hamilton sees in it a symbolic depiction of the way Christ brings fulfillment of the OT at a wedding on the third day, in James M. Hamilton, *John* in vol. 9 of *The ESV Expository Commentary*, ed. Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton, and Jay Sklar (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019), 58–61.

about Jesus's glory. The prominent feature of this account is the wine. In particular, its quality, abundance, and how it was changed from water in jars used for Jewish purification rites.<sup>14</sup> The setting of the wedding (a covenant making ceremony) "on the third day" is also important. The OT expectation of a restoration of all things included the making of a New Covenant (Jer 31:31–34), a restoration of life on the third day,<sup>15</sup> and the promised kingdom included the abundance of wine (Isa 25:6; Jer 31:12; Joel 2:24, 3:18; Amos 9:13–15; Zech 9:17; 2 Bar 29:5). This expectation coupled with Nathanael's confession (that Jesus is the King of Israel, 1:49), Philip's testimony (that Jesus is the one of whom "Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote," 1:45), and Andrew's witness (that Jesus is the Messiah, 1:41), makes it plausible that they perceived through the miracle that this is the Messiah who will usher in the new age of restoration. The miracle signals the advent of the messianic kingdom.<sup>16</sup> The account of the temple cleansing that immediately follows this miracle, and Jesus's statement about his own body as the temple

---

<sup>14</sup> Schnackenburg briefly discusses the possibility of influence from stories of miraculous wine in connection with Dionysus and dismisses it due to the abundance of wine being an element of Jewish expectation, in *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1:340. See also the discussion in Haenchen, *John*, 177–78. Salier explores the possibility that while the account of the miracle at Cana may not have been influenced by Dionysus stories, perhaps some of the Gospel's original audience may have known them. Thus Salier proposes that "a skilled writer and evangelist like John takes the opportunity to testify to Jesus and at the same time provide a point of comparison and contrast with a rival claimant for the allegiance of his audience." See Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Semeia in the Gospel of John*, 66–69.

<sup>15</sup> The expectation that the third day holds significance in regards to resurrection life can be seen in 1 Corinthians 15:4 and also Hosea 6:2, but this is only part of a wider pattern of "resurrection life" on the third day, see Stephen G. Dempster, "From Slight Peg to Cornerstone to Capstone: The Resurrection of Christ on 'the Third Day' According to the Scriptures," *WTJ* 76 (2014): 371–409.

<sup>16</sup> Those who identify the miracle drawing upon messianic expectation nonetheless still differ on the details. For example, Ridderbos identifies Jesus himself with the "good wine" while Schnackenburg sees the wine as the "eschatological gift of the Messiah." Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1:337–38; Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 109. See also Ridderbos' comment on the significance of "now" in 2:10, Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 108–9. For an extensive analysis of John 2:1–11 see Birger Olsson, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1–11 and 4:1–42*, trans. Jean Gray, ConBNT 6 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), 18–114. For a critique on Olsson's "Sinai screen" where he finds Exodus 19–24 as a background for John 2:1–11, see Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 111–12. It is a common view that the miracle signals the advent of the messianic age of abundance, D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 174; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible Commentary 29–29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 1:103–05; J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 149–51.

(2:13–22) leads us also to detect a theme of fulfillment.<sup>17</sup> Thus when Brown asks the question of how the miracle displays Jesus’s glory, he answers with, “Messianic replacement and abundance.”<sup>18</sup> Brown follows with,

This replacement is a sign of who Jesus is, namely, the one sent by the Father who is now the only way to the Father. All previous religious institutions, customs and feasts lose meaning in his presence.

Instead of such a strong replacement motif that claims what has previously come “lose[s] meaning in his presence,” it is better to affirm with Ridderbos,

All that has been promised by God and held out in prospect in a profusion of images and concepts is fulfilled in Jesus, it all lies enclosed in him, and it can therefore only be known in its realization and concretization from him . . .<sup>19</sup>

Thus Jesus fulfills the eschatological hopes for the messianic age and kingdom.<sup>20</sup>

Additionally, the hermeneutical perspective afforded by the prologue adds a layer of understanding for the reader that the disciples within that narrative time could not yet have grasped. Jesus’s manifestation of glory in the miracle at Cana transcends prior revelation from Moses (1:14–18) because in Jesus, we see the *μονογενής*, the only begotten Son, who comes to fulfill the eschatological promises of the kingdom. Put another way, this sign reveals the glory of Jesus and identify him as both the Son of God and the Christ (20:31).

John contributes to the purpose of his gospel by recording this sign for his readers (20:31). Seeing this glory (as mediated through John’s witness) makes a case with

---

<sup>17</sup> Dodd wrote, “It is thus that the glory of Christ is manifested—by a sign which sets forth the truth that with His coming the old order in religion is superseded by a new order,” in C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 299. See also Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 155.

<sup>18</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 104.

<sup>19</sup> Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 109.

<sup>20</sup> Also contrasting his interpretation with the “replacement” view, Hays states, “It is not accurate, then, to say that Jesus nullifies or replaces Israel’s Torah and Israel’s worship life. Rather, he *assumes* and *transforms* them” (emphasis original), in Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 287–88.

his readers that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (20:31). Jesus should be seen as the Son of God in this miracle in connection with *δόξα* as previously defined in 1:14, he is the only begotten of God, full of grace and truth. It is he that reveals the Father (1:18). He is also the Son because he is the Son of God, the King of Israel (cf. 1:49).<sup>21</sup> That Jesus is the Christ is also confirmed in Jesus’s response to Nicodemus. Soon after the miracle at Cana is presented, John shows Nicodemus coming to Jesus and admitting, “Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher come from God, for no one can do these signs [ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα] that you do unless God is with him” (3:2). Jesus indicates that Nicodemus misses the mark, “Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born again he cannot see the kingdom of God [ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ]” (3:3). Nicodemus should have discerned that the signs of Jesus pointed to the kingdom of God, and that in Jesus himself the “King of Israel” (1:49) has come. That Nicodemus should “see the kingdom of God” (ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ) in Jesus’s signs is further confirmation that the sign of glory is related to Jesus as the Christ, the one who brings about the kingdom promises of the OT. Therefore the beginning of John’s Gospel signals to the reader that one should detect a new revelation of God in Jesus’s *δόξα* (1:14–18), but this *δόξα* is made manifest as Jesus fulfills the promises of the OT in bringing about the kingdom as the Christ, the Son of God (20:31). The radiance of God’s character is manifest in the fulfillment of God’s promises through God’s Son.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Jesus as the “Son of God” (John 20:31) is not only in relation to his being the only begotten from the Father (1:14) but also to the Davidic sense of being the Messiah as well (cf. 1:49, “You are the Son of God! You are the king of Israel!”). In John’s Gospel, however, the emphasis seems to lay on the Son as the one from the Father, and thus on the divine status of the Son, not so much on Jesus’ Davidic lineage.

<sup>22</sup> Perhaps we can further query, what is shown about God in this sign? The power to change water into wine is not a raw display of ability, nor does it simply point to his creative and divine power. Armed with the viewpoint of the prologue, it demonstrates that the Logos made flesh (1:14) is the Messiah who has come to bring about a new age of abundant life. The turning of water into wine may recall for the reader how it is the pre-existent creator Logos who has brought this about (1:3), and thus serves as a fresh reminder of his condescension in becoming flesh to give life to his people (1:4, 12, 14). The abundant life symbolized in the new wine provided by Jesus is consonant with the witness of the prologue, for in it we see the glory that is “grace and truth”—the radiance of God’s character. Margaret Pamment defines Jesus’ manifestation of glory in the Gospel (including 2:11) not as “acts of power but [as] acts of love, as expressions of God’s generosity in restoring life.” Margaret Pamment, “The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 74, no. 1–2

**Place and significance within the narrative.** The miracle of Jesus turning water into wine at Cana is foundational to understanding how the glory of Jesus is revealed in the Gospel and how it should lead to belief. As stated in the prologue, glory is seen in the person of Jesus Christ himself, the λόγος incarnate (1:14), yet the miracle at Cana demonstrates that the glory needs to be revealed and perceived—it is not apparent to the naked eye. John remarks that it is the “first of” (ESV, NRSV, NET, TNIV) Jesus’s signs (ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων, 2:11) which manifested his glory and as a result his disciples believed in him. The noun ἀρχή designates this sign as the first in a process or series, the commencement of, the “beginning of” or “first of” his signs. This generates the expectation of more signs to come.<sup>23</sup> The miracle itself, conveying the dawn of a new age in Jesus and the fulfillment of God’s promises, is programmatic for how he will fulfill the “institutions, customs, and feasts of the Jews.”<sup>24</sup>

---

(1983): 14. There is no need to create a false dichotomy, for here we have God’s power used in an expression of life-giving symbolism. Jesus’ glory here is a display of God’s character, an expression of his gracious, life-giving power, and perhaps, as Pamment argues, of “love.” Although it seems premature to read “acts of love” so early into the narrative, the later manifestation of glory in the raising of Lazarus is linked to Jesus’ love (11:5–6). There too Jesus’ glory is revealed in a demonstration of power, yet power used to grant life (11:43). Likewise, in the miracle at Cana, the Logos made flesh demonstrates power and in doing so symbolizes the new and abundant life he brings. John will soon garb the action of God’s sending the Son to grant life as *love* (3:16), so Pamment seems on the right course to see love in Jesus’ demonstration of glory. Alternatively, Schnackenburg identified the glory revealed as Jesus’ “divine and creative power” but admits it cannot be restricted to such qualities. He continues to say that to see Jesus’ glory is to experience “something of the divine being of Jesus,” to contemplate “the majesty of the Son of God,” and to sense “the brightness of the heavenly world” which the disciple cannot yet see with bodily eyes, in Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1:335–36. Thompson also recognizes that the signs in John, and the miracle of Cana in particular, point to God revealed in Jesus as “the creator, sustainer, and giver of all life,” in Marianne Meye Thompson, “Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 1 (1991): 102.

<sup>23</sup> The explicit label of “sign” (σημεῖον) is directly applied to the following miracles of Jesus: the changing of water into wine (2:11); the healing of the nobleman’s son (4:54); the feeding of the multitude (6:14); and the raising of Lazarus (12:18). Indirectly two more miracles are called signs: the healing of the invalid (5:1–15; included in “signs” of 6:2; 7:31); and healing of the man born blind, included in the “signs” of 9:16). The death and resurrection of Jesus is also called a “sign” via 2:18–22, see the discussion in the next chapter. For a discussion on the number of signs in John see Köstenberger, *A Theology of John’s Gospel and Letters*, 326–35. However, see my critique of his criteria for a “sign” in the next chapter.

<sup>24</sup> Brown uses the term “replacement,” see Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:104. For this fulfillment motif see Richard L. Morgan, “Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations,” *Interpretation* 11, no. 2 (April 1957): 155–65; Brian J. Tabb, “Johannine Fulfillment of Scripture: Continuity and Escalation,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 21, no. 4 (2011): 495–505.

Koester points out how words (whether in the form of hearing, for the initial disciples, or of reading for those reading John's gospel) are crucial to this pattern of seeing and believing. The disciples had already heard a witness to Jesus, John the Baptist, and have heard from Jesus himself. Therefore Koester rightly observes,<sup>25</sup>

Their faith does not originate with the sign. Rather, what they see confirms what they have already heard. And now, by recounting this sign, the gospel writer conveys Jesus's glory to the readers in verbal form.

The indication that the "hour" has not yet come (2:4) also anticipates for the reader a greater event to occur later in the narrative. This is also the first description of those that follow Jesus as his disciples using the term μαθητής (2:2, 11) and the first direct characterization of them as believing in Jesus (2:11).<sup>26</sup> The manifestation of Jesus's δόξα in the sign which begins a series of signs, with the response of belief, signals to the reader that this pattern of sign and belief should be expected. This expectation also explains why later in the narrative John provides a rationale for why some people have *not* responded according to this pattern (12:37).

### **John 5:41, 44: Blinded by Seeking Δόξα**

Δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνω (John 5:41)  
"I do not receive glory from men."

πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε; (John 5:44)  
"How can you believe when you receive glory from one another and do not seek the glory which comes from the only God?"

Jesus miraculously heals a man on the Sabbath (5:2–9) but the Jews respond with unbelief. Jesus argues that the Jews have had sufficient reason to believe, for the Jews have had John the Baptist, the work Jesus had done before them, and even the

---

<sup>25</sup> Craig R. Koester, "Jesus' Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 57.

<sup>26</sup> Prior to this they had "followed" Jesus (1:37, 38, 40, 43). The first use of πιστεύω in reference to the disciples is indirect, on the lips of Jesus as he questions Nathanael (1:50).

Father through the Scriptures, which all bear witness to Jesus (5:30–38). Jesus claims that they disbelieve not due to insufficient proof, but because there is something more fundamentally wrong—they seek δόξα that comes from man and not from the only God (5:44). In contrast to their impulses, Jesus says that he does not receive δόξα from people (5:41).

**Meaning of δόξα.** The meaning of all three occurrences of δόξα does not fall under the category of appearance. For Jesus speaks of how he does not receive δόξα from men (παρὰ ἀνθρώπων, 5:41), in contrast to how his interlocutors are receiving δόξα from one another (παρὰ ἀλλήλων, 5:44), rather than seeking the δόξα that comes from the only God (τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ, 5:44). It makes sense to understand δόξα here in relation to status. It is possible that δόξα means “praise” in particular, namely, the verbal affirmation one gives to another. But it is more likely that it refers generally to “honor.”

In context, Jesus was discussing how the Father has granted authority to the Son to give life and to render judgment in order that all may honor (τιμῶσιν) the Son just as they honor (τιμῶσιν) the Father (5:21–23). This seems to contradict Jesus’s statement in 5:41 where he asserts that he does not receive “honor” (δόξαν) from people. Jesus’s following statements, however, explains what he means and resolves the apparent contradiction:

I do not receive honor from people, (5:41)  
but I know that you do not have love for God in you. (5:42)

The implication of these contrasting statements is that Jesus does have love for God, for what is important is his standing and recognition by God, rather than man. Conversely, his interlocutors seek to be honored by their fellow man, and thus do not have love for God.<sup>27</sup> Jesus’s logic entails that one cannot have regard for honor from men and have

---

<sup>27</sup> The “love of God” (τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ) should be understood as an objective genitive, “love for God.” This coincides well with Jesus’ analysis of the Jews’ response to him. They reject Jesus who comes in the name of the Father, while they receive others who come in their own name (5:43), and in so doing they reveal that they do not actually have regard for God. They do not love God nor do they care



love for God, they are mutually exclusive. This interpretation is confirmed by how Jesus rounds out his argument against his opponents:

I have come in the name of my Father and you do not receive me. If another comes in his own name, you receive him. How can you believe when you receive honor from one another but do not seek the honor that comes from the only God? (my trans., 5:43–44)

Jesus has come representing the Father and their dishonoring of him demonstrates that they do not have love for God nor regard for honor from God. Jesus is thus fundamentally not concerned with the *δόξα* (status) people can give him, rather he has love for God and what God regards, thus he receives honor from God.

The utilization of *δόξα* explains why it is that the Jews disbelieve—they fundamentally orient themselves towards men and not towards God. They seek status (“honor”) among men and not from God. This fundamental orientation makes them *unable* to believe—thus Jesus indicts them, saying, “how can you believe [*πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι*] when you seek *δόξαν* from one another and do not seek the *δόξαν* that comes from the only God?” (5:44).<sup>28</sup>

**Place and significance within the narrative.** At this point in John’s narrative there have been several signs performed by Jesus to varying reactions. Some have received Jesus with belief that John seems to present as exemplary, like the disciples at the wedding of Cana (2:11), or the Samaritans (4:39–42). Others have believed in Jesus yet he himself did not entrust himself to them (2:24).<sup>29</sup> The Jews’ response to the healing of the invalid (5:9) is John’s first clear assertion that Jesus’s life was in danger, and illustrates most clearly, thus far, an outright rejection of Jesus:

---

for the *δόξαν* that comes from God, they rather receive *δόξαν* from one another.

<sup>28</sup> This explanation makes sense of 5:43, “I have come in my Father’s name and you do not receive me. If another comes in his own name, you receive him.” They have regard for man but not for God.

<sup>29</sup> See the commentary by Hamilton for the way this belief seems to fail to “see” what is signified by the signs because the new birth is needed, in Hamilton, *John*, 66.

This was why the Jews were seeking all the more to kill him, because not only was he breaking the Sabbath, but he was even calling God his own Father, making himself equal with God (5:18).

John indicates that their rejection of him is not only a refusal to acknowledge that Jesus is sent from God, but a refusal to recognize that he is equal with God. The following discourse Jesus gives (5:19–47) ought to be viewed in connection to this rejection, and thus Jesus’s analysis of their rejection is telling.<sup>30</sup> Jesus’s own analysis connects their seeking of δόξα from one another to their inability to respond to “see” the signs of Jesus and respond with belief. They are rendered blind to the revelation of δόξα in Jesus due to the fact that they seek δόξα from one another and not from God. Their failure to “see” Jesus’s δόξα leads to a failure to recognize Jesus’s δόξα (status). Jesus’s stunning assertion that they do not even believe Moses’s writings indicates that Jesus is not simply accusing them of blindness towards him, but of blindness towards their whole purported religion. Jesus implies that they fail to recognize Jesus’s δόξα as Yahweh’s δόξα, because they don’t even recognize Yahweh’s δόξα in Moses (cf. 5:38, 42). Understood in light of the prologue, particularly 1:14–18, they fail to see this new revelation of δόξα in Jesus because they never even saw the previous revelation of δόξα through Moses. This account may also function polemically, by claiming that the followers of Jesus and their testimony to him are the true followers of the Torah and Moses in contrast to the Jews of Jesus’s time (and likely of the original hearers’ time).

### **John 7:18: Disbelief and Δόξα Continued**

ὁ ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ· ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. (John 7:18)

“The one who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory; but the one who seeks the glory of him who sent him is true, and in him there is no falsehood.

---

<sup>30</sup> 5:1–47 contains the story of the healing (5:1–17), John’s rationale for why the Jews sought to kill Jesus (5:18), and Jesus’ extended discourse about the authority the Father has given the Son and the rejection of the Jews (5:19–47). The whole should be understood as a unit.

In the midst of questioning the identity of Jesus and where he comes from, the Jews also question where he gets his teaching (7:15). In response, Jesus argues that those who speak with self-given authority seek their own δόξα, and thus their words cannot be trusted, but because Jesus seeks the δόξα of God who sent him, his teaching can be trusted (7:18).

**Meaning of δόξα.** The two occurrences of δόξα in 7:18 do not make much sense if they mean “splendor” or “radiance.” It is more natural to understand the meaning as “honor,” thus “the one who speaks on his own authority seeks his own honor” (7:18). For those who speak on their own authority (ὁ ἄφ’ ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν, “The one who speaks from himself”), if their teaching brings honor it honors themselves since the teaching is theirs. In contrast, the “teaching is not mine” Jesus says, but “his who sent me” (7:16). Therefore δόξα, or honor, for Jesus’s teaching goes not to Jesus but to the one sent him.<sup>31</sup> The more specific meaning of “praise” would also make sense but there doesn’t seem to be a need to limit the meaning to verbal affirmation.

**Placement and significance within the narrative.** This is now the second exchange Jesus has with the Jews in response to his healing of the invalid at the pool (5:1–9). If Jesus manifested his δόξα in a sign, why do they not recognize the δόξα of the Father in the Son and believe in him? Once again his analysis is damning: They are angry at Jesus not because they desire to keep the Sabbath and do God’s will, but because their will is not to do God’s will (7:17); they do not keep the law (7:19). Jesus’s analysis of their disbelief is similar to his analysis of their disbelief in 5:41–47. Whereas in 5:46–47 Jesus accuses them of not believing Moses’s writings, here in 7:19 he accuses them of not keeping the law of Moses.<sup>32</sup> They fail to see the Father in the Son, and thus fail to

---

<sup>31</sup> Perhaps the use of δόξα instead of τιμή here is intentional, in order to maintain the connection between Jesus’ ministry and the honor he brings to the Father by revealing his glory.

<sup>32</sup> Additionally, in the earlier exchange Jesus says they have never heard the Father’s voice (5:37), nor do they have the love of God within them (5:42), and now in 7:17 he implies that they do not do God’s will.

recognize Jesus's δόξα manifest in the signs as Yahweh's own δόξα, proving themselves to be religious frauds.<sup>33</sup>

Once again, Jesus uses the terminology of δόξα in describing whether one is fundamentally oriented towards God or man. In 5:41–44 Jesus identifies their mis-placed seeking of δόξα as the reason for their disbelief. In 7:18 Jesus makes a different but related argument. He asserts that their failure to recognize his teachings and doings as from God exposes their own teaching as not from God, but from themselves, which in turn demonstrates a mis-placed seeking of δόξα (“one who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory,” 7:18a). Not only does orienting oneself towards receiving δόξα from man render one unable to believe (5:44), but also results in a twisting of the teaching of Moses so that Jesus's own ministry comes under a negative evaluation.

#### **John 8:50-54: Failure to Render Δόξα**

ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου. (John 8:50)  
“Yet I do not seek my own glory.”

ἐὰν ἐγὼ δοξάσω ἑμαυτόν, ἡ δόξα μου οὐδὲν ἔστιν· ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με. (John 8:54)  
“If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing. It is my Father who glorifies me.”

The Jews now accuse Jesus of being a Samaritan and having a demon (8:48).

Central to this back and forth is the identity of Jesus, so in response Jesus asserts that he

---

<sup>33</sup> The second-half of Jesus' statement in 7:18 is a bit puzzling if taken out of its context, “the one who seeks the glory [τὴν δόξαν] of him who sent him is true, and in him there is no falsehood.” Jesus is not making a generic truism, but one that specifically refers to God. “Him who sent him” refers back to 7:16, “My teaching is not mine, but his who sent me.” Jesus is contrasting himself, as one who seeks God's honor by presenting God's teaching, with others who seek their own honor in presenting their own teaching. If Jesus indeed seeks the honor of the Father, then the teaching will be of God and thus there can be “no falsehood” (7:18). Jesus is presenting the Jews and their response to him as his foil. For the teaching the Jews hold to and evaluate Jesus by is one which seems to be of Moses, and thus of God. Yet they condemn Jesus for healing a man on the Sabbath, a condemnation inconsistent with Mosaic practice (7:23). They thought they were keeping the law and obeying God but now that the only begotten God has come, they are exposed. The Father has sent the Son and they reject the Son, and in so doing the Jews' own criteria are shown to be false and a demonstration of self-glory seeking rather than truly God-oriented obedience. They do not recognize God's will when they see it in Jesus and the rules they have set up certainly do not uphold the law, contrary to what they may think. The coming of Jesus exposes them for being blind when they claim to see. Jesus has performed a sign and rather than responding by recognizing his δόξα, they are blind to it as they seek their own δόξα. They evaluate Jesus not based on Moses, but on their own teaching which is false.

is the Son who honors his Father, and that it is the Father who honors him. If Jesus were to honor himself, his glory would be nothing. However, since the Father is the one who honors Jesus, they also ought to recognize him and keep his word. If anyone keeps Jesus's words, they will not see death (8:51), and even Abraham rejoiced to see Jesus's day (8:56). Jesus closes this debate with the Jews by asserting "before Abraham was, I am" (8:58).

**Meaning of δόξα.** The word δόξα is used twice in this passage (8:50, 54), alongside two uses of the verb δοξάζω (both in 8:54). The uses of δόξα / δοξάζω refer to one's status, therefore δόξα should be understood as "honor." This is most clearly seen against the context of Jesus's use of τιμάω and ἀτιμάζω, "I do not have a demon, but I honor [τιμῶ] my Father, and you dishonor [ἀτιμάζετε] me. I do not seek my own honor [δόξαν]; there is one who seeks it, and he is the judge" (my trans., 8:49-50).<sup>34</sup> The occurrence in 8:54 is in the same context of the Jews dishonoring Jesus although they claim to know God. If δόξα means "honor" in 8:50 then it should as well in 8:54 since Jesus re-iterates in 8:54 what he said in 8:50, that it is not Jesus himself but God the Father who seeks Jesus's δόξα, "If I honor [δοξάσω] myself, my honor [δόξα] is nothing. It is my Father who honors [δοξάζων] me, of whom you say, 'He is our God'" (my trans., 8:54).

**Placement and significance within the narrative.** Up to this point in the narrative there have been several exchanges between Jesus and "the Jews." Three in particular rise to the level of confrontation such that Jesus explicitly accuses them of not

---

<sup>34</sup> Compare with Jesus' statement back in 5:41 (Δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνω, "I do not receive glory from people") and 5:44, (πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε; "How can you believe, when you receive glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the only God?). Jesus' words in 8:50 (ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου, "I do not seek my own glory") refer back to 5:44 where Jesus indicts the Jews for seeking seeking honor (ζητέω + δόξαν) among one another rather than from the only God. Thus the switch from Jesus' use of τιμή/τιμάω to a use of δόξα connects with Jesus' previous indictments against the Jews and also the wider theme of seeing δόξα, or rather, failing to see δόξα (appearance) because one seeks δόξα (status) from one another.

being Jews at all (5:19–47; 7:14–24; 8:22–59).<sup>35</sup> It is notable that John presents Jesus utilizing *δόξα* terminology on all three occasions, and that they are all related to the Jews rejection of Jesus, and thus related to their failure to see his *δόξα*. We already outlined Jesus’s accusations in the previous two occasions, and in this particular instance Jesus does not recognize them to be children of Abraham but rather children of the devil (8:44); they are “not of God” (8:47). On all three occasions Jesus utilizes the terminology of *δόξα* for related but slightly different reasons. In contrast to 5:44 and 7:18, Jesus does not in 8:50 accuse the Jews of mis-placed *δόξα* seeking, but rather of mis-placed *δόξα* giving. They fail to give *δόξα* to the Son, and thus dishonor the Father whom they claim to be their God.

The parallels between 8:49–51 and 5:21–24 in particular are striking and worth examining:<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> The exchanges with “the Jews” are found in 2:18–20; 5:16–17 (and by extension 5:19–47, “So Jesus said to them [αὐτοῖς]” referring to “the Jews” of 5:16, 18); 6:41, 52; 7:14–24; 7:32–36; 8:22–59; 10:24–39.

<sup>36</sup> John 8:49–51, 53 and 5:21–24:

Jesus answered, “I do not have a demon, but I honor my Father and you dishonor me. Yet I do not seek my own glory; there is One who seeks it, and he is the judge. Truly, truly, I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, he will never see death” . . . “Are you greater than our father Abraham, who died? And the prophets died! Who do you make yourself out to be?” (8:49–51, 53)

For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will. The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father. Whoever does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him. Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life. He does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life (5:21–24)

Table 9. Comparison of John 5:21–24 and John 8:49–51, 53

John 5:21–24	John 8:49–51, 53
“The Father judges no one” (5:22)	“and he is the judge” (8:50)
“that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father” (5:23)	“I honor my Father and you dishonor me” (8:49)
“the Son gives life to whom he will. . . whoever hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life, but has passed from death to life” (5:21, 24)	“If anyone keeps my word, he will never see death” (8:51)

In both passages: Jesus discusses judgment in relation to the Father; relates the honoring of the Father and the honoring of the Son; and asserts a direct relationship between his words and the giving of life. What Jesus presents in 5:21–24 may serve to illuminate his argument in 8:49ff. It could be that Jesus refers to God as judge to indicate that he, Jesus, will ultimately be vindicated before God who is the true judge in contrast to how the Jews view him. But it is more likely that John presents Jesus saying this in order for the readers to recall what Jesus had said earlier in John 5, that the Father is indeed the judge and has given all judgment to the Son, “that all may honor the Son” (5:23). The Father, the judge, seeks the honor of the Son (8:50, 54) since he has given judgment to the Son, including authority to give life and raise the dead (5:21–22).

The implication of Jesus’s statements in both 5:21–24 and 8:49–54 is that Jesus himself is to be regarded as God—just as the Father is God the Son is also God. The Father himself seeks the Son’s *δόξα* (8:50, 54), but what kind of *δόξα* must the Jews render to the Son? The Jews ought to honor the Son just as they would the Father (5:23). Therefore, the point being made must be that the Son is God as the Father is God, for how can it be otherwise. If they ought to honor the Son as they honor the Father, the only worthy honor given to the Father is the honor due to the Father as God. The question of *δόξα* as status is related to identity. They must recognize the *δόξα* (status) of Jesus, and

they must do so because it is precisely the Father himself who honors the Son. Jesus is no demon or Samaritan, rather he is the Son sent from the Father. Therefore the only appropriate honor to render Jesus is that of the honor due to God. The point is further made by Jesus when he makes a statement of pre-existence in reference to Abraham, “before Abraham was, I am” (8:58).<sup>37</sup> Therefore in response to the manifestation of Jesus’s δόξα (the radiance of God’s character) in his signs, the Jews fail to recognize it as Yahweh’s δόξα and thus they fail to give δόξα (“honor”) to Jesus as they would to Yahweh.

### **John 9:24: Disbelief and the Healing of the Man Born Blind**

δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐστίν. (John 9:24)  
 “Give glory to God. We know that this man is a sinner.”

Jesus heals a man born blind. The Jews are perplexed since it is obvious a miracle has been done but it was on the Sabbath. At first the Jews are in disbelief, and so question the man and even his parents. They call the man to “Give glory [δόξαν] to God,” but cannot give credit to Jesus, recognizing him as only a sinner. The man who was blind sees Jesus for who he is while the men born seeing fail to recognize Jesus. The Jews cast the man out of the synagogue, and Jesus affirms that he also came for judgment, “that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind” (9:38).

---

<sup>37</sup> William Loader detects no allusion to the divine name in Jesus’ absolute “I am” statements, see William Loader, *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 347–54. However, Bauckham and Williams see a reference to Isaiah 40–55 and Yahweh’s repeated claims of unique and exclusive divinity through the use of אֲנִי הוּא (e.g., Isa 43:13, 25; 46:4; 48:12; 51:12), and Thompson admits reference to the divine name is “allusive or indirect” but recognizes that Jesus is still making a claim to the unique divine identity through Jesus’ claim to share in God’s kind of existence. See Richard Bauckham, “Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 239–52; Marianne Meye Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 87–92; Catrin H. Williams, *I Am He: The Interpretation of Aní Hú in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, WUNT II 113 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 255–303, for John 8:58 see 275–83. See also Jörg Frey, “God in the Gospel of John,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 335–38.



**Meaning of δόξα.** In response to the healing of the blind man, the Jews call the “man who had been blind” to “give glory to God” (δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, 9:24). The giving of δόξα to God is a common expression of religious devotion, whether it be to give δόξα to God (Acts 12:23; Rom 4:20; Rev 4:9; 11:13; 1 Esd 9:8; 4 Macc 1:12) or that δόξα “be” to God (Luke 2:14; Rom 11:36; Gal 1:5; 1 Clem. 20:12). In these expressions it is understood that the worshiper is not actually handing “glory” over to God like an object transferred, but that it is an ascription of “glory” to God. It makes most sense to understand δόξα under the category of status, as “honor” or “praise”—it is a recognition of or extolling of one’s status.<sup>38</sup> In this context the man formerly blind is being called to extol God—to give praise to God (9:24).

**Placement and significance within the narrative.** John devotes a significant amount of his narrative on this miracle of Jesus (41 verses). A man born blind sees while men born seeing are blind. The significance of this miracle revolves around whether one sees Jesus rightly. Although there has already been an emphasis on sight throughout John, this particular miracle about vision serves as a poignant backdrop to underscore the blindness of the Jews (9:39–41).

The introduction of this miraculous account reminds the reader of its revelatory aspect, “It was not that this man sinned, or his parents, but that the works of God might be displayed in him” (φανερῶθῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, 9:3).<sup>39</sup> Coupled with his

---

<sup>38</sup> Δόξα is often collocated with τιμή: Rom 2:7; 1 Tim 1:17; Heb 2:7; 2 Pet 1:17; Rev 4:9. Δόξα is also collocated with ἔπαινος in 2 Pet 1:7; Phil 1:11. See also the parallel in Josh 7:19, “give glory. . . and give praise” (LXX “Δὸς δόξαν . . . καὶ δὸς ἐξομολόγησιν”). For an example where δόξα is explicitly linked with both senses of status and appearance, see Psalm 70:8 LXX: “Let my mouth be filled with praise [αἰνέσεως], so that I will sing of your glory [δόξαν], your majesty [μεγαλοπρέπειαν], the whole day” (my trans).

<sup>39</sup> The revelatory nature of Jesus’ “works” (τὰ ἔργα) matches the revelatory nature of Jesus’ signs (2:11). Earlier Jesus said that “the works [ἔργα] that the Father has given me to accomplish, the very works [ἔργα] that I am doing, bear witness about me that the Father has sent me” (5:36). Jesus is speaking here in context of the miracle of healing the invalid, which is later included in his “signs” (σημεῖα, 7:31). In several instances the signs [σημεῖα] that Jesus performs are also called works [ἔργα] (cf. 5:36; 7:31; 9:4, 16). It is most likely that the “works” of Jesus serves as a more general category that includes “signs.” Morris tentatively suggests, “Perhaps it would be true to say that where John sees miracles from one point of view as σημεῖα, activities pointing people to God, from another he sees them as ἔργα, activities that take their origin in God,” in Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 612. For “works” in light of the OT work of

statement, “I am the light of the world” (9:5), Jesus makes the stunning assertion that the years of darkness in which the man walked since birth were divinely appointed to shine forth the light of God in Jesus. The result of the light coming is division. Jesus himself is presented as summarizing one of the purposes of the miraculous account: “For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind” (9:39; cf. 3:19–21).

As the Jews interrogate the man formerly blind, the growing faith of the man versus the stubborn refusal of the Jews to believe in Jesus becomes apparent.<sup>40</sup> Although the blindness of the Jews can be observed in several ways,<sup>41</sup> one stands out—their command to the man born blind to “Give glory to God. We know that this man is a sinner” (9:24). The Jews claim to worship God, to believe Moses, and to keep the Law. According to Jesus they have failed in each point (5:45–47; 7:19; 8:42, 54), and their response to the healing of the man born blind is yet another exhibition of their failure. The point, precisely, is that it is impossible to give δόξα to God while calling Jesus a sinner. The Jews are not judging “with right judgment” (7:24) and are proving themselves children of the devil (8:44) in their failure to affirm the truth right before them. In the

---

God, and as that which God works in and through Jesus, see Peter J. Riga, “Signs of Glory: The Use of ‘sēmeion’ in St John’s Gospel,” *Interpretation* 17, no. 4 (October 1963): 416–23. See also Raymond E. Brown, “Appendix III: Signs and Works,” in *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols., Anchor Bible Commentary 29–29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 1:525–32; Leon Morris, “Additional Note G: Miracles,” in *The Gospel According to John*, Revised edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 607–13.

<sup>40</sup> The man first calls Jesus a “prophet” (9:17), is agnostic about Jesus being a sinner (9:25), acknowledges that the miracle and Jesus must be from God (9:31), and by the end believes in Jesus and worships him (9:38). In contrast, the Jews are divided on how to evaluate Jesus (9:16), refuse to acknowledge the healing (9:18), refuse to acknowledge Jesus as from God (9:24), and are unable to refute the man formerly blind’s argument about Jesus (9:34). As a result, they do not know what to do other than to resort to force and cast the man out, remaining stubborn in their blindness. See also Schnackenburg’s comments in *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2:239.

<sup>41</sup> E.g., Learned men of the law don’t know what to do with Jesus such that they resort to asking the lowly beggar for his opinion (9:17), yet they reject his word because they refuse to believe what obviously has happened (9:18). They do not know where Jesus comes from (9:29), and even after they cannot deny a miracle has taken place they call Jesus a sinner (9:24). Although they cast out the man born blind for teaching them (9:34), it is clear to the audience that he has a better read of the circumstances than the Jews (9:25–32).

previous encounter with the Jews, Jesus indicated that “whoever is of God hears the words of God. The reason why you do not hear them is that you are not of God” (8:47). This miraculous account functions also to demonstrate that whoever is of God *sees* the works of God. The δόξα of God is displayed in the sign Jesus performed, but they fail to render δόξα to God by failing to believe that Jesus is sent by God. Additionally, their reasoning is evidently irrational— for it is irrefutable that the miracle took place, so how can they give glory to God while simultaneously calling the man who brought it about a sinner? Their stubborn refusal demonstrates that even when a work of God is clearly carried out before them, they cannot bring themselves to honor Jesus. The only possible answer is that they are blind, and this blindness according to John 5:44 is due to their mis-placed δόξα seeking. Those who seek δόξα from one another and not from the only God fail to see the δόξα of God in Jesus, and thus fail to render δόξα to God rightly, whatever the Jews may claim.<sup>42</sup>

The readers of the gospel may be encouraged if they are undergoing similar ostracization, whether it is in the context of the synagogue or not. Although the man born blind was cast out, Jesus indicates that he also came for judgment, thus the response of the Jews to Jesus was part of the intended response. John’s audience need not be afraid like the man’s parents but can openly confess Jesus. Community ostracization may come,

---

<sup>42</sup> And thus portions of the Gospel of John can function as a polemic against the Jews and their specific claims to worship God while rejecting Jesus. If John had any intention of distributing his gospel for a wider readership than his own “community,” then it is reasonable to conclude that these clashes between Jesus and the Jews have some relevance to various Christian audiences. In view of a possible wider readership, and also in following Bauckham’s caution against assuming what must be relevant for some of John’s audience must be relevant for all, I remain doubtful of our ability to reconstruct a Johannine community or its particular social history. See Richard Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?,” in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 22–26. Many commentators find in this particular miraculous account (9:1–41) a clear reference to some contemporary events for the *Sitz im Leben* of the gospel, and that may be to some degree and among particular Christian audiences, but it is not necessary to begin reading into the narrative a dual-layered interpretation like J. L. Martyn, or to assert that the account must have fictive elements in order to match contemporary events. See Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 238–39.

but as Jesus affirms later to his disciples, the hatred and ostracizing is part of discipleship (15:18–25; 16:1–4).

### **John 11:4, 40: The Raising of Lazarus**

αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς. (John 11:4)

“This illness does not lead to death. It is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it.”

οὐκ εἶπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὅψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ; (John 11:40)

“Did I not tell you that if you believed you would see the glory of God?”

There are two occurrences of δόξα in the context of raising Lazarus from the dead. The first is in Jesus’s response to the news of Lazarus’ sickness: “This illness does not lead to death. It is for the glory of God [ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ], so that the Son of God may be glorified [δοξασθῇ] through it” (11:4). The second is Jesus’s response to Martha: “Did I not tell you that if you believed you would see the glory of God [τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ]?” (11:40).

**Meaning of δόξα.** The occurrence of δόξα in 11:40 as the object of the verb ὅψῃ leads us to understand δόξα under the category of appearance and in line with its meaning from 2:11 and 1:14, “the radiance of God’s character” referring to the very glory of God in continuity with Exodus 34:6–7. Whether the occurrence of δόξα in 11:4, along with the verb δοξάζω, activates a meaning in relation to appearance or to status is not as clear. Is the illness for the “glory of God” in the sense of appearance, namely, that it is for the revealing of God’s glory? Or is the illness for the “honor of God” in the sense of status, as in the illness leads to the ascribing of honor to God?

It is possible that δόξα and δοξάζω in 11:4 could refer to status. It is for the “honor” of God, that the Son of God “may be honored” through it (11:4). This reading doesn’t preclude that the sign performed is one that manifests Jesus’s δόξα, for later Jesus still affirms that the raising of Lazarus is something in which Martha would “see the

glory of God” (11:40). The “honor” comes when people recognize the glory of God in Jesus and believe in Jesus, honoring him and the Father who sent him. This reading certainly follows the pattern that the δόξα (“radiance of God’s character”) of Jesus displayed in the signs is one that should result in rendering δόξα (“honor”) to Jesus, and in giving δόξα to Jesus one gives δόξα to the one who sent him (5:22; 8:54). Additionally, the praise of God and the honoring of the Son of God is directly linked here, which pointedly counters the desire of the Jews in 9:24, where they sought to give δόξα to God apart from honoring the Son.

There are at least four reasons for understanding δόξα in relation to appearance. First, the second occurrence of δόξα in this account relates δόξα with seeing, “if you believed you would see the glory of God” (11:40). Jesus is referring to the raising of Lazarus from the dead, the sign which Jesus obviously refers to in 11:4 as well, “this illness does not lead to death” (11:4). Second, the illness leads to the resurrection of Lazarus, a miraculous “sign” (σημεῖον, labelled as such by John in 12:18), which should be understood as manifesting Jesus’s glory (cf. 2:11).<sup>43</sup> The illness leads to a miracle which is seen and witnessed. Third, it is not difficult to detect a connection between the purpose of this illness being “for the glory of God” and the previous incident of the man born blind “that the works of God might be displayed [φανερωθῇ] in him” (9:3). Both are miraculous works reversing the corruption of creation and are called signs (cf. 9:16). Fourth, an additional layer of meaning may be discerned in the phrase “it is for the glory of God.” Namely, that the raising of Lazarus from the dead leads to the great act of glory in the gospel, the glorification of Jesus on the cross. It is in response to this sign that the Jews gather and make plans to put Jesus to death, thereby initiating what is labelled

---

<sup>43</sup> See also 12:11, on account of this miraculous sign many were believing in Jesus. The resurrection of Lazarus fits the schema presented in 2:11 of seeing glory in a miraculous sign and responding with belief. For a discussion on the three instances of σημεῖον following the raising of Lazarus (11:47; 12:18, 37) see Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*, 120–28.

repeatedly as the “glorification” of Jesus (and God) (11:45–53; 12:23; 13:31–32).<sup>44</sup> If the glorification of Jesus can be understood in a revelatory sense, and the verb *δοξάζω* understood as conveying not merely “to honor” but “to clothe with splendor” or in the middle sense “to reveal splendor,” then it stands that the aorist passive form in John 11:4 may carry this sense as well.<sup>45</sup> On this reading, the illness of Lazarus leads not to death, but the illness is “for the glory of God”, that is, for the revealing of God’s glory—in the raising of Lazarus from the dead but also in how it leads to the hour of Jesus’s glorification. The illness takes place “that the Son of God may reveal his glory through it.”<sup>46</sup> If this is correct, then the assertions of John 11:4 coincide with the logic of John

---

<sup>44</sup> I understand the prepositional phrase “ὅτι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ” and also the purpose clause “ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι’ αὐτῆς” as parallel statements explaining what the illness is for: αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι’ αὐτῆς (John 11:4). Murray Harris provides a similar explanation when he says the ἵνα clause “redefines” the ὑπὲρ phrase, in Murray J. Harris, *John*, EGGNT (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 208. Therefore both the glory of God is revealed, and the Son of Man is glorified in the raising of Lazarus from the dead. *Contra* Chibici-Revneanu, who indicates that in the miracle, the glory of God is revealed but denies that the Son of Man is glorified. See Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, “Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine Δόξα-Language,” in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Gilbert Van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 223 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 518–19. See also Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 144–48. In light of 7:39 and 12:16, Chibici-Revneanu states that the reader would come to understand the glorification of the Son of Man has *not* happened in the raising of Lazarus, thus she also denies that glorification can be a descriptor of Jesus’ earthly glory ministry (prior to the hour). She rightly traces out how the raising of Lazarus leads to the passion of Jesus, and thus his glorification (used in the strict sense of referring to his “hour”) and recognizes that 7:39 and 12:16 uses glorification to strictly refer to “the hour” of Jesus’ glorification. In this way she is right that the reader would discern there is yet a glorification to occur. But what then do we do with the language that describes the raising of Lazarus as both happening “for the glory of God” and also “that the Son of Man may be glorified” (11:4)? Even in her own discussion she allows that in the raising of Lazarus, there is some sense in which Jesus is glorified (see *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 177), yet in light of 7:39 and 12:16, she still concludes that glorification *must* refer only to “the hour” (and beyond, e.g. in the disciples activity, 14:13). This leads her also to exclude the aorist indicatives of *δοξάζω* in 12:28 and 17:4 as referring to Jesus’ public ministry of signs (which seems to read against the natural sense of the term in its context, see my next chapter). It is better, on the whole, to recognize a special use of *δοξάζω* (7:39; 12:16; 13:31–32; 17:1–5) reserved for the events of “the hour” while also acknowledging that the term can be utilized to describe Jesus’ earthly ministry (such as 11:4, 12:28; 17:4). Thus there is a distinguishable difference in how *δόξα* is used as opposed to *δοξάζω*. Jesus’ public ministry is a ministry of revealing *δόξα*, while Jesus’ passion is the hour of *δοξάζω*, but both are also related—Jesus’ public ministry glorified God on earth (17:4), and Jesus’ hour of *δοξάζω* reveals the glory of God (1:14). Chibici-Revneanu forces too strict a distinction.

<sup>45</sup> The possibility of understanding the aorist passive forms with middle meaning is discussed in the next chapter.

<sup>46</sup> The revelatory meaning indicated by “for the glory of God” (11:4) is regularly noted, see Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 406; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 390; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:431; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 839. Interpretation of the meaning of “glorify” here in 11:4 has wider divergence. Barrett detects a bestowal of glory upon the Son (proleptically), Barrett, *The Gospel According*

1:14–18 and 2:11. Jesus manifests *his* glory in a sign (2:11), corresponding to 11:4, “the Son of God reveals his [own] glory through it,” yet John 1:14–18 makes clear Jesus’s glory is revealing God’s glory, corresponding to 11:4, it is “for the glory of God.” The emphasis on seeing the Father in the Son, in addition to the reasons above, lead us to conclude that *δόξα* conveys the sense of appearance. Yet the appearance of glory ought to lead one to honor the Son and so it becomes difficult to cleanly untangle one from the other. We conclude that appearance holds the primary meaning here.

**Placement and significance within the narrative.** The raising of Lazarus is significant in at least seven ways within the narrative structure of John.

First, the resurrection of Lazarus is the last sign of Jesus in his public ministry.<sup>47</sup> John does not show Jesus performing any more signs after this event. Aside from the resurrection of Jesus itself, this is the last sign in the Gospel.<sup>48</sup> And it is the resurrection of Lazarus, unique to John’s gospel, which effectively leads to Jesus’s death.<sup>49</sup> This event compels the Jewish leaders to make plans to put Jesus to death (11:53). Early on in John’s narrative the Jews were already seeking to kill Jesus (*ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτείνειν*, 5:18), but only now does John identify definitive plans being

---

to *St. John*, 390. Carson prefers to understand the verb in terms of honor, so the Father is revealed in the Son and the Father honors the son through it, Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 406. Others, not commenting on the semantics of the verb still connect it to the glorification of Jesus on the cross, e.g. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, WBC 36 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 187–88; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:431; Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 839.

<sup>47</sup> The signs: turning water into wine (2:1–11, called a sign in 2:11); healing of the official’s son (4:46–54, called a sign in 4:54); healing of the invalid at the pool (5:1–17); feeding of the five thousand (6:1–14, called a sign in 6:14); walking on water (6:16–21); healing of the man born blind (9:1–41, called a sign in 9:16); the raising of Lazarus (11:1–44, called a sign in 12:18).

<sup>48</sup> Justification for the death and resurrection of Jesus as a sign is given in the next chapter.

<sup>49</sup> John is careful to demonstrate that Jesus is in control, as Jesus states ahead of time the purpose of the illness (11:4) and then intentionally waits two more days (11:6). Even Caiaphas’ words unwittingly fit into God’s plan as he makes a case for Jesus’ death (11:41). Up to this point Jesus had evaded arrest because his hour had not yet come (7:30; 8:20; 10:39), but after this occasion Jesus declares that “the hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified” (12:23).

made (11:53). This marks a turning point in John's narrative, for now "Jesus therefore no longer walked openly among the Jews" (11:54).<sup>50</sup>

Second, the first and last miracles of Jesus function like an *inclusio* to his public ministry. The first miracle of turning water into wine set the pattern of Jesus performing a "sign" [σημεῖον] that reveals "glory" [δόξα] leading to belief (2:11). The raising of Lazarus is also called a "sign" (11:47; 12:18), is the only other sign besides the miracle at Cana that is explicitly said to reveal δόξα (2:11, 11:4, 40), and leads to a believing response (11:45). The raising of Lazarus reinforces the pattern set by the miracle at Cana, that Jesus performs signs to reveal glory for the purpose of belief. If the reader wasn't alerted to this pattern from 2:11, then this re-iteration of the pattern should lead to the conclusion that all of Jesus's signs narrated in the gospel function similarly, inducing the reader to see how it is that each sign demonstrates the glory of Jesus and should lead to their believing in him.

Third, the complex relationship between seeing glory and believing is also brought out by this narrative. In 2:11 the pattern seems straightforward: witnessing Jesus's glory leads to believing in him. However, Jesus's words in 11:40 to Martha is the opposite: "Did I not tell you that if you believed you would see the glory of God?" The order seems reversed, for here believing precedes seeing. But this order is not extraordinary, when we consider that those who are said to "believe" in Jesus at the miracle of Cana are those who were already "his disciples" (οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, 2:11).<sup>51</sup> The disciples with Jesus at the raising of Lazarus included the disciples who were there at Cana,<sup>52</sup> yet Jesus still says to them, "Lazarus has died, and for your sake I am glad that I

---

<sup>50</sup> Chapter 12 is a transition between the public ministry of Jesus and the private discourses to his disciples.

<sup>51</sup> Prior to seeing the miracle at Cana, the disciples already believed him to be "the Son of God, the King of Israel" (1:49), and "the Lamb of God" (1:36), and "him of whom Moses in the Law and also the prophets wrote" (1:45). Yet after seeing Jesus' glory in the miracle at Cana, "his disciples believed in him" (2:11).

<sup>52</sup> We can conclude this because we know at least Andrew, Simon Peter, Philip, and Nathanael



was not there, so that you may believe” (11:14–15). John is communicating to his readers that there are increasing levels of believing in Jesus as one sees more of Jesus’s glory.<sup>53</sup>

Fourth, it further validates Jesus as sent from the Father by showing that the glory of Jesus is the glory of Yahweh. In the story Jesus prays out loud for the sake of those hearing, “that they may believe that you sent me” (11:42). Just like the signs God gave to Moses to do, that the people may believe the Lord sent him, Jesus does the works the Father gives and they testify that Jesus is indeed from the Father (Exod 4:8–9; John 5:36). The raising of the dead demonstrates Jesus’s earlier claims to be true. (cf. 5:21, “As the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will”). Life and death are the prerogatives of God alone, and Jesus asserts that both life and judgment have been granted to the Son by the Father (5:26–27). Although Jesus in 5:28–29 was surely speaking of a future judgment, he did indicate in 5:25 that the time is also “now here” [ἐρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν] for the dead to hear the voice of the Son of God and live.<sup>54</sup> We can note the correlations between John 5:25, 28 and the details in the raising of Lazarus. Jesus had said “all who are in the tombs [πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις] will hear his voice [τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ]” (5:28), and that “an hour is coming and is now here, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live”

---

were there with Jesus at the wedding of Cana. They are part of the “twelve” that Jesus chose (6:70) and they were explicitly identified by John as part of those who did not leave Jesus after his Bread of Life discourse (6:67). As John presents Jesus testifying, only Judas was lost out of the twelve (17:12).

<sup>53</sup> On the issue of signs and faith, some see the Gospel as presenting signs in a negative light (cf. 4:48), Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1971), 696; while others interpret that signs can bring people to an initial faith, who should longer need signs as they mature, W. Nicol, *The Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 32 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 99–106. It is best to understand, along with Koester, that the issue is not the signs in themselves but the people who perceive it, and what they perceive in it, Koester, “Jesus’ Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John,” 53–54. And on the issue of the kinds of faith John describes, there is a distinction in the gospel between those who “believe” but do not persevere and those who believe and continue to follow Jesus by abiding in his words and in him (cf. 8:31; 15:4).

<sup>54</sup> The “now here” aspect of 5:25 does not need to refer only to the raising of Lazarus. As Jesus said, “everyone who lives and believes in me shall never die” (11:26). There is a sense in which those who believe in Jesus now, he claims, will not die. Thus they will live and no longer die in their sins (cf. 8:24). The raising of Lazarus demonstrates the truth of Jesus’ words and need not be the primary referent of them.

(5:25). Jesus, acknowledged to be the “Son of God” by Martha (11:27), cries out with a great voice [φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 11:43] to a dead man in the tomb [τὸ μνημεῖον, 11:38], and the man who had died came out alive. Jesus’s authority over life and death is put on display,<sup>55</sup> thereby proving that he is indeed the Son of God, to whom the Father has granted to have life in himself (5:26). His glory is the Father’s glory, his power is the Father’s power.<sup>56</sup>

Fifth, this event links the love of Jesus with the demonstration of his glory. The only mention of love from Jesus or God towards the world or people, at this point in the narrative, has been in John 3:16.<sup>57</sup> It seems significant, then, that in this narrative there is one occurrence of ἀγαπάω (11:5) and two of φιλέω (11:3, 36); and that all three describe the love of Jesus towards Mary, Martha, or Lazarus. The explicit reason for Jesus waiting two more days, ostensibly so that Lazarus would surely be dead and in the tomb by the time Jesus arrived in Bethany, is that Jesus loved Mary, Martha, and Lazarus (11:5). Out of love for his friends (Jesus calls Lazarus “our friend” [ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν], 11:11), Jesus

---

<sup>55</sup> The glory of Jesus as giver of life is further underscored in how the expectation of all around him is that death is an insurmountable obstacle. The narrative reeks of the fear of death from beginning to end, and we can detect how John purposefully contrasts Jesus with all other parties involved. The *disciples* fear death and can not conceive of Jesus overcoming it. They hesitate when Jesus wants to go back to Judea, saying to him, “Rabbi, the Jews were just now seeking to stone you, and are you going there again?” (11:8). When Jesus makes clear that Lazarus has died, the only outcome that Thomas can conceive of as a result of going to Lazarus is death: “Let us also go, that we may die with him” (11:16). They do not realize the truth of Jesus’ prior words that he has life in himself (5:26) and gives life to whom he will (5:21). *Mary and Martha* both affirm that Jesus could have prevented Lazarus’ death (11:21, 32, “Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died”). Martha even confesses that Jesus is “the Christ, the Son of God” which is the only such confession on the lips of a character in the entire gospel. But neither Mary nor Martha can conceive of how Jesus himself could reverse death. The *Jewish leaders* too are guilty of thinking death cannot be overcome by Jesus. Rather than realizing that the miracle validates Jesus as the Son of God who has life in himself (and thus, cannot truly be overcome by death), they irrationally think the very thing that Jesus has just overcome will put a final end to him (11:46–53). In contrast to the expectations of all the other characters in this narrative, Jesus is the light who is the resurrection and the life (11:9–10, 25–26). The sign of the raising of Lazarus demonstrates his glory, and that glory is the same glory as the Father.

<sup>56</sup> He does not possess this as a mere envoy but by being the Son. That the glory of the Son is the glory of the Father, or the glorification of the Son is the glorification of the Father, is attested to in the parallel purpose statements in 11:4 and also in the repetition of glorification statements in 13:31–32.

<sup>57</sup> Other mentions in chapters 1–11 of love (whether verbal or nominal, ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη, φιλέω) are in reference to the lack of love towards God in people (5:42; 8:42), people’s love for darkness (3:19), or in reference to love between the Father and Son (3:35; 5:20; 10:17).

allows them to undergo hardship—the death of their brother for Mary and Martha, and death for Lazarus—in order that he might demonstrate to them who he is in displaying God’s glory. What might the relationship be between love and the display of glory? Love motivated the display of glory (11:5), but the display itself involved acts of love. He loved his friends, so he responds to their request to come, weeps with them and raises Lazarus from the dead.<sup>58</sup> The mercy and compassion of Jesus displays the love of God towards the world (John 3:16). The raising of Lazarus from the grave is part of the witness of John in the Prologue (1:14). Therefore the glory of God that is on display is indeed the “radiance of God’s character”: the sign reveals the love and power of God in Jesus, as he demonstrates authority over life and death in his merciful compassionate healing of the one whom he loves.

Sixth, like the Miracle at Cana, this miracle asserts that a new age has come in Jesus. Salier writes, “Within a Jewish framework as articulated by Jesus and Martha in their conversation, this event suggests that the promises of the end times have been enacted in the present.”<sup>59</sup> Martha’s words represent the Jewish eschatological hope of resurrection (John 11:24), which is linked to the restoration of Israel (Dan 12:2–3; Hos 6:2; Ezek 37:11–14). The raising of Lazarus is a living picture of the eschatological fulfilment that “an hour is coming, and is now here, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live” (John 5:25). Both the first and last miracles in Jesus’s public ministry reveal glory in acts which signal that the new age has dawned in Jesus, and thus the revelation of glory is tied to the fulfillment of Scripture.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Note the remark of the Jews right after John reported that “Jesus wept” (11:35): “See how he loved him!” (11:36).

<sup>59</sup> Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*, 139.

<sup>60</sup> Chibici-Revneanu interprets the use of *δόξα* terminology as characterizing the whole of Jesus’ earthly mission as an eschatological event, in *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 545–46.

Seventh, the resurrection of Lazarus links death and glory together, anticipating the glorification of Jesus through his death. Chibici-Revneanu makes the observation that 11:4 shows that death and δόξα do not exclude one another, but that they even belong together in this story.<sup>61</sup> Not only does the event lead to the death of Jesus, but the event itself, characterized with δόξα and δοξάζω (11:4, 40), links the darkness of death with the revelation of glory.

### **John 12:41, 43: Rejection as Fulfillment**

ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ. ὅμως μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὡμολόγουν ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται· ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. (12:41–43)

“Isaiah said these things because he saw his glory and spoke of him. Nevertheless, many even of the authorities believed in him, but for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it, so that they would not be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the glory that comes from man more than the glory that comes from God.”

At this point in the narrative Jesus “departed and hid himself” from the public, and John provides a rationale for why so many did not believe in Jesus though he had done so many signs among them (12:36–37). John draws from Isaiah 53:1 and 6:10, then follows with the stunning claim that Isaiah said “these things” because he saw “his glory” (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ). John then provides further explanation for Jesus’s rejection as he describes some from the authorities who did believe in Jesus but failed to confess it because they loved the δόξα that comes from man more than the δόξα that comes from God (12:43).

**Meaning of δόξα.** The first occurrence of δόξα (12:41) is the object of the verb “he saw” (εἶδεν), placing it firmly in the category of appearance. The latter two occurrences of δόξα are used as objects of the verb ἀγαπάω and are in the category of

---

<sup>61</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 143.

status, namely, the recognition of status, whether “praise,” or “honor.” The way most translations have rendered it is appropriate: “For they loved praise from men more than praise from God” (NET, cf. also ESV, NASB95, NIV84, HCSB, KJV). The concern of those authorities who have believed in Jesus but dare not confess it is related to how they would be viewed by others, not God. Their status or reputation would be thrown into question, and open confession would risk their expulsion from the synagogue. Therefore John similarly explains their failure to confess with how Jesus explains the failure of other Jewish leaders to believe, as a failure on the level of whether one loves God and regards δόξα from him as more important than δόξα from men (“one another” in John 5:44).

In further defining the first occurrence of δόξα (12:41) we turn our attention to the Isaiah quotations and explore their significance. Of particular import is the three-clause commentary John provides in 12:41 that follows his Isaiah quotations.<sup>62</sup> In this commentary John clarifies that Isaiah is speaking not of God, but of *Jesus*, “Isaiah said these things because he saw his glory and spoke of him” (ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, 12:41). First we will establish that the third person pronoun αὐτοῦ is indeed John’s clarification that Isaiah saw *Jesus’s* glory. Then we will consider the quotations of Isaiah and how they shape what kind of glory that John presents Isaiah bearing witness to.

It is possible that the third person singular αὐτοῦ (“his”) could refer back to the implicit third person singular subject of τετύφλωκεν and thus John is referring to God, who would be the assumed subject of his quotation of Isaiah 6:10. But this is unlikely for two reasons. First, John says Isaiah “spoke of him” (ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, 12:41) and

---

<sup>62</sup> Catrin Williams calls it a “highly condensed three-clause commentary,” in “The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology,” in *“As Those Who Are Taught”: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, ed. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, Symposium Series 27 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 115.

continues the use of the third person singular pronoun in describing the authorities believing “in him” (εἰς αὐτόν, 12:42) with no explicit change of referent. Thus it makes best sense to see the use of the personal pronoun αὐτός in the singular throughout 12:37–43 as referring to Ἰησοῦς in 12:36. Second, the contrast John makes is more fitting if Isaiah saw *Jesus’s* glory and spoke of him. He contrasts Isaiah with many from the authorities (ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων) who believed in Jesus but stopped short of confessing it (12:42).<sup>63</sup> This clarifies that John is interpreting Isaiah as seeing the glory of Jesus, but what sort of glory is this? We now turn our attention to the Isaiah quotations.

The kind of glory that John bears witness to is not simply the pre-existent glory of the Son but the glory of the rejected, glorified and lifted up servant of Isaiah. Therefore the glory that John interprets Isaiah seeing is that of the glorified servant who has been rejected by his own people. As Brendsel has rightly argued, Isaiah 53:1 is not presented as the *cause* for rejection, but John interprets that the rejection of Jesus has taken place *in order that* Isaiah 53:1 would be fulfilled (note the telic force of the ἵνα in John 12:38). John then adduces Isaiah 6:10 as the cause of rejection. By linking the two Isaiah quotations in this specific way (rejection of Jesus in order to fulfill Isaiah 53:1, because of Isaiah 6:10), John likely locates the fulfillment of Isaiah 6:10 in the rejection of Jesus via Isaiah 53:1.<sup>64</sup> This impacts our interpretation of δόξα because when John says, in 12:41, that Isaiah spoke “these things” *because* (ὅτι) “he saw his glory,” John is locating

---

<sup>63</sup> Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:887. *Contra* Painter, and others, who take the adversative ὅμως μέντοι “nevertheless” (ESV) to contrast the “believers” of 12:42 with those who are blind (12:37–40), see John Painter, “The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b–32,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William R. Stegner, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 445; Harris, *John*, 238; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 217. It is interesting that many commentators overlook that the adversative could be contrasting with the verse immediately preceding. It makes more sense to see the contrast between Isaiah who saw and spoke and the “believers” who believed and did not confess.

<sup>64</sup> See Daniel J. Brendsel, “*Isaiah Saw His Glory*”: *The Use of Isaiah 52–53 in John 12*, BZNW 208 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 119.

the seeing of Jesus's glory in *both* passages of Isaiah (53:1 and 6:10), not simply Isaiah 6's vision of Yahweh.<sup>65</sup>

John saw in the description of the servant of Isaiah 52:13–53:12 an explanation for why Jesus had to suffer and how people would respond to the “arm of the Lord.”<sup>66</sup> As the servant will be “lifted up and glorified” (LXX Isaiah 52:13, ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται), Jesus's hour has come “to be glorified” (John 12:23, δοξασθῆναι) and he states, “I will be lifted up” (12:32, ὑψωθῶ). As the servant will be lifted up and many nations

---

<sup>65</sup> The first clause of 12:41 plays an important role in determining what kind of glory John interprets Isaiah as seeing. Brendsel makes a good case that ταῦτα (“these things”) in 12:41a should refer back to both Isaianic quotations, not only to Isaiah 6:10. First, he shows that the plural ταῦτα is suggestive (but not conclusive) of multiple elements as an antecedent. Second, he argues that the construction in 12:39 (πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας) link together both Isaiah 53:1 and 6:10 and give them a singular theological function, that is, fulfillment, and that they “are presented together as fulfilling what Isaiah said.” Third, the threefold repetition of the phrase εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας (12:38, 39, 41) links all of 12:38–41 together. Based upon these observations, Brendsel goes on to argue that John is interpreting Isaiah to have seen Jesus' incarnate glory as the rejected and crucified Christ. See Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 123–34. Evans tentatively suggests that Isaiah spoke of Jesus in the servant song, in Craig A. Evans, “Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, Scholars Press Homage Series 10 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 232.

<sup>66</sup> See Craig Evans proposal that John 12:1–43 “is, at least in part, a midrash on Isa 52:7–53:12,” in Evans, “Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” 232–36. Brendsel argues for the influence of Isaiah 52–53 on John 12, in Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*. Many have correlated the presentation of Jesus in John with the Servant of Isaiah. Brendsel lists these correlations (pp. 114–115):

- (1) Jesus as the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (John 1:29, 36), the servant is like a sheep led to slaughter; bears sin (Isa 53:4, 7, 11–12);
- (2) Jesus is the chosen one of God (John 1:34), the servant is “my chosen one” (Isa 42:1);
- (3) The Spirit is on Jesus (John 1:32–33), the Spirit is on the servant (Isa 42:1);
- (4) Jesus is God's witness in a trial with “the Jews” and the world (John 3:11, 32–33; 8:14, 18; 18:37; cf. 4:44; 5:31; 7:7), the servant Israel is to be God's witness in a trial against the nations/idols (Isa 43:9–10, 12; 44:8), in which they fail (e.g. 42:18–22);
- (5) Jesus is the “light of the world” (John 8:12; 9:5; 11:9; cf. 12:35–36, 46), The servant is a “light to the nations” (Isa 42:6; 49:6);
- (6) “The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep” (John 10:11, 15), the servant is struck down for the wayward sheep (Isa 53:4–6; cf. v. 10);
- (7) Jesus has a saving role vis-à-vis the nations (John 4:42; 10:16; 11:52; 12:32), the servant has a saving role vis-à-vis the nations (Isa 42:6–7; 49:6; 52:15);
- (8) Jesus is the messianic King (John 12:3, 13–15; 18:37; 19:19; cf. 1:49), the servant is a royal figure (Isa 42:1, 4; 52:14; 53:2; cf. 49:7; 52:15);
- (9) The Son of man is “glorified” and “lifted up” (John 12:23, 28, 32, 34; cf. 3:14; 8:28; 13:31–32; 17:1, 5), the servant is “glorified and lifted up” (Isa 52:13);
- (10) The passion narrative shows Jesus beaten, mocked (19:1–2), giving Pilate no answer (19:9), crucified with criminals (19:18), pierced (19:34, 37), and buried by Joseph (19:38), and the fate of the Servant is that he would be struck, despised (Isa 50:6; 53:3, 5), not open his mouth (53:7), be numbered with the transgressors (53:12), pierced (53:5), and with the “rich” in death (53:9).

See also the recent work by Adam Day, “Lifted up and Glorified: Isaiah's Servant Language in the Gospel of John” (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016).

will marvel at him (LXX Isaiah 52:15), the Greeks came seeking Jesus (John 12:21) and Jesus will draw all people to himself in his lifting up (John 12:32). Isaiah also described others who would “despise” (ἀδοξήσει) the “glory” (ἡ δόξα, LXX Isaiah 52:14) of the servant. It is fitting that John would see Jesus as the servant described in Isaiah 52:13–53:12, and thus John identifies the fulfillment of Isaiah 53:1 in the rejection of Jesus’s δόξα by some of the Jews, “Lord, who has believed what he heard from us, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?” (John 12:38).<sup>67</sup> The rejection of the Jews fulfilling Isaiah 53:1 not only serves as an apologetic for why many have not believed, but functions also as a positive confirmation of Jesus’s identity as the servant who will be “lifted up and glorified” (Isa 52:13). John then concludes from this fulfillment that the Jews “could not believe” (οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν, 12:39), because (ὅτι) of Isaiah 6:10, “He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they see with their eyes, and understand with their heart, and turn, and I would heal them” (John 12:40). Brendsel argues that John’s use of Isaiah 6:10 “likely declares that the fulfillment of the obduracy judgment, inaugurated in Isaiah’s day, has reached its climactic consummation in the rejection (and death) of Jesus.”<sup>68</sup> The tight logic between the Isaianic quotations may indicate that John locates the fulfillment of the hardening effect of Isaiah’s ministry (6:10) in the rejection of the servant as Jesus.

The changes John makes to the quotation of Isaiah 6:10 from the LXX and the HB emphasizes at least two items: seeing and God’s judgment.<sup>69</sup> Both the LXX and the

---

<sup>67</sup> John’s quotation matches verbatim with LXX, save for the movable ν on the third person singular ἐπίστευσε (LXX, ἐπίστευσε; NA28, ἐπίστευσεν).

<sup>68</sup> Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 89. See his analysis of Isaiah 6:10 in context and John’s interpretive and theological use of it, 67–97.

<sup>69</sup> For comparison, here are the texts.

HB Isaiah 6:10: הַשִּׁמְן לִב־הָעַם הַזֶּה וְאַזְנוֹי הַכְּבֹד וְעֵינֵי הַשֶּׁעַ פֶּן־יִרְאֶה בְּעֵינָיו וּבְאָזְנוֹי יִשְׁמַע וּלְבָבוֹ יִבִּין וְשֵׁב וְרָפָא לוֹ

LXX Isaiah 6:10: ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν ἀκούσωσι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ



HB describe the heart, then ears, and then eyes. John changes the order by bringing eyes to the front, and removes mention of the ears, thus emphasizing vision. He also changes the text to emphasize the direct judgment of God. In the Hebrew the second person masculine singular commands were given to Isaiah, “Make the hearts of this people dull, and their ears heavy, and blind their eyes” (Isa 6:10). The LXX introduces 6:10 with a γάρ and changes the verbal forms to make the people the subject. The effect is that LXX Isaiah 6:10 no longer describes Isaiah’s ministry of hardening, but provides the reason for Isaiah’s ministry, “For the heart of this people has been thickened; and they have heard heavily with their ears, and they closed their eyes” (LXX Isa 6:10). John diverges from the HB and the LXX by directly attributing the hardening to God, “he has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart” (τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, John 12:40).<sup>70</sup> These changes show John is underscoring the seeing of God’s glory in Jesus and also how the rejection of Jesus is from God.

Since Isaiah saw Jesus’s glory, then the one presented as speaking in John’s quotation of Isaiah 6:10 is Jesus himself.<sup>71</sup> If Isaiah saw Jesus’s glory (Isa 6:1 LXX; 6:3

---

συνῶσι καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς

John 12:40: τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

<sup>70</sup> Menken acknowledges the possibility of an Isaianic allusion in the curious use of τυφλόω (LXX Isa 42:18–19; cf. also 43:8) but opts to see the use of τυφλόω in concert with John 9:39 (and he sees in 9:39 an allusion to Isa 6:9), Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 110–12. Also Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 88.

<sup>71</sup> There is some difficulty in regard to the subjects of the verbs in 12:40, particularly in terms of who is doing the hardening (3ms verbs) and how that makes sense with the 1cs verb at the end of the verse, “and I would heal them” (καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς). Painter presents six possible views, and argues that the subject of the 3ms verbs is the “ruler of this world” (John 12:31, cf. also 2 Cor 4:4), in Painter, “The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b–32.” Schuchard proposes that the subject of the 3ms verbs is neither God, nor Jesus, but the “report” (ἀκοή) in John 12:38, in Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBL Dissertation Series 133 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 98–102. Menken argues that it is God who is the subject of the first two lines, with Jesus as subject of the fourth line, so also Brendsel, in Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 109–20; Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 89–91. Carson takes Jesus as performing the judicial hardening, without comment on the issue of the 1cs ἰάσομαι, Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 450. If Jesus is presented as the speaker, then perhaps God is the one who hardens and Jesus is the subject of ἰάσομαι.

MT)<sup>72</sup> in the year King Uzziah died, then it was Jesus that Isaiah saw upon the throne (6:1). John is presenting the glory of Jesus as the glory of Yahweh. Whereas in John 11:4, Jesus's glory may particularly have to do with Jesus as the resurrection, exercising authority over life and death out of love for his friend, in this case glory is related to Jesus as a sovereign king issuing judgment upon his people.

Yet there is more. When John quotes both passages in Isaiah, he links the two together and attests that Isaiah saw Jesus's glory not only on the throne but as the servant.<sup>73</sup> Bauckham argues that since the phrase “high and lifted up” (רום + יָ + נָשָׂא) speaks of God in Isaiah 6:1 and 57:15, John may have concluded that for the servant of Yahweh, and thus Jesus, in his lifting up and glorification (cf. Isa 52:13, יָרוּם וְנָשָׂא MT, ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται LXX), his divine identity is revealed.<sup>74</sup> In John's context, it is in the lifting up of Jesus, his death, that his glory is made known (John 12:23, 28, 32; 13:31–32), and that others will recognize him to be “I am” (8:28). The laying down of his life, which is in his lifting up on the cross, will glorify the Father and exhibit the unity of the Father and the Son (10:18, 38; 12:33). Brendsel concludes:

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf. also the Targum of Isa 6:1, 5.

<sup>73</sup> As Brendsel writes, “John interprets this Isaiah 6 glory as being identified with and further revealed in the glory of the Servant.” Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 131. Chibici-Revneanu also identifies Isaiah's witness to Jesus in the servant of Isaiah but does not develop the connection as thoroughly as Brendsel. See Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 196. Others have noted how John may have connected Isaiah 6:10 and 53:1 through different elements common to both contexts, especially in the rare phrase “high and lifted up” (רום + יָ + נָשָׂא) which only occur in Isa 6:1, 52:13, and 57:15. In Isa 6:1 and 57:15 the verbs describe Yahweh, and in 52:13 the servant. Others who have also noted various connections between Isaiah 6:10 and 53:1 and their respective contexts: Evans, “Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” 230–32; Williams, “The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology,” 117–18; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 449–50. See also the many connections proposed by Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 117–18. Frey identifies this vision of glory in John 12:41, therefore, as a vision of glorified crucified glory. Frey argues that John's use of Isaiah in this passage is what provides the background for John's sophisticated Christology where glory and glorification is located in Jesus' passion rather than as a result of it, see Frey, “The Glory of the Crucified One,” 244–52.

<sup>74</sup> Richard Bauckham, “God Crucified,” in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 49–51. Those who follow Bauckham's interpretation on this are Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:885; Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 118.

John sees in the verbal repetition in Isa 6:1 and 52:13 a clue indicating that the revelation of Jesus's divine identity is bound up especially in his rejection and death as the Servant. For the Servant who is "exalted and lifted up" and thus shown to share in God's identity (Isa 52:13) is also the servant who suffers humiliation and death (Isa 52:14–53:12).<sup>75</sup>

The kind of glory Isaiah bears witness to is the glory of the suffering servant who is identified with the glory of Yahweh.<sup>76</sup> It is the glory of a king who declares judgment which leads to his own lifting up and glorification, which contributes all the more to the picture of how Jesus demonstrates the love of God for the world, and loves his own till the end.

**Placement in narrative.** As John closes out his section on Jesus's public ministry, he now provides an apologetic for why not everybody saw what John and Isaiah saw. John provides two different reasons, a proximate cause and an ultimate cause. The ultimate cause John identifies is a divine hardening as described above (12:37–40). The proximate cause for their blindness is their own love for δόξα from one another rather than from God (12:41–43).

John identifies two groups in this section, those who "did not believe in him" (οὐκ ἐπίστευσον εἰς αὐτόν, 12:37) and those of the authorities who did believe in him (ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, 12:42). That there are two groups is evident, but whether one contrasts with the other is not as clear. Beasley-Murray thinks that the "believing" group in 12:42 demonstrates that those who "could not believe" in 12:39 are not sealed in their fate and could break out of it.<sup>77</sup> Conversely, M. M. Thompson calls the group in 12:42 "would-be disciples" and Carson says they "know nothing of the new birth."<sup>78</sup> Those who argue for a potentially positive evaluation of these believers in 12:42

---

<sup>75</sup> Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 132.

<sup>76</sup> See also Frey, who writes, "That the prophet saw this δόξα (12.41) therefore refers not only to the temple vision but at least in equal measure to the δόξα of the servant of God attested in Isaiah 52.13 LXX," in Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One," 244–47, esp. 247.

<sup>77</sup> Beasley-Murray, *John*, 217.

<sup>78</sup> Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville, KY:

point to the example of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus.<sup>79</sup> However, Carson points out that although Joseph is called a “secret believer” (ὢν μαθητῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεκρυμμένος) in 19:38, he negates the label by making a courageous request to take Jesus’s body. Nicodemus as well went along with him, and earlier Nicodemus showed a measure of public support for Jesus by speaking up before the other Jewish leaders (7:50–52).<sup>80</sup> Most decisive is John’s own negative evaluation of the believers in 12:43.

The verbiage in 12:43 evaluates the believers in 12:42 negatively and places them squarely into the same larger category as those who “could not believe” in 12:39, or those who “believe” but do not “abide” in 8:31–47 (cf. 2:23–25). In 12:43 John utilizes Jesus’s own argument from 5:44 for why people did not believe in him. In John 5:44 Jesus confronts the doubters by indicating they *could not* believe, “How can you believe [πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι], when you receive glory [δόξαν] from one another but do not seek the glory [δόξαν] that comes from the only God?” (5:44). It seems John detects the same phenomenon at play when he states in 12:43, “For they loved the glory [δόξαν] that comes from man more than the glory [δόξαν] that comes from God.” Thus John is including these “believers” who refused to confess Jesus openly with those unbelievers who responded with no faith (12:37), the same unbelievers of whom John says “could not believe” [οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεῦειν] (12:39). Additionally, the contrast indicated by the adversative ὅμως μέντοι (12:42, “nevertheless,” or “yet”) is not between those who did not believe (12:37) and those who do (12:42), but between “Isaiah who saw his glory and

---

Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 276; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 450–51.

<sup>79</sup> Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2:417. Josaphat C. Tam takes a more optimistic view of these believers and includes Nicodemus as one of them, indicating that “it takes time for God to work in their hearts to bring them to full faith. This is a hint foreshadowing the courageous appearance of the secret believers later in 19:38–39,” in *Apprehension of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 399 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 111.

<sup>80</sup> Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 450–51, 628–29. Carson rightly observes that being a secret believer would condemn Joseph in John’s eyes, “but Joseph exculpates himself by the courageous action he now undertakes.”

spoke of him” (12:41) and “many even of the authorities believed in him but for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it” (12:42). If John is presenting the “believers” as a contrast to Isaiah, then it reinforces the interpretation that he provides a negative evaluation of them. Carson rightly recognizes that John’s language places these so-called believers “under Jesus’s searing indictment.”<sup>81</sup> These “believers,” then, are also those who are blind and cannot see.

Therefore in addition to the ultimate cause of divine judgment, there is the proximate cause that relates to human responsibility. They themselves could not see Jesus’s δόξα (appearance, “radiance”) because they loved the δόξα (status, “honor”) that came from man. The logic of rejection, explained in terms of moral responsibility and not in terms of whether God has drawn or hardened (cf. 6:44; 12:40), is here explicitly laid out for the first time. John arrays the two different meanings of δόξα in logical relationship, love for δόξα from man blinds one to δόξα revealed from God. The Jews who believed but did not confess were afraid to lose their status among men, they feared becoming ἀποσυνάγωγοι (12:42). They saw signs and responded somewhat positively, rather than with outright rejection. But seeing Jesus’s δόξα must lead to honoring him as one honors God, meaning one confesses his status as the Son of God. Jesus’s δόξα (“radiance”) reveals Jesus’s δόξα (“honor”). Those who see God’s δόξα in Jesus’s signs should then confess him to be who he says he is, that is, the Son sent from the Father. But for these believers who seem to see but do not confess, they don’t regard their own status in view of God, but in view of others.

John therefore takes up the themes of rejection/disbelief developed earlier in his narrative (5:41, 44; 7:18; 8:50–54; 9:24) and provides the rationale for why those who do not see Jesus’s δόξα and confess him are blind. They are blind because God has blinded them (12:40), yet they are blind because they themselves are oriented toward

---

<sup>81</sup> Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 451.

their fellow man, not towards God (12:42–43).<sup>82</sup> At the same time, John also finds in their rejection a fulfillment, such that this section of 12:37–43 is not simply an apologetic for rejection but an affirmation of fulfillment. Jesus’s glory is indeed the glory of Yahweh, in particular as the servant of Yahweh who is glorified and lifted up. Again, this glory is fully consistent with the prologue’s presentation of Jesus’s glory as “full of grace and truth” (1:14).

This apologetic given by John functions also to question the reader, do they respond to Jesus with faith and honor him as the Son of God? If not, then are they guilty as well of seeking δόξα from one another and not from the only God? If they see the δόξα of God in Jesus, then they too must respond with faith that confesses the δόξα of Jesus. The public ministry of Jesus is a presentation of Jesus’s δόξα in his signs, so that all people may see his δόξα (appearance) and believe in him by confessing his δόξα (status, “the Christ, the Son of God”). Anything short of that will not yield eternal life in his name.

### **Glory as Hermeneutical Framework**

From this survey we can make a few observations. Only in 1:14–18; 2:11; 11:4, 40; and 12:41 is the use of δόξα in the category of appearance. These constitute the “edges” of the narrative, 1:14–18 being in the prologue (1:1–18) and 12:41 at the end of Jesus’s public ministry. The instances in 2:11 and 11:4, 40 are in the first and last miracles within this same narrative space. The other instances of δόξα, in the category of status, other than 12:43, are in the middle of the narrative (5:41, 44; 7:18; 8:50–54; 9:24). A pattern emerges in these occurrences of δόξα and we can map out their occurrences according to their respective meanings over the first twelve chapters of John. There is a

---

<sup>82</sup> Paul Rainbow helpfully notes that the twin themes of divine sovereignty and human responsibility are presented in the Gospel, and that John doesn’t seem to find them at odds with each other, in Paul A. Rainbow, *Johannine Theology: The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 144.

discernable “outer frame” and “inner frame” to Jesus’s public ministry (chs. 1–12) when it comes to John’s use of δόξα:

Table 10. Glory as hermeneutical frame pt. 1

	“Outer Frame”				
		“Inner Frame”			
	A	B	C	B’	A’
Category of Meaning	“Radiance”	“Radiance”	“Honor”/ “Praise”	“Radiance”	“Radiance” and “Honor”
References	1:14	2:11	Chs. 5–9	11:4, 40	12:41 and 12:43

The following table also illustrates this framing. The table indicates occurrences of δόξα as appearance with an “x” and occurrences of δόξα as status with an “o.”

Table 11. Glory as hermeneutical frame pt. 2

	“Outer Frame”											
	“Inner Frame”											
Chapter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Instances of δόξα	x	x			o		o	o	o		x	xo
	Contexts of Disbelief											
	Pattern: Δόξα revealed in σημεῖα for belief.											
	Δόξα defined and set in revelatory framework.						Δόξα further defined by rejection.					

The outer frame is constituted by definitions of δόξα and attestations that Jesus’s δόξα is Yahweh’s δόξα (1:14; 12:41). The prologue introduces and defines δόξα as the radiance of God’s character, predicating about Jesus’s δόξα what is predicated in the OT about Yahweh (1:14). It also sets the revelation of Jesus’s δόξα within the framework of

previous revelations of God through Moses (1:16–18). John himself bears witness that Jesus’s *δόξα* is Yahweh’s *δόξα*. This is matched by 12:41 when John asserts that “Isaiah saw his glory” in reference to Jesus. Instead of an encounter with Yahweh, John interprets Isaiah as encountering Jesus (John 12:40), thus by substitution implying that Jesus’s *δόξα* is Yahweh’s *δόξα*. Thus A and A’ of the outer frame bracket the ministry of Jesus as one of revealing the glory of Yahweh, while A’ also provides an apologetic as to why many failed to see this revelation (12:37–43). A’ also demonstrates a development of *δόξα*, for the glory of Yahweh is seen in the servant who is glorified and lifted up through rejection (12:38). A’ serves to explain the rejection by the Jews throughout the narrative, but also interprets this rejection as part of God’s plan to glorify and lift up the servant. It is through the rejection of the servant, in fulfillment of Isaiah 6:10, that Jesus will be glorified and lifted up on the cross. In using the label “outer frame” I do not mean that chapters 1–12 form an exclusive unit of thought, for the prologue is the prologue to the whole Gospel, not just chapters 1–12. Additionally, 12:37–43 gives John’s editorial comments on Jesus’s rejection, but then 12:44–50 continues with Jesus’s own comments about those who do not receive him. Thus both 1:14–18 and 12:37–43 are but parts of larger units, the former as ending the prologue and the latter as part of the section that closes out Jesus’s public ministry.<sup>83</sup> Nonetheless these passages frame Jesus’s public ministry of signs quite explicitly and aid the reader to understand that to see Jesus’s *δόξα* is to see Yahweh’s *δόξα*, and therefore to reject Jesus is tantamount to rejecting Yahweh.

The inner frame is comprised of the miracle at Cana and the resurrection of Lazarus, which also are the first and last miracles in the public ministry of Jesus. These miracles bracket the other miracles of Jesus, which comprise many other signs done

---

<sup>83</sup> Jesus’ words in 12:44–50 are not presented as an “additional event” in Jesus’ public ministry. John already recounted that Jesus is not openly walking among the Jews (11:54), and that Jesus had hid himself from the crowd (12:36b). In 12:44–50 it seems we have John’s intentional placement of Jesus’ words in this juncture of his narrative in order to provide Jesus’ own words as commentary on what it means for those who do receive or do not receive him and his words.



before his disciples and the public (2:23; 6:2; 7:31; 20:30). The fact that these miracles are labeled a “sign” (2:11; 12:18), are the only signs that are explicitly connected with manifestation of δόξα (2:11; 11:4, 40), and that they begin and end John’s presentation of Jesus’s public ministry, strongly suggest that John intends them to frame Jesus’s ministry.<sup>84</sup> This inner frame provides the pattern for how Jesus’s δόξα is revealed—it is revealed in the signs he performs for the purpose of belief. Both of these signs also indicate that a new eschatological age has come in Jesus, associating the revelations of δόξα with the fulfillment of Israel’s Scriptures. Therefore the “outer frame” and “inner frame” both bracket the public ministry of Jesus and together characterize it as a ministry of revealing Yahweh’s δόξα in signs for belief, while also providing an apologetic for why many did not respond with belief.

In the middle of these “frames” are the occurrences of δόξα in chapters 5–9, all bearing the meaning of either “honor” or “praise.” The common denominator between these occurrences is that they are used in contexts of the Jews’ rejection of Jesus or confusion about him (5:41, 44; 7:18; 8:50, 54; 9:24). This use of δόξα as status provides John with one of the reasons that many do not believe. In contrast to Jesus, who seeks only the Father’s glory (7:18), they are oriented towards their fellow man and do not regard δόξα from God, therefore they fail to see the δόξα of God revealed in Jesus (5:44, 12:43). John utilizes δόξα to demonstrate that the failure of vision is a moral failure, even though it is divinely ordained (12:37–43). One’s love for δόξα from one another will blind them to δόξα revealed from God.

---

<sup>84</sup> Köstenberger also notes how these two signs are “framing references” and effectively “envelop John’s presentation of all of Jesus’ signs in the first half of his Gospel,” in Andreas J. Köstenberger, “The Glory of God in John’s Gospel and Revelation,” in *The Glory of God*, ed. Christopher W. Morgan and Robert A. Peterson, Theology in Community (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 110. Bauckham also detects that in light of 2:11 and 11:4, 40, “we should undoubtedly conclude that all of the signs reveal the glory of God, which is also Jesus’s own glory, the divine glory revealed in him,” in Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 55.

We set out to understand John's use of *δόξα* within the narrative structure of his Gospel, and we find that John uses *δόξα* at important junctures of his narrative to help frame the narrative itself. It serves as a hermeneutical framework for Jesus's public ministry. If John has indeed framed the public ministry of Jesus in this way, how does it achieve the purpose of his gospel (20:31)? In the signs of Jesus, and perhaps even his works and words, John is presenting Jesus as the revelation of Yahweh's glory, for the glory of Jesus is the glory of Yahweh. John's Christological focus is theological. To believe in Jesus as the "Son of God" (20:31), for John, must entail the recognition, the *seeing*, that Jesus is the revelation of the Father.<sup>85</sup> To confess Jesus as the Son is to recognize Yahweh's glory in him. This explains why eternal life consists in knowing God *and* the one whom he has sent (17:3), for John is asserting one cannot know God unless you see God in the one whom he has sent. The presentation of Jesus's public ministry then is a presentation of glory, of God's glory in Jesus. Thus a rejection of Jesus, or a failure to see his glory, is a rejection of God and a failure to believe in Moses.

Additionally there is a development of the understanding of *δόξα* from the introduction of glory (1:14) to the rejection of glory (12:37–43). The eschatological nature of this revelation of glory is seen in how Jesus's signs demonstrate him to be the Messiah who brings a new age of abundant life (2:11) and the one who brings eschatological resurrection life forward into the present (11:4, 40). In 12:37–43 John not only explains why so many have failed to see what he bears witness to, but he interprets the rejection itself, as illustrated throughout the narrative, as proof that Jesus is the glorified and lifted up servant whom Isaiah prophesied about. Retrospectively, then, from the perspective of 12:37–43, the failure of the Jews to see Jesus's *δόξα* (5:41, 55; 7:18; 8:50–54; 9:24) only builds the case for Jesus as the one Isaiah foresaw. This is the glory

---

<sup>85</sup> Chibici-Revneanu rightly points out how in 12:37–41, once again signs, faith, and *δόξα* are related, similar to the miracle of Cana in 2:11, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 193. The failure to believe is the failure to see, such that seeing relates to knowing, understanding, and believing.

of the servant of Yahweh who, in his rejection by men, is led to be lifted up and glorified on the cross to take away the sins of the world. Therefore the revelation of glory (1:14) is to be seen in the signs that Jesus does (2:11; 11:4, 40), and the rejection of them (5:41, 55; 7:18; 8:50-54; 9:24) leads to the ultimate sign that reveals his glory, the glorification of the servant on the cross (12:37–43).

We can anticipate a few ways that our understanding of *δόξα* at this point may aid the interpretation of the disciples' *δόξα* in John 17:22. The possible ways track with the possible meanings of *δόξα* as appearance or status. First, the characterization of disbelief in the horizontal seeking of *δόξα* ("from one another," 5:44; "from man," 12:43) may inform the giving of *δόξα* from Jesus to his disciples (17:22). Perhaps *δόξα* in 17:22 should also be understood in the category of status, in that the disciples ought to seek it from the only God (5:44) and not from one another. In 17:22, then, it is possible that Jesus is providing the *δόξα* ("honor") from God, establishing securely the identity of his disciples in the face of a world that may hate them (15:18). Second, the ministry of Jesus is one of revealing the glory of the Father in his signs. At this point there is no indication that the disciples are to perform signs like Jesus, but later they will be said to do "greater works" than Jesus does, which is set in the context of revealing the Father in the Son (14:12). If the disciples are to continue the work of Jesus, and his work is framed in revelatory terms, then the granting of glory to the disciples as they are sent out by Jesus may indicate that their mission may have revelatory aspects as well (17:18, 22).

Nielsen's study on narrative structure and glory in John came to the conclusion that *δόξα* and *δοξαῖζω* are about divine identity and the recognition of this identity. In this I agree, but recognition of divine identity does not sufficiently explain John's framing of Jesus's ministry. John does not present Jesus as revealing God's glory to merely assert, "Recognize his divine identity." John asserts more than this when the prologue compares the revelation through Moses to the revelation through Jesus, stating that it transcends what Moses had been given at Sinai (1:14–18). Thus as the prologue attests, it is not

simply that Jesus will exhibit the character of God as revealed at Sinai, but that this new revelation will transcend it. In seeing Jesus's *δόξα* we are not simply recognizing him to be God, but we have a new reference point for who God is. Thus John presents Jesus as a reality that expands our understanding of who God is. There is the sheer fact that God has come in the flesh, yet it is the Son from the Father, who is one with the Father and yet distinct from the Father. Jesus's ministry of glory, then, is not underscored simply to communicate that Jesus is God, but that God is more than previously revealed through Moses. Like Nielsen, we can affirm that *δόξα* is about divine identity and the recognition of that identity, but it is also a re-shaping and expansion of that identity. Rather than, "Come, see that Jesus is God," John calls to his audience, "Come, see who God is like through Jesus." Each sign given builds his case, and presents Jesus in greater perspective, expanding one's view of God and understanding of who he is. The signs given also build John's case by proving Jesus came to be rejected by men and die on the cross, in order to bring about the resurrection life that God promised to Israel. The radiance of God's character is ultimately shown through the fulfillment of kingdom promises through the rejection and death of the king—this king laid down his life in love.

The use of *δοξάζω* should also be informed by this study on *δόξα*. It is more than likely that the verb will carry on the same theme and pattern the noun has introduced. We already see this in the parallel usage of 11:4, "It is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it." The use of *δοξάζω* is generally reserved for the particular events of Jesus's "hour." We anticipate that the long awaited "hour" (cf. 2:4) of Jesus must too be a sign, a climactic one that reveals Jesus's glory to be Yahweh's glory, inviting us to ask how it does so and in what ways it transcends prior revelation.

## CHAPTER 4

### GLORIFICATION AND JESUS

Understanding the theme of glory in the Gospel of John, as elucidated by both terms  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , is necessary as we seek to interpret the meaning and function of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22. Chapter 2 examined the meaning and explanation of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  that John provides in the prologue (1:14–18) and Chapter 3 recognized the way he framed the public ministry of Jesus as one of revealing Yahweh’s glory in signs. We are now in position to examine John’s use of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  in his Gospel. What follows will neither be a comprehensive survey of all  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  passages nor a treatment of all issues related to glorification in John. The aim of this chapter is more specific and simple. I will argue that John presents the glorification of Jesus, especially in his death and resurrection, as the climactic sign of glory that reveals the love of God. Following the logic of the prologue (1:14–18), this new act of redemption in Jesus by God is the defining way in which he has made his glory known and should be the new point of revelation by which God’s people know him.  $\Delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  continues the theme of the revelation of the Father in the Son that was uncovered in the previous two chapters. I anticipate that the glorification of Jesus, as related to the glorification-work continued through the disciples, will have application to the meaning and function of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22.

#### A Brief Overview

In all twenty-three occurrences of the verb  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  Jesus the Son or God the Father is being glorified, either as the verb’s subject with the passive form of the verb (e.g. 15:8, “By this my Father is glorified”), or its object, when another is the subject (e.g.

17:5, “And now, Father, glorify me”).<sup>1</sup> Only the Father and Son are glorified in John’s Gospel. The contexts of the glorification of the Father or the Son are as follows (whether through elaboration in the immediate context or through prepositional phrases modifying the verb): the Father is glorified in the Son’s death (12:28; 13:31; 17:1), in the Son answering the disciples’ prayers after he goes away (14:13), in the fruit-bearing of the disciples (15:8), in the Son accomplishing the work the Father gave him to do (17:4), and in the death of Peter (21:19). The contexts of the Son’s glorification are: through the illness of Lazarus (11:4), in his own death (12:23; 13:31), by the Holy Spirit’s disclosure of what belongs to Jesus to the disciples (16:14), with the Father (17:5), and by his disciples (17:10).

We can observe that glorification occurs in primarily two contexts: in the work of the Son and in the continuation of his work through the disciples. Although there is clearly a mutual glorification that takes place between the Son and the Father, the locus of glorification is *in the Son*, that is, in *his* glorification. John 1:14–18 and John 11:4 already prepares the reader to understand that when Jesus “is glorified,” it is “for the glory of God.” The revelation of Jesus’s glory leads to the revelation of God’s glory. Therefore when Jesus declares that it is “the hour” of the Son of Man’s glorification (12:23), he also prays, “For this purpose I have come to this hour. Father, glorify your name” (12:27). The logic is clear. For the Father to glorify his own name, the Son of Man must be glorified, that is, he must be lifted up from the earth, he must die and draw all people to himself (12:32; cf. 13:31; 17:1–5).<sup>2</sup> Enveloped in between Jesus’s declaration in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Son being glorified (whether as subj. or obj.) [13x]: 7:39; 8:54 (2x); 11:4; 12:16, 23; 13:31 (3x); 16:14; 17:1, 5, 10. The Father being glorified (whether as subj. or obj.) [10x]: 12:28 (3x); 13:31 (2x); 14:13; 15:8; 17:1; 17:4; 21:19.

<sup>2</sup> An important distinction must be made between the glorification of God and the glorification of Jesus. Their mutual glorification takes place in the “hour” (13:31–32), yet the locus of glorification must be *in the Son*. That is, in the Son’s going to the cross, dying, and rising from the dead. We cannot collapse the glorification of the Father into the glorification of the Son. The Father does not go to the cross, but rather *in the Son’s* cross-work, the Father is glorified. However, in the Gospel the Father is so intimately involved in every way through his Son, that Jörg Frey goes so far to say that it may be possible to call the Father a “co-sufferer,” in “God in the Gospel of John,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One*, trans. Wayne

12:23 and his prayer in 12:27 is a call for his disciples to follow him in his pattern of death, that is, to follow him in his glorification. This is a significant passage in understanding discipleship and glorification in the Gospel since it is the first time it connects the two so explicitly. The link between Jesus's glorification and discipleship also confirms the need to understand Jesus's glorification in the Gospel before we can know how the disciples are to follow Jesus in his glorification, and how that may relate with *δόξα* given to them in 17:22. This chapter will focus on glorification and Jesus, and the next on glorification and discipleship.

Space does not permit examining each *δοξάζω* passage, but I will present a fresh argument for why glorification should be rightly located *in* the death and resurrection of Jesus, and then ask what is revealed about the glory of God in the death of Jesus, according to John's unique presentation as informed by the prologue. The outline of this chapter will be as follows. First I will identify how John's specific use of *δοξάζω* is located in the "hour" and relate it to the glory-ministry of Jesus prior to the hour (chs. 1–12). Second I will briefly discuss the semantics of the term and propose that as *δοξάζω* relates to the hour, we should understand the term to indicate both an honoring and a revealing of God or the Son. Third, I will argue that in the glorification of the Son, that is, in his death and resurrection, John presents a climactic sign that reveals God's glory.

### ***Δοξάζω* and the Hour**

There is a specific way that *δοξάζω* is used which shows that John, at least in many instances of the term, has some definitive action or a bounded set of events in mind. The first use of the term in the Gospel reflects this, "as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (*Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη*, 7:39). Glorification

---

Coppins and Christoph Heilig, *Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 324. However, the distinction between Father and Son is also clear and maintained throughout the gospel.

here is an event or set of events that had not yet taken place, the taking place of which would precede the giving of the Spirit. That set of events begins to be defined for us in John 12:23, “The hour has come” (ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα) for the Son of Man “to be glorified” (δοξασθῆναι). A majority of the occurrences of δοξάζω, fourteen out of twenty-three (60%), are clustered in three specific passages: 12:23–28 (4x), 13:31–32 (5x), and 17:1–10 (5x). In all three passages the context is “the hour” (ἡ ὥρα, 12:23; 13:1; 17:1).<sup>3</sup> What in particular are these events, and what is the relationship between the glorification of Jesus in “the hour” and the miraculous signs of Jesus which revealed his glory?

### **The Events of Glorification**

What events comprise the hour of glorification? Because Jesus indicates that his hour of glorification has come (12:23) and immediately refers to a grain of wheat falling into the earth and dying (12:24), his hour of glorification is the hour of his death. This explains why his soul becomes troubled, and he states, “And what shall I say? ‘Father, save me from this hour’? But for this purpose I have come to this hour” (12:27). In addition, the hour of glorification is also called the time when Jesus will “be lifted up” (12:32, from ὑψόω).<sup>4</sup> John makes clear that the “lifting up” refers to the crucifixion of Jesus when he follows up with an editorial comment, “He said this to show by what kind of death he was going to die” (12:33). Therefore, the primary reference of Jesus’s glorification is his death on the cross. Yet John does have more in mind than the crucifixion of Jesus. If glorification must happen before the Spirit is given, then John must be including the resurrection of Jesus and his going to the Father (16:7) as part of

---

<sup>3</sup> The noun ὥρα occurs 26 times in the Gospel of John and usually refers to a specific hour or a general period of time (1:39; 4:6, 52 [2x], 53; 5:35; 11:9; 16:2, 4, 21; 19:14, 27). Other instances refer to the specific period of time that encompasses Jesus’ passion and departure to the Father (2:4; 4:21, 23; 5:25, 28; 7:30; 8:20; 12:23, 27 [2x]; 13:1; 16:25, 32; 17:1).

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion on the relationship between exaltation and glorification see Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 614–17.



Jesus's glorification (cf. also 13:1, "Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart out of this world to the Father. . ." and Jesus's repeated references to what is about to happen in terms of going away to the Father, 14:3; 16:5, 10, 17, 28; 17:11, 13). Therefore the hour of glorification includes the events of the death, resurrection, and return of Jesus to the Father.<sup>5</sup>

### **Relation between Glorification of the Hour and the Glory-Ministry of Jesus**

The assertion by Jesus in 12:23 forces a distinction between that which has come before and the glorification "now" announced. Many occurrences of *δοξάζω* also refer to the glorification of the hour (e.g. 7:39; 13:31–32; 17:1, 5). But in John 17:4 Jesus

---

<sup>5</sup> The glorification and lifting up of Jesus, like the glory of Jesus, is connected to the fulfillment of OT patterns and prophecy and draws from OT imagery as well. A few examples will be pointed out. Glorification (*δοξάζω*) is linked explicitly with exaltation, or "lifting up" (*ὑψόω*) (12:23, 12:32) and corresponds with the "glorified and lifted up" (*ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται*, Isa 52:13 LXX) servant of Isaiah 52:13–53:12 (cf. John 12:38–40). Jesus' death as a Passover lamb (1:29; 19:36–37) can also be viewed in connection to the description of the servant as the sacrificial lamb (Isa 53:7, 10). The glorification of the "Son of Man" (John 12:23; 13:31; cf. 1:51; 5:27) may be a reference to the Danielic "Son of Man" (Dan 7:13–14), while the "lifting up" saying of John 3:14 (also "Son of Man" as the subject) points to the typological fulfillment of the pattern of the serpent being lifted up on the pole in Numbers 21:9. The other lifting up saying in John 8:28 connects the Son of Man with Isaianic language where Yahweh declares himself to be the only savior, the "I am" (Isaiah 43:10; cf. also John 8:45). The "hour" of Jesus' glorification, having "come" in 12:23, begins the fulfillment (*πληρόω*) quotations of the passion (12:38–40; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 18:9, 32; 19:24; 19:36; cf. also 19:28, *τελείω*). "Fulfillment" language is not used prior to 12:38. What Ridderbos writes about the glory of Jesus being revealed at the wedding in Cana is also apropos for the glorification of Jesus,

All that has been promised by God and held out in prospect in a profusion of images and concepts is fulfilled in Jesus, it all lies enclosed in him, and it can therefore only be known in its realization and concretization from him . . . (in Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 109)

For the connection between glorification, exaltation and the servant of Isaiah see Daniel J. Brendsel, "Isaiah Saw His Glory": *The Use of Isaiah 52-53 in John 12*, BZNW 208 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014); Jörg Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One," in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 244–52. For Jesus' death as Passover lamb see Stanley E. Porter, "Jesus, the Passover Theme, and John's Gospel," in *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 198–224.. For the Son of Man as reference to the Danielic Son of Man, see D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 164; Benjamin E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 249 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 214–28. For the typological interpretation of John 3:14 and Numbers 21:9 see James M. Hamilton, *John* in vol. 9 of *The ESV Expository Commentary*, ed. Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton, and Jay Sklar (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019), 73–74. The allusion to Isaiah 43:10 from John 8:24, 28 is helpfully laid out and explained in David Mark Ball, "I Am" in *John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 188–91.

describes his ministry “on the earth” (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) with δοξάζω, designating his entire earthly ministry as one that “glorified” the Father,<sup>6</sup> which prevents us from restricting every instance of δοξάζω to the events of the hour (cf. also 11:4; 12:28). “I glorified you on earth” (ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) in 17:4 corresponds to Jesus’s statement in 17:6, “I have manifested your name [ἐφάνερwsά σου τὸ ὄνομα] to the people whom you gave me out of the world.”<sup>7</sup> Jesus has glorified the Father in revealing the name of the Father throughout his ministry.<sup>8</sup> When we consider that Jesus has been doing the works the

---

<sup>6</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 3:173; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 2:1054; Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 80; Johan Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, JSNTSup 160 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 92. Moloney also agrees that 17:4 indicates a completion of Jesus’ entire mission, but Moloney identifies a distinction between “the works” (τὰ ἔργα) and “the work” (τὸ ἔργον) of Jesus, in Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 143, 461. He sees τὰ ἔργα as that which makes God known, while the latter τὸ ἔργον refers to the whole mission of Jesus (4:34, 17:4). However, the instances of the singular τὸ ἔργον in 6:29 used by Jesus, and also in 7:21 (although anarthrous) make it difficult to maintain a strict distinction. In Ensor’s study on the work and works of Jesus, he finds that the “work” in 17:4, like in 4:34, “is primarily the work of revelation, whereby Jesus through word and deed revealed God and himself as the way to God, but also includes the work accomplished on the cross, whereby Jesus gave himself for the life of the world,” in Peter W. Ensor, *Jesus and His “Works”: The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective*, WUNT II 85 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996), 160. The connection between 17:4 and the cross is strengthened in the use of τελειώω (cf. 19:28), but should not be restricted to reference to the cross either. The verb is also used in 4:34 and 5:36 in context of the work or “works” the Father has given Jesus to accomplish, and in those contexts what Jesus has been given to accomplish encompasses his ministry and not just his hour of glorification.

<sup>7</sup> In light of John 1:14–18 and its vision of glory, with its connection to Exodus 33–34, the revelation of God’s name and the revelation of God’s glory are tied together (Exod 33:18; 34:5, 6–8). It is the revelation of who Yahweh is.

<sup>8</sup> The correspondence of 17:4, “I glorified you on earth” and 17:6, “I manifested your name” is commonly noted by interpreters, J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 862; Joshua J. F. Coutts, *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 447 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 76–85; Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 351; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1972), 521; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 462. Chibici-Revneanu disagrees, locating the “glorification” of Jesus *only* in the “hour” of John. She sees a strict divide between the glory-ministry of Jesus and the glorification of Jesus, such that the aorists of 12:28 and 17:4 are not past-referring but “punctiliar” and understood “ingressively, the aoristic statements have Jesus’ glorification tied even more closely to the most prominent ‘temporal point’ in the Fourth Gospel: the ‘hour,’” in Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, “Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine Δόξα-Language,” in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Gilbert Van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 223 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 519. Chibici-Revneanu interprets the aorists of 12:28 and 17:4 in this way because she claims that the Fourth Gospel is quite clear that “there was no glorification before the coming of the hour.” She points to verses such as 12:16. What about the counter-example of 11:4, “This illness does not lead to death, it is for the glory of God that the Son of Man may be glorified through it”? She explains this as a glory of God that could be seen in the raising of a dead friend (11:40), but not the glorifying of the Son of Man. She reads 12:16, and 7:39 as evidence that glorification could not have taken place in the raising of Lazarus. See her discussion as well in her monograph, Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 144–45. Therefore, for Chibici-Revneanu, the glorification statements of 12:16 and 7:39 control her interpretation of the glorification statements of 11:4, 12:28, and 17:4, eliminating the option of

Father has given him (5:19, 36; 10:38), in his Father's name (10:25), that Jesus's work displays the work of God (9:3), and that Jesus's signs reveal glory (2:11; 11:40), it is not difficult to understand that God has already been glorifying his name in Jesus's public ministry. Thus when the Father responds to Jesus in 12:28, "I have glorified [my name], and I will glorify it again" (καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω), the first of these occurrences, the aorist, refers to how the Father has already revealed his name through Jesus's signs (cf. 17:6), and the future tense refers to the coming hour of glorification just referred to in 12:23.<sup>9</sup>

---

Jesus' public ministry being described as glorification. See also Frey who also rules out glorification as reference to Jesus' prior miraculous deeds in John 12:28, in Frey, "The Glory of the Crucified One," 249. But is it necessary to understand glorification so strictly? Why can it not be that 7:39 and 12:16 indicate the particular hour of glorification, which Jesus often refers to as indicated in my discussion above, while 11:4, 12:28, and 17:4 are examples where glorification *also* describes the ministry of Jesus? This is more likely for three reasons. First, glory and glorification need not be bifurcated so strictly. To describe Jesus' ministry as glorification comes quite naturally within the theology of the Gospel in light of Jesus' public ministry of glory (cf. 1:14–18; 11:4, 40; 17:4, 6, 26). After 12 chapters of recounting signs that reveal glory, it is agreeable to think that Jesus glorifying the Father on earth (17:4) and the Father glorifying his own name (12:28; cf. 17:6, 26) refers to such activity. Second, glorification occurs through the disciples even after Jesus departs (14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 21:19). These instances are examples where although John usually designates glorification with a specific referent to the death, resurrection, and return of Jesus to the Father, glorification is also used to describe activity after those events. It is not inconceivable then, that glorification also describes Jesus' activity prior to the events of the hour either. Third, 11:4 indicates that the glory of God revealed through the miracle of Lazarus' resurrection is *also* the glorification of the Son of Man. Chibici-Revneanu forces a distinction that does not exist when she indicates that the "glory of God" is seen in the Lazarus miracle, but not the glorification of the Son of Man. It is inconsistent to claim that in 13:31–32 there is a blurring of lines between the glorification of the Son and the Father (see her article, "Variations on Glorification") while in 11:4 she maintains such a strict distinction between the glory of God and the glorification of the Son of Man. It makes more sense to understand that the statements of glory and glorification both apply to the raising of Lazarus, even while recognizing the event itself leads to the specific hour of glorification. For her interpretation of the clauses in 11:4 see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 146–49. For further critique on Chibici-Revneanu's view of 11:4 see chapter 3 where I discuss John 11:4.

<sup>9</sup> Köstenberger rightly sees in God's response a reference to both a past and future glorification of Jesus, encompassing both the manifestation of Jesus' glory in signs and also the glorification of Jesus at the cross, in Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Glory of God in John's Gospel and Revelation," in *The Glory of God*, ed. Christopher W. Morgan and Robert A. Peterson, Theology in Community (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 113. So also Murray J. Harris, *John*, EGGNT (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 233–34; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, WBC 36 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 212; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 426; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 441. Others interpret the aorist to refer to the passion, and the future to post-resurrection glorification. E.g., Nicholson sees the future aorist referring not to the death and exaltation of Jesus but to the continuation of "works" by the Johannine community after Jesus is glorified, Godfrey C. Nicholson, *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*, SBL Dissertation Series 63 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 129. Thüsing proposes that the aorist includes all of Jesus' ministry, inclusive of the passion, and that the future tense refers to the exalted Jesus drawing all men to himself, Wilhelm Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 21 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 195–98. Schnackenburg surveys the possibilities of what the aorist can refer to: (1) Jesus' pre-existent glory; (2) specific events in his earthly activity such as his baptism; (3) the "signs" in which Jesus' glory is revealed. He concludes that it is best to take ἐδόξασα as "referring to the whole of Jesus' earthly activity up to his

Within fourteen occurrences of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  in 12:23–28, 13:31–32, and 17:1–10, three of them describe Jesus’s ministry on earth as a whole or his public ministry until the time of his hour (12:28; 17:4, 10), but the rest refer to his hour.<sup>10</sup> A survey of all occurrences of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  reveal that over half (thirteen of twenty-three) refer to the specific hour of glorification (7:39; 12:16; 12:23, 28 [2x]; 13:31–32 [5x]; 17:1 [2x], 5). The verb is also used in reference to the raising of Lazarus from the dead, although its usage can be understood in connection with the hour of glorification as well (11:4).<sup>11</sup> Apart from these instances of Jesus’s ministry as glorification and his specific hour of glorification, there are six remaining occurrences of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ . Two of them refer to glorifying Jesus (both in 8:54) as he disputes with the Jews.<sup>12</sup> Three refer to how the disciples will glorify the Father after Jesus goes away (14:13; 15:8; 21:19), and lastly, still in the context of the disciples, the Holy Spirit will be sent to them and will glorify Jesus (16:14). The use of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , therefore, although used on a few occasions to describe Jesus’s ministry in general, or the continuing work of the disciples, is usually referring to the particular events of the hour.

Therefore,  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  is used in a specific way to describe the events of Jesus’s hour, but not exclusively so. The ministry of Jesus is also described as glorification, which is fitting in light of how the ministry of Jesus has been framed as a ministry of glory in signs. The glorification of Jesus’s hour, then, is seen in continuity with the signs of glory in his public ministry, but the particular use of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  for Jesus’s hour, which has been long anticipated since the beginning of the narrative (2:4), gives a heightened sense that the most important  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}$  event is about to occur.

---

‘hour.’,” in Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2:388.

<sup>10</sup> I argue that 17:10 refers to the disciples’ reception of Jesus’ ministry in chapter 6.

<sup>11</sup> As discussed in the previous chapter.

<sup>12</sup> “If I glorify ( $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ ) myself my glory is nothing. It is my Father who glorifies ( $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ ) me, of whom you say, ‘He is our God’” (John 8:54).

## Δοξάζω: Glory and Honor

Does the glorification of God mean the honoring of God or the revealing of God? As Caird observed, many commentators recognize that the verb *δοξάζω* is referring to the cross, but often many do not explain what the verb itself says about the cross.<sup>13</sup> Why did John use this particular word so often to describe Jesus's hour? What does John mean, for example, when he presents Jesus saying, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him" (13:31)?

BDAG lists two general meanings for *δοξάζω*:

1. to influence one's opinion about another so as to enhance the latter's reputation (glosses: to praise, to honor, to extol);
2. to cause to have splendid greatness (glosses: to clothe in splendor, to glorify).<sup>14</sup>

These definitions correspond to the two general categories of meaning for *δόξα* in the LXX and NT, status or appearance.<sup>15</sup> In applying these two possible meanings to John 13:31, where the aorist passive form is used (*ἐδόξασθη*), we may translate: (1) "Now is the Son of Man honored, and God is honored in him"; or (2) "Now is the Son of Man endowed with splendor, and God is endowed with splendor in him." The first definition can make sense, but in what sense can God be "endowed with splendor"? In the Gospel, only God or Jesus is glorified, and as Peter Ensor notes,

In their case, 'glory' was already theirs from before the creation of the world (17:5), [therefore] their 'glorification' is not a matter of acquiring something they never had, but rather of manifesting something that is inherently theirs.<sup>16</sup>

If there is any sense in which the Word become flesh has lost or set aside pre-incarnate glory (cf. 17:5),<sup>17</sup> then Ensor's argument may need slight modification. In any case, if it

---

<sup>13</sup> George B. Caird, "Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics," *New Testament Studies* 15, no. 3 (April 1969): 265–66.

<sup>14</sup> *BDAG* s.v. "*δοξάζω*."

<sup>15</sup> See the discussion on the meaning of *δόξα* in chapter 2.

<sup>16</sup> Peter W. Ensor, "The Glorification of the Son of Man: An Analysis of John 13:31–32," *Tyndale Bulletin* 58, no. 2 (2007): 235.

<sup>17</sup> So Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 557. I am in agreement with Ensor here, and interpret 17:5 not as a regaining of lost glory. See chapter 6 for an argument of 17:5 as a request of the

is true, that for God to be glorified, it must be a “manifesting something that is inherently [his],” then for God to be glorified it means his glory is being revealed. For the Gospel of John, then, it is possible that *δοξάζω*, when applied to God or Jesus, carries a meaning under the category of appearance not in terms of adding or endowing with glory, but revealing a glory already possessed. Caird made a linguistic case for such a reading, arguing for *δόξαζω* in the passive form to account for the middle-sense, something along the lines of, “to reveal one’s splendid greatness.”

Caird asked, “What does the Johannine Jesus mean when he says that God is glorified?”<sup>18</sup> In his analysis on John 13:31 he makes a persuasive argument regarding the aorist passive of *δοξάζω* as meaning “he has revealed his glory.” Pointing to the LXX usage of *δοξάζω* as the background, he proposes that the passive-form *ἐδοξάσθη* could be understood as a true passive in 13:31a, “Now the Son of Man is glorified [*νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*],” but that the second use should be understood as an intransitive passive, “and God has revealed his glory in him [*καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ*].” His explanation of the “intransitive passive” is similar to a description of a verb with middle-voice semantics in recent scholarship.<sup>19</sup> Caird points out that the LXX translations of the *nifal* of כבד and קדש are *δοξάζεσθαι* and *ἀγιάζεσθαι*, respectively (i.e. -θη passives), and yet carry a “reflexive” or “intransitive” meaning. These are instances where it means God has “manifested his glory” or “manifested his holiness” (e.g. Ezek 20:41; 28:22; 39:13). He concludes that in John 13:31, with God as the subject of *ἐδοξάσθη*, it means “God has revealed his glory in him.”

---

incarnate glorified Son to be with the Father.

<sup>18</sup> Caird, “Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel,” 265.

<sup>19</sup> E.g., see Rachel Aubrey, “Motivated Categories, Middle Voice, and Passive Morphology,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Christopher J. Fresch and Steven E. Runge (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 563–625.

Many have adopted Caird's proposal for the term or admitted its possibility.<sup>20</sup> For example, the *NIDNTTE* points out that the meanings of δόξαζω in the NT can also be "to show one's glory" or "to make or show one glorious."<sup>21</sup> Roger Aus made a similar argument about the aorist passive ἐνδοξασθῆναι in 2 Thessalonians 1:10, "when he comes on that day to be glorified [Aus: to reveal his glory, ἐνδοξασθῆναι] in his saints." C. A. Wanamaker dismissed this reading based on the (presumed) fact that contemporary Greek speakers would have understood the form to be strictly passive.<sup>22</sup> The same objection can be made to Caird's conclusion about John 13:31, but for two mitigating factors. First, Caird presented several verbs in the LXX which also carry an intransitive meaning in the passive form, and adduced other similar verbs in Classical Greek.<sup>23</sup> Second, recent research into deponency and the middle voice show an increasing awareness of passive-forms used with middle sense.<sup>24</sup> We can note Constantine Campbell's statement about such verbs, "It will also be necessary to acknowledge that some 'passives' will actually be middle in meaning, even if it is not yet possible to explain with certainty why it is

---

<sup>20</sup> Caird's article is widely cited, e.g., in BDAG and *NIDNTTE*. Carson notes that Caird has demonstrated how the *niphal* of כבד stands as a plausible background for the aorist passive of δόξαζω, in Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 482. See also Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible Commentary 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 2:606; Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 462; Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 450.

<sup>21</sup> Moisés Silva, ed., "Δόξα," in *NIDNTTE*, 1:761–67.

<sup>22</sup> Roger Aus' dissertation, "Comfort in Judgment: The Use of Day of the Lord and Theophany Traditions in Second Thessalonians 1," (PhD diss., Yale University, 1971) is cited and discussed by C. A. Wanamaker in Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 230.

<sup>23</sup> Caird, "Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel," 274–77.

<sup>24</sup> Carl W. Conrad argues that the fundamental polarity in ancient Greek should not be active-passive, but rather active-middle, and provides numerous examples, Carl W. Conrad, "New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb" (Unpublished paper, 2002), <https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/cwconrad/newobsancgrkvc.pdf>. See also Jonathan T. Pennington "Setting Aside 'Deponency': Rediscovering the Greek Middle Voice in New Testament Studies," in *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Matthew B. O'Donnell, New Testament Monographs 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 181–203. For a recent summary of the discussion on deponency, see Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 91–104.

so.”<sup>25</sup> More study needs to be done on the passive occurrences of δοξάζω and its possible middle-voice meanings.<sup>26</sup>

At the very least, in light of recent research, Caird’s proposal that the aorist passive ἐδοξάσθη in John 13:31 be rendered as “God has revealed his glory in him” is made more plausible. His understanding that ἐδοξάσθη in the first half, “Now is the Son of Man glorified” should be a true passive, is based upon the presumption that the cross-work of Jesus gains him a glory that was previously unpossessed.<sup>27</sup> However, the glory of Jesus in the Gospel of John is not an achieved status or glory but something he possesses by grant from the Father before the world began (17:24), and exhibits in the miracles he performs (e.g. 2:11). In John the cross-work of Jesus does not add to his glory but reveals it.<sup>28</sup> If this is a correct reading of John’s Christology, then the same logic that is applied to God and glorification can be applied to Jesus and glorification. When God is glorified it means his glory is revealed, rather than any glory being added unto him, and thus when Jesus is glorified it means his glory is revealed as well.

Ensor rejects Caird’s proposal for the aorist passive in 13:31 as carrying an “intransitive passive” sense of “to reveal one’s glory.” However, Ensor still interprets the glorification statements in terms of one agent revealing the glory of another.<sup>29</sup> Brown

---

<sup>25</sup> Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek*, 104.

<sup>26</sup> A Logos search of δοξάζω in the NT (NA<sup>28</sup>) and LXX (Rahlfs edition) shows 194 occurrences, with numerous examples of the aorist passive form but never with the aorist middle form. This may be further evidence that both middle and passive senses were expressed with the same passive form. More study is needed.

<sup>27</sup> Caird writes, “The glorification of Jesus on the Cross means his endowment with a glory which, at least in his representative function as the Son of Man, he has not up to that point possessed,” in “Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel,” 270.

<sup>28</sup> For example, in 8:28 Jesus asserts that when he is lifted up then others will recognize who he is. The lifting up does not make him who he is, that is, the Son of God, but demonstrates him to be who he is, one with the Father. The works of Jesus demonstrate the unity already present between Father and Son, revealing the glory of the Father even as it reveals the glory of the Son (cf. 10:38).

<sup>29</sup> Ensor takes the glorification statements in 13:31 as both true passives, “Now the Son of man is glorified, and God is glorified in him.” Ensor differs from Caird on several points. Ensor interprets “in him” instrumentally instead of locatively, “God is glorified *through* him,” and thus understands Jesus to be the active agent, glorifying the Father (that is, making known his divine qualities), and the Father as the active agent in glorifying the Son (that is, making known his divine qualities). Therefore Ensor still



accedes that Caird can be right, and thus admits “God reveals his glory [in Jesus]” (13:31b) is likely right. But Brown adds that the “full meaning” is found in also recognizing that “God is honored [by Jesus].”<sup>30</sup> The point of this discussion is not to argue that the aorist passives of *δοξάζω*, such as those in 13:31 or 11:4 must carry a “middle” or “intransitive passive” meaning, but that even without such a linguistic argument, interpreters recognize the revelatory features of glorification and also the possible double-meaning utilized by the term, meaning both “to honor” and “to reveal glory.”

How are we to determine, however, in specific instances of *δοξάζω*, whether it carries the meaning of status, such as “to honor,” “to praise,” and “to extol,” or the meaning of splendor, such as “to reveal glory” or “to endow with splendor”? Or should we opt, like Brown, to see both meanings present? John repeatedly presents Jesus as glorifying the Father and the Father as glorifying the Son through the events of the hour (13:31–32; 17:1). Correspondingly, in the Gospel the Son seeks the “honor” (*δοξάν*) of the Father (7:18) while the Father is the one who “honors” (*δοξάζων*) the Son (8:54).<sup>31</sup> If *δοξάζω* means “to honor” in connection to the events of the hour, it would seem fitting,<sup>32</sup> but in light of John’s prologue and developing narrative it would be incomplete.

The connection between seeing God’s glory (*δόξα*) in Jesus’s signs and the glorification (*δοξάζω*) of the Son of God was made explicit in 11:4 (cf. 11:40). Therefore,

---

understands the passive *δοξάζω* as carrying a meaning of revealing the glory one possesses, but through a different agent based on his interpretation of the passive voice. See Ensor, “The Glorification of the Son of Man,” 240–43.

<sup>30</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:606.

<sup>31</sup> For an argument on why the meaning of *δόξα* and *δοξάζω* in 7:18 and 8:54 should fall under the general category of status rather than appearance, see chapter 3.

<sup>32</sup> This is precisely how Loader interprets the occurrences of *δοξάζω* in reference to the hour, when God is glorified. He does not consider how John’s prologue and presentation of Jesus’ *δόξα* revealed in signs should impact the interpretation of *δοξάζω*. Additionally, he understands *δοξάζω* to refer primarily to the return to the Father, for a critique of this view see below. See William Loader, *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 219.

even if δόξαζω in 11:4 meant “that the Son of God may be honored,” it is *in* the revealing of God’s glory (i.e., through the raising of Lazarus, cf. 11:40) that the Son of God is honored. Conversely, when the Son of God reveals his glory in signs (2:11), the right response is that God should be honored in the honoring of his Son (5:23). Jesus’s glory as revealed through signs *is* the revealing of God’s glory to his people (John 1:14–18). Additionally, John connects the glorification of the Son of Man and his lifting up (12:23; 32) with the glorification of the Father’s name (12:28). Jesus glorified the Father on earth by doing the work the Father gave him to do (17:4) and revealed the name of the Father in his ministry (17:6). Thus the work and signs of Jesus both honor God and reveal God. It would be difficult to view the incredible act of Jesus willingly laying down his life only to take it up again (10:18) as something outside this paradigm of revelation. Even if we grant that 13:31 can mean, “Now is the Son of Man honored, and God is honored in him,” the narrative context of John pushes us to understand the cross of Jesus as that which brings honor to God in connection with its revelation of God. Therefore it is reasonable to recognize a double-meaning in the use of δόξαζω as it relates to the events of Jesus’s hour, as Chibici-Revneanu affirms,

Glorification is not just honoring, but also a revelation of God. These two aspects intertwine in the Gospel of John: Glorification is an honoring by revelation, or as well a revelation in honor.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, “Variations on Glorification,” 518. For example, in God’s response to Jesus’ prayer in 12:28, “I have glorified [my name], and I will glorify [my name] again” (καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δόξάσω), Chibici-Revneanu comments, “. . . In 12.28 both levels of meanings depend on each other – for how should God bring honor to his name without revealing it?” (“. . . in 12,28 beide Bedeutungsebenen aufeinander angewiesen – denn wie sollte Gott seinem Namen Here verschaffen, ohne ihn zu offenbaren?”), in Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 330. Several have recognized a double-meaning to the glory language of the gospel. C. H. Dodd argued that the evangelist uses δόξα to evoke both meanings of honor and divine revelation, in *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 207–8. Bauckham finds “prophetic precedence” from Isaiah 52:13–53:12 to both meanings of “honor” and “visible splendor” in δόξα and δόξαζω being activated in John, “The Servant is given the visible splendor that Isaiah saw in chapter 6, but he is also exalted to the highest position of honor. Here we have excellent prophetic precedent for John to move from one to the other meaning of both *doxa* and *doxazō*, or even to combine the meanings,” in Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 53–55.

### Δοξάζω: A Climactic Sign

Bultmann and Käsemann both emphasized glorification as Jesus's return to the Father while downplaying the significance of his death and resurrection in the Gospel of John. In 2006 John Dennis provided a survey of how Bultmann and Käsemann's interpretation of Jesus's death has provided the parameters of the debate up to the present day.<sup>34</sup> The Bultmann-Käsemann paradigm<sup>35</sup> emphasized the cross as an act of glorification (and revelation) and denied that the death of Jesus in the Gospel is a soteriological event. The death itself is part of the greater event of Jesus's earthly mission and is important because it marks the completion of his mission and Jesus's return to the Father. The cross is glorification because "in it Jesus leaves the world and returns to the Father."<sup>36</sup> Thus according to the Bultmann-Käsemann paradigm, the cross at one level adds nothing to the revelation yet as part of the greater glorification event, the death of Jesus makes revelation possible. This view links the death and resurrection with glorification because it *leads* to glorification.

Many have continued to use the Bultmann-Käsemann paradigm as a point of reference, either building upon it or in conscious departure from it. Dennis observed that those who approach the Gospel as a unity and interpret the text as it stands tend to interpret the death of Jesus along more traditional lines, that is, as an atoning event. The

---

<sup>34</sup> John A. Dennis, "Jesus' Death in John's Gospel: A Survey of Research from Bultmann to the Present with Special Reference to the Johannine Hyper-Texts," *Currents in Biblical Research* 4, no. 3 (June 2006): 331–63. See also Martinus C. de Boer's survey and critique of Bultmann and Käsemann on the death of Jesus, in *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 17 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 20–29.

<sup>35</sup> "The Bultman-Käsemann paradigm" is Dennis' designation and is in reference to their interpretation of the death of Jesus as non-atoning and only necessary in so far as it enabled revelation to take place, see Dennis, "Jesus' Death in John's Gospel: A Survey of Research from Bultmann to the Present with Special Reference to the Johannine Hyper-Texts," 331–39. In reference to Christology in general, Bultmann and Käsemann's *differences* have set the stage for scholarly debate as well, see Maarten J. J. Menken, "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer, JSNTSup 84 (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993), 292–93.

<sup>36</sup> Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*, trans. Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 19.

emphasis that Bultmann and Käsemann laid on the revelatory features of the Gospel are right, yet the discarding of any actual achievement by the cross failed to consider seriously the *ὑπερ* texts (John 6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50, 51, 52; 15:13) and the presentation of Jesus as a lamb who takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29).<sup>37</sup> Additionally, if there is no redemption at the cross, then what does it reveal about the Father? It makes sense that this paradigm must resort to seeing the cross as only *leading* to revelation. However, if it can be shown that the cross itself should be understood as glorification, not simply as the event that leads to glorification, then we must ask what it reveals about God.

The debate about Jesus's death raises two questions in our discussion of glorification. First, Bultmann and Käsemann rightly emphasized the theme of revelation, but is it more likely that glorification describes the death of Jesus because it leads to glory, or because there is glory in it? Second, if there is glory in the death of Jesus, what does it reveal about God? In this section I will argue that John presents the death and resurrection of Jesus as the climactic sign that reveals the glory of God, and in the next we explore what it reveals about God.

---

<sup>37</sup> Dennis provides a summary of works that have argued for Jesus' death as an atoning event, in "Jesus' Death in John's Gospel: A Survey of Research from Bultmann to the Present with Special Reference to the Johannine Hyper-Texts," 339–60. See also Dennis' monograph on the topic, John A. Dennis, *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel: The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology in the Light of John 11:47-52*, WUNT II 217 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). For John 1:29 as "programmatic" for understanding Jesus' death see Max Turner, "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John--Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (April 1990): 121–22; Jörg Frey, "The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John," in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 190, 195. For John the Baptist's statement in 1:29, it is possible, as Carson and Sandy have pointed out, that historically John the Baptist may have had in mind the apocalyptic warrior lamb from Second Temple Judaism, rather than Isaiah 53. This may be the case in light of his inquiry in Matthew 11:2ff. For this reason Sandy does not see a link back to Isaiah. Carson, though, presents a better solution than Sandy. He argues that in light of John's gospel as a whole, John the author would be using the Baptist's words as another example of how someone can speak better than they know (e.g. Caiaphas in John 11). If this is true, then John the Baptist may have understood Jesus coming as the warrior lamb to take away sin, yet appropriated in the Gospel of John's context, this warrior lamb is also the lamb that is a slaughtered, sacrificial lamb. See D. A. Carson, "Adumbrations of Atonement Theology in the Fourth Gospel," *JETS* 57, no. 3 (September 2014): 518–19; D. Brent Sandy, "John the Baptist's 'Lamb of God' Affirmation in Its Canonical and Apocalyptic Milieu," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34, no. 4 (December 1991): 447–59.

## Glorification and the Death of Jesus

William Loader published his well-received *Christology and the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues* in 1980, and has recently published a third edition under a new title, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (2017). Loader carries forward the Bultmann-Käsemann paradigm although with some modification. He continues the line of interpretation that argues that the death of Jesus makes revelation possible, but that it in itself does not interpose “an additional achievement such as atonement or victory.”<sup>38</sup> The lifting up of Jesus on the cross is exaltation and glorification “because in and through this event Jesus will be exalted to God’s presence.”<sup>39</sup> If we examine the usage of glorification language, we see, *contra* Loader, that John links glorification closely with death.<sup>40</sup> Additionally, the pattern of glory established in Jesus’s public ministry was that signs are performed to reveal God’s glory, and if the death and resurrection of Jesus can be a sign, then it follows that John intends for us to see in the death and resurrection itself a revelation of God’s glory.

First, John links glorification closely with death and resurrection: (a) The introduction of glorification and the defining of it with “the hour” in 12:23 is immediately followed by a reference to a seed of wheat dying so that it can bear fruit; (b) When Jesus calls on the Father, “Father, glorify your name” (12:28), in context he refers to the suffering on the cross, otherwise it would not make sense for his soul to be troubled and to pose the rhetorical question, “What shall I say? ‘Father, save me from this hour?’” (12:27); (c) In the same context, Jesus says he will be “lifted up” (from *ὑψόω*) from the earth (12:32), which may refer not only to his ascension to the Father but also to his cross. In light of John’s editorial comment, however, it surely emphasizes that he will be

---

<sup>38</sup> Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 270.

<sup>39</sup> Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 244.

<sup>40</sup> See also Chibici-Revneanu’s considered discussion on whether glorification is located in death or resurrection, or in death and resurrection. She concludes that death and resurrection should be kept together in glorification, see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 611–14.

lifted up on the cross to die (12:33). Here it is clear that John intends for his readers to view the lifting up on the cross *as* his exaltation, not simply as a step to the exaltation of Jesus with the Father;<sup>41</sup> (d) When Jesus makes the five-fold declaration of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  (13:31–32) it is true that immediately after in 13:33, he speaks of going where the disciples cannot come.<sup>42</sup> But even here the departure of Jesus has in view the way of his departure, his death, which Peter will follow later (13:36; 21:19). Additionally, Jesus’s remarks about glorification (13:31–32) are precipitated by Judas’ going out, initiating the passion of Jesus. Therefore out of the occurrences of  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  that refer to “the hour” or have “the hour” as their context, only one clearly refers to the exaltation of Jesus to the Father’s side (17:5). Much clearer connections to Jesus’s death and resurrection can be made for others (12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 17:1). Although it is true that the return to the Father is an important aspect of Jesus’s hour of glorification (cf. 13:1),<sup>43</sup> we cannot relegate the death and resurrection as a mere entry point to glorification but rather we must reckon with why the death of Jesus itself is described as glorification and exaltation.<sup>44</sup>

Second, if Jesus’s death and resurrection can be understood as a “sign” in which God’s glory is revealed in Jesus, then glorification takes place *in* the death and resurrection. John’s narrative presents Jesus performing miraculous acts as “signs” which display God’s glory. It would be strange if Jesus’s greatest act, the laying down of his life

---

<sup>41</sup> That  $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omega}$  refers to crucifixion, particularly in 12:32, is the commonly held view among scholars, e.g. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 378–79; Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2:394; Thompson, *John*, 272. However, see Nicholson’s objections which have not taken hold amongst interpreters, in Nicholson, *Death as Departure*, 137–38. For analysis of the lifting-up statements (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32), see Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, 3–35; Nicholson, *Death as Departure*, 75–144. For  $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omega}$  as reference to the servant of Isaiah in Isa 52:13, and the nature of this allusion in relation to the Greeks seeking Jesus, see Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 154–57.

<sup>42</sup> For an analysis of glorification language in 13:31–32 see the next chapter.

<sup>43</sup> Thus Margaret Pamment overstates her case when she argues that, “Only when Jesus’ death on a cross is in mind is the verb *doxazo* used,” in “The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 74, no. 1–2 (1983): 12–16.

<sup>44</sup> See also Jörg Frey’s concise arguments for why the death of Jesus is the “inner goal of the Johannine story of Jesus,” in “The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John,” 172–74.

and taking it up again (cf. 10:17), was excluded from this pattern. As John closes his gospel explaining that he has narrated such signs for the purpose of belief in Jesus and life in his name (20:31), it is most natural to include Jesus's death and resurrection as one of those signs. However not everyone agrees on the number of signs and whether the death and resurrection should be considered a Johannine "sign."<sup>45</sup>

### Death and Resurrection as "Sign"

Andreas Köstenberger argued that the death and resurrection of Jesus should not be considered a sign and that there are only seven specific signs identified in the Gospel.<sup>46</sup> Köstenberger proposed three criteria for identifying a "sign" in the Gospel:

1. Is a given work performed by Jesus as part of his public ministry?
2. Is an event explicitly identified as a "sign" in John's gospel?
3. Does the event, with its concomitant symbolism, point to God's glory displayed in Jesus, thus revealing Jesus as God's true representative?<sup>47</sup>

He found that the death and resurrection of Jesus did not fit the first two criteria, but also provided additional reasons why it should not be categorized as a Johannine "sign":

---

<sup>45</sup> There are many studies on "signs" in the Gospel, whether in regards to the composition of the Gospel, their number and function, their background, or their significance. See Peter J. Riga, "Signs of Glory: The Use of 'sēmeion' in St John's Gospel," *Interpretation* 17, no. 4 (October 1963): 402–24; Willis Hedley Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 186 (Mohr Siebeck, 2004); Raymond E. Brown, "Appendix III: Signs and Works," in *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols., Anchor Bible Commentary 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 1:525-32; M. de Jonge, "Signs and Works in the Fourth Gospel," in *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, ed. Tjitze Baarda, Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, and W. C. van Unnik, vol. 2, NovTSup 48 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978); Marianne Meyer Thompson, "Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 1 (1991): 89–108; Brandon D. Crowe, "The Chiastic Structure of Seven Signs in the Gospel of John: Revisiting a Neglected Proposal," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28, no. 1 (2018): 65–81; Gilbert Van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*, BETL 116 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994); Craig R. Koester, "Jesus' Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 47–74.

<sup>46</sup> He identifies the following as the seven signs: the changing of water into wine (2:1–11); the clearing of the temple (2:14–17); the healing of the nobleman's son (4:46–54); the healing of the lame man (5:1–15); the feeding of the multitude (6:1–15); the healing of the blind man (9:1–41); the raising of Lazarus (11:1–57).

<sup>47</sup> Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 328.

- a. Jesus's crucifixion and resurrection are the reality to which the signs point.
- b. The "signs" in John's gospel are preliminary in nature.
- c. While the "signs" reference in 20:30 allows for the possible inference that Jesus's crucifixion and resurrection should be numbered among the Johannine "signs," this inference falls short of making the connection explicit.
- d. It probably would have appeared rather inappropriate (if not blasphemous) to Jesus's own disciples, and to the author of John's gospel, to place Jesus's crucifixion and resurrection into the same category as the commonly acknowledged six Johannine signs.<sup>48</sup>

I find Köstenberger's case for excluding the death and resurrection of Jesus as a "sign" unconvincing. Let us first consider his three-fold criteria. He established these criteria by surveying the "six explicitly identified and commonly acknowledged Johannine signs in an effort to identify their common characteristics."<sup>49</sup> In selecting these particular signs to establish a criteria for evaluating other signs, if part of their inclusion for the data was that they had to be explicitly identified, then how can it follow that one of the criteria for establishing further signs is explicit identification? His method effectively predetermines what can be called a sign or not.

Köstenberger's first criterion is based upon the observation that because no signs are explicitly mentioned after chapter twelve, that the "signs" of Jesus, then, must be only in the public ministry of Jesus (chaps 1–12). He also points to chapter twelve and John's apologetic for why many did not believe as closing out the section on the "signs" of Jesus. Although John 12:37–43 closes out Jesus's public ministry, it does not necessarily limit Jesus's signs to his public ministry any more than it limits the explanation for why people do not believe in Jesus to chapters 1–12.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, if it is possible that 2:18–22 does indeed refer to Jesus's death and resurrection as a "sign," as

---

<sup>48</sup> Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, 330–32.

<sup>49</sup> Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, 326.

<sup>50</sup> The explanation of John for why people do not believe in Jesus (12:37–43) and John's positioning of Jesus' appeal to believe in him (12:44–50) also apply to the coming events in the narrative. As noted in the previous chapter, the vision of Isaiah is of a glorified and lifted up servant, thus Isaiah's vision itself testifies to an incarnate, glorified servant, and looks forward to the lifting up of Jesus on the cross.



I will argue below, then that satisfies Köstenberger's second criterion while nullifying his first.

The second criterion, that a "sign" ought to be explicitly labelled as such, is also debatable. Köstenberger pointed out six "signs" scholars generally acknowledge due to some explicit reference by John or characters in his gospel:

- (1) the changing of water into wine (2:1–11)
- (2) the healing of the nobleman's son (4:46–54)
- (3) the healing of the lame man (5:1–15)
- (4) the feeding of the multitude (6:1–15)
- (5) the healing of the blind man (9:1–41)
- (6) the raising of Lazarus (11:1–57)<sup>51</sup>

Four of these miracles are called a "sign" directly: the changing of water into wine (2:11); the healing of the nobleman's son (4:54); the feeding of the multitude (6:14); and the raising of Lazarus (12:18). In each case, John unambiguously refers to the miracle as a "sign" in an editorial comment. However, two of the miracles listed are labelled as such indirectly. For the healing of the invalid in 5:1–15, it is two chapters later in 7:31 that the crowds refer to "more signs" [πλεῖονα σημεῖα], indirectly identifying 5:1–15 a "sign" (cf. 7:21). Similarly, the healing of the blind man can be called a "sign" because the Pharisees are debating amongst themselves and include it in their reference to other signs, "How can a man who is a sinner do such signs [τοιαῦτα σημεῖα]?" (9:16). Why include these two miracles as "explicit" signs, although they are indirectly labelled as such, but not the death and resurrection which John may also be indirectly referring to in his purpose statement of John 20:31 (which comes directly after Jesus's resurrection and his appearances to the disciples)? Furthermore, throughout the Gospel are general references to "signs" that Jesus performs, some narrated by John and some not (2:23; 3:2; 6:2; 11:47; 21:30). The indirect labelling of two of the six signs listed above, along with the

---

<sup>51</sup> Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, 324.

general references to “signs” Jesus performs suggest that a “sign” need not be so explicitly identified.<sup>52</sup>

Next we consider Köstenberger’s additional reasons for excluding the death and resurrection as a “sign.” His first two reasons are similar: that the “signs” point forward to the reality of the crucifixion and resurrection; and that the “signs” in John’s gospel are preliminary in nature. Köstenberger, citing agreement with Schnackenburg, Barrett, Davies, de Jonge, and Brown, states in various ways that the concept of a “sign” is that it points to something else. Because the sign symbolizes something else, or points beyond itself, the death and resurrection of Jesus cannot be a sign because the events in themselves are the “reality to which the signs point.”<sup>53</sup> The signs are also “preliminary” in nature, so that once the reality (the death and resurrection) has come, no further signs are needed nor can the reality itself be called a sign. I don’t deny that the signs relate to Jesus’s death and resurrection. But in the Gospel the “signs” do not necessarily point to the reality of the death and resurrection of Jesus. What they point to is given by John—they reveal the glory of Jesus and the glory of God (2:11; 11:4). Thus in 2:11, Jesus manifested his glory in the first of his signs, and his disciples believed in him. The account does not indicate that they now understood something about the death and resurrection of Jesus, as if the sign primarily functioned to point forward to a later event. Rather, John shows that they saw his glory and believed in Jesus. Therefore “signs” do not so much point to the reality of the cross as much as they point to the identity of who performed them. Although it is understandable why many commentators have emphasized the symbolism of the signs and how they point elsewhere, in the context of the Gospel that “reality” is not the cross but the glory of Jesus. Understood this way, a

---

<sup>52</sup> Thus M. M. Thompson prefers to “cast the net widely” and not restrict what should be understood to be a “sign” as only those explicitly identified, Thompson, *John*, 66.

<sup>53</sup> Köstenberger, *A Theology of John’s Gospel and Letters*, 330.

“sign” reveals the glory of God in Jesus, and the death and resurrection, fittingly described with *δοξάζω*, can be appropriately called a “sign.”

Finally, we consider Köstenberger’s third reason. He asserts that the mention of “signs” in 20:30 may lead to the possible inference that Jesus’s crucifixion and resurrection is included among them, but that it falls short of making the connection explicit. In terms of an “explicit” connection, I already pointed out above that two of the six “explicit” signs are only indirectly so, and so it is questionable to exclude the death and resurrection on that basis. But I also want to point out how odd the placement of 20:30–31 reads if Köstenberger is right. Let us consider the flow of John’s narrative in the resurrection appearances of Jesus to his disciples. Jesus is crucified (19:17–37), laid in the tomb (19:38–42), and after being raised up makes appearances to Mary (20:11–18), to the disciples (20:19–23), and then to the disciples with Thomas present (20:24–29). Thomas’ famed confession caps this sequence, “My Lord and my God!” (20:28), and is followed by Jesus’s response, “Have you believed because you have seen me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed” (20:29).<sup>54</sup> It is at this point that John includes his purpose statement:

Now Jesus did many other signs [*σημεῖα*] in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name (20:30–31).

The purpose statement of John, in this context, would most naturally have in view the death and resurrection of Jesus, and the believing responses just narrated (and extend to

---

<sup>54</sup> For the issue of whether believing in Christ without “seeing” is a better kind of faith than that which requires “seeing,” see D. A. Carson, “Is Faith in Christ Without Evidence Superior Faith? A Re-Examination of John 20:29,” in *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology: Essays in Honor of Max Turner*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, Volker Rabens, and Cornelis Bennema (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 105–18. Carson argues that the disciples who saw Jesus belonged to a certain period of salvation history. The contrast he detects between “seeing and believing” (first part of 20:29) and “those who have not seen and yet have believed” is not between a faith that is inferior versus faith that is superior, but rather a contrast between the grounds of faith for those who were first generation believers and those who come afterwards.

all the signs in the Gospel, “written in this book”). We can note the connections between the purpose statement of 20:30–31 and the accounts just narrated: (a) Jesus stood among his disciples (20:19, ἔσται εἰς τὸ μέσον; also 20:26), and Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples (20:31, ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ); (b) The disciples see Jesus’s raised body and believe (20:20, 20:28–29), and “These are written so that you may believe” (20:31). It would seem John purposefully placed 20:30–31 after these accounts since they illustrate his intent for writing the book.<sup>55</sup> In Köstenberger’s view, these “signs” which are written for John’s readers exclude what was just narrated and must refer to the signs narrated in the public ministry of Jesus, the last of which was reported over 9 chapters back by our modern reckoning. Köstenberger’s criteria for signs forces a reading of 20:30–31 that lifts it out of its context.<sup>56</sup>

Finally, a positive case can be made that John identifies the death and resurrection of Jesus explicitly as a “sign.” In 2:13–17 John narrates how Jesus went into the temple and subsequently drove out livestock, overturned tables, and poured out the coins of the money changers. In response to these dramatic actions the Jews asked Jesus, “What sign do you show us that you do these things?” (τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς, 2:18). “These things” (ταῦτα) refer to the actions Jesus just performed and are the cause for which they ask for a sign from Jesus. It is certainly possible, as Dodd argues, that although the Jewish leaders ask for a sign, John intends for us to understand the

---

<sup>55</sup> Koester finds that the resurrection appearances function in a manner similar to the signs narrated earlier, in “Jesus’ Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John,” 52–53.

<sup>56</sup> Van Belle categorized the “traditional interpretations” of the reference of σημεῖα in 20:30–31 under four headings: (1) the miracles or miracle narratives in chapters 1–11; (2) the resurrection narratives of chapter 20; (3) both the miracle narratives and the resurrection narratives; (4) the content of his entire gospel. See Gilbert Van Belle, “The Meaning of Sēmeia in John 20,30-31,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 74, no. 4 (1998): 300–325. Van Belle’s discussion is largely oriented along source-critical discussions. See also his 1994 monograph where he extensively documents the “Semeia Hypothesis,” its proponents and its opponents, and provides a critical evaluation, Van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*. For 20:30–31, Van Belle concludes that σημεῖα has in view the contents of the entire gospel, see his Appendix I, “The Johannine ΣΗΜΕΙΑ,” 389–404, esp. 404.

dramatic actions themselves as the sign.<sup>57</sup> Köstenberger follows this line of interpretation as well and identifies the temple clearing as part of John’s seven signs. However, all the other signs of John that are explicitly identified as such are miraculous acts, and although it is possible that the clearing itself is a prophetic sign of sorts in the style of the OT, it doesn’t follow the pattern of John.<sup>58</sup> This doesn’t exclude the dramatic actions of Jesus from being a sign but make it less likely.<sup>59</sup> Alternatively, a more likely referent to the sign is found in Jesus’s own answer. Jesus answers their question not by pointing at the actions just performed, but by pointing to his death and resurrection, “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up” (2:20). The clarifying comment made immediately after by John demonstrates that by “temple” Jesus meant the “temple of his body” and thus the raising up of it in three days is the resurrection of his body (2:21–22). Therefore the “sign” Jesus refers to is most likely not the temple cleansing itself, but rather is the death and resurrection of Jesus, a sign that reveals glory and that should lead to belief (2:22).<sup>60</sup>

In addition to the reference to the death and resurrection as “sign” in 2:18, the usage of the verb *σημαίνω* is instructive as well. Salier notes that the three occurrences of the verb *σημαίνω* used in the Gospel are significant (12:33; 18:32; 21:19):

τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν. (12:33)  
 “He said this to show by what kind of death he was going to die.”

---

<sup>57</sup> Dodd finds in Jesus’ response to the Jews a parallel in 6:30, where the Jews also demand a sign after the feeding of the multitude. Dodd argues that Jesus, like in 6:30, is inviting his questioners to realize that his previous action is the actual sign they seek, in Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 301.

<sup>58</sup> The examples in the OT that are not miraculous (e.g., Isaiah walking stripped and barefoot for three years, Isa 20:3) are precisely why Köstenberger does not make a miraculous act one of the criteria for identifying the signs, although the six signs he uses for establishing criteria are all miraculous acts.

<sup>59</sup> However, we must note that “sign” or “signs” in the Gospel unambiguously relate to miraculous acts, while other possible signs (such as the temple clearing) are at best ambiguously a “sign,” see Thompson’s observations in, “Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel,” 93n15.

<sup>60</sup> Also Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 56; Edward W. Klink, *John*, ZECNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 181–82.

ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίω θανάτῳ ἡμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν.  
(18:32)

“This was to fulfill the word that Jesus had spoken to show by what kind of death he was going to die.”

τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίω θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει αὐτῷ·  
ἀκολούθει μοι. (21:19)

(This he said to show by what kind of death he was to glorify God.) And after saying this he said to him, “Follow me.”

The verb is used each time in the context of Jesus’s death or in Peter’s case, of following after the pattern of Jesus’s death. Salier points out that John’s use of the verb cognate of *σημεῖον*, in 12:33 and 18:32, establishes a subtle connection between the death of Jesus on the cross and the language of *σημεῖον*. Additionally, the use in 21:19 shows that Peter will glorify God in death as well, again using the language of *σημεῖον*. Salier concludes,

The connections established between the hour, glory, the lifting up of Jesus, the cross, and language cognate with *σημεῖον* lead the reader to view the death of Jesus as a *σημεῖον*.<sup>61</sup>

In sum, there is good reason to view the death and resurrection of Jesus as his glorification, not simply that it leads to it.<sup>62</sup> The glorification of the Son also includes the return to the Father’s side (17:5), but the emphasis on glory and glorification is not in the mere return to the Father, but rather in the manner of return, through Jesus’s death and resurrection. In contrast (but not necessarily in contradiction) to the Synoptic presentation of Jesus’s death, glory does not only come after his suffering, but is in his suffering.<sup>63</sup> The verb *δοξάζω* is used to describe the cross in order to highlight how Jesus’s obedience on

---

<sup>61</sup> Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*, 123.

<sup>62</sup> *Contra* Francis Moloney who writes, “The glorification of Jesus, however, does not happen on the cross. He is glorified by means of the cross. Jesus will be glorified only when—his words clearly allude to 1:1–2—through the cross and resurrection he returns to the glory he had with the Father before all time,” in Francis J. Moloney, *Love in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical, Theological, and Literary Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 53. To say that Jesus is glorified only when he returns to the Father, and that only the Father is glorified on the cross, ignores the pattern of glory where Jesus’ own glory is revealed in signs.

<sup>63</sup> In the Synoptic gospels *δόξα* or *δοξάζω* are never used to describe the death of Jesus, but only the eschatological return of Jesus as the Son of Man (Matt 16:27; 19:28; 24:30; 25:31; Mark 8:38; 13:26; Luke 9:26; 21:27; 24:26).

the cross honors the Father but also how it reveals glory. Those who interpret Jesus's cross as the reality to which the signs point are right in that the cross is an event unlike the previous signs, and an event to which the entire narrative has been anticipating since mention of "the hour" (2:4).<sup>64</sup> The cross and resurrection are uniquely labelled as glorification because they are the climactic act of Jesus, the greatest "sign" which reveals the glory of Jesus, which also reveals the glory of God.<sup>65</sup>

### **Δοξάζω: Revelation of God's Love**

Forestell's work was a welcome corrective to the Bultmann-Käsemann paradigm by centering the revelation of God in the cross of Jesus. He argued that the cross was the "supreme revelation of the love of God for men because Jesus effectively lays down his life for his sheep."<sup>66</sup> However, in line with Bultmann and Käsemann, he continued to deny that there was any sense of a vicarious atonement in the Gospel.<sup>67</sup> Max Turner pointed out the problems in Forestell's interpretation:

Forestell leaves himself unable to offer a satisfactory alternative explanation of why Jesus has to die at all, of how his death can truly be said to be 'for us', or why it should be considered the cardinal revelation of the Father's love.<sup>68</sup>

Forestell rightly recognized the revelatory import of Jesus's death in the Gospel while he simultaneously subverted its revelation by denying that the cross achieved anything.

Dennis observed that those who interpret John's Gospel as a whole and respect the

---

<sup>64</sup> The resurrection of Lazarus, as pointed out in the previous chapter, also links the revelation of glory and death (11:4, 40) and anticipates the glory of God in Jesus' death.

<sup>65</sup> Although Köstenberger did not identify the death and resurrection as a "sign," he still identifies the cross as a climactic revelation of God's glory in Christ, see Köstenberger, "The Glory of God in John's Gospel and Revelation," 108–9.

<sup>66</sup> J. Terence Forestell, *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, *Analecta Biblica* 57 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 191–92.

<sup>67</sup> Thus one of the weaknesses of the redaction-critical and source-critical approaches is evident, as Forestell relegates passages such as John 1:29 and 20:23 as "secondary" and as an "intrusion," see Forestell, *The Word of the Cross*, 148, 157, 194.

<sup>68</sup> Turner, "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John--Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell," 122.

narrative unity of the Gospel tend to push back on such conclusions and make a case for Jesus's death on the cross as vicarious atonement for sin and necessary for salvation.<sup>69</sup> Therefore it is better to affirm with Forestell that the cross is the supreme revelation of God's love, but to add with Turner, because "there, in his Son, God dealt decisively with sin."<sup>70</sup> Turner did not simply indicate that "there, at the cross" God dealt decisively with sin, but in particular, there "in his Son," God dealt decisively with sin. It is in the sending of *God's son* to deal decisively with sin that we find the love of God displayed.

It is ironic that the theme of Jesus coming down from heaven and ascending back to the Father, or his being sent from God,<sup>71</sup> has served as the greater context in which some scholars found the significance of the death of Jesus's diminished. This greater context, some would argue, makes Jesus's death merely as a waypoint towards glory.<sup>72</sup> On the contrary, the sending of the Son and his heavenly origin (as indicated in

---

<sup>69</sup> Such as Bruce H. Grigsby, "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 5, no. 15 (1982): 51–80; Turner, "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John--Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell"; Rainer Metzner, *Das Verständnis der Sünde im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT 122 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Jörg Frey, "Die 'Theologia Crucifixi' des Johannesevangeliums," in *Kreuzestheologie im Neuen Testament*, ed. Andreas Dettwiler and Jean Zumstein, WUNT 151 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 169–238. See Dennis for a brief overview of these works and for a fuller listing of other works, Dennis, "Jesus' Death in John's Gospel: A Survey of Research from Bultmann to the Present with Special Reference to the Johannine Hyper-Texts," 349, 360–61.

<sup>70</sup> Turner, "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John--Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell," 121. See the discussion by Köstenberger, where he affirms redemption and revelation go together, not separately, in Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, 534–38. See also his exposition of glory in John's gospel where he concludes "John's theology of glory is at the same time a theology of the cross," in Köstenberger, "The Glory of God in John's Gospel and Revelation," 107–19, esp. 119.

<sup>71</sup> Some works that address the descent and ascent schema in the Gospel of John are Wayne A. Meeks, "Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *JBL* 91, no. 1 (March 1972): 44–72; Nicholson, *Death as Departure*; John W. Pryor, "The Johannine Son of Man and the Descent-Ascent Motif," *JETS* 34, no. 3 (September 1991): 341–51. Recently Susan Humble examined language related to descending, ascending, coming, going, and sending in the Gospel, in Susan Elizabeth Humble, *A Divine Round Trip: The Literary and Christological Function of the Descent/Ascent Leitmotif in the Gospel of John*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 79 (Leuven: Peeters, 2016). Humble's discussion on the impact of Jesus' ascent/descent on the theme of glory is confusing and unclear. For example, in the resurrection of Lazarus Jesus prays out loud so that those who hear may believe that the Father sent him (11:42). Humble identifies the language of sending as part of the descent/ascent Leitmotif, and then states, "it is important to the Evangelist that the crowd believes that the Father sent Jesus, and to accomplish this he incorporates the Descent/Ascent Leitmotif," (96–97). It is unclear what Humble sees in her statement, for her logic amounts to: "the Father sent Jesus" is incorporated into the Lazarus account so that the reader may believe "the Father sent Jesus."

<sup>72</sup> For example, Nicholson states, "By embedding some of the allusions to the crucifixion (those inherent in the three LUS [Lifting Up Sayings]) within the framework of the descent and ascent of



the descent / ascent statements) is an important part of the picture that contributes to a heightening of the importance of his death. We should not miss how his heavenly origin serves to underscore *who* Jesus is—he is the Son who is in full, complete control, yet he goes willingly to die for others.<sup>73</sup> The first mention of Jesus being “from the Father” or “from God” is in the prologue, which presents his heavenly origin for the purpose of accenting who Jesus is to underscore the revelation he brings. He is the Logos become flesh, the only begotten Son “from the Father” (παρὰ πατρός, 1:14). When the crowds show confusion about Jesus’s origins and also dispute about where Jesus says he is going, John does not seem as much interested in showing the crowds ignorance about Jesus’s Davidic bona-fides as he is about accenting their failure to realize that Jesus is from God,

---

the Son of Man (i.e. within the DAS), the Fourth Evangelist is saying that the crucifixion receives its ‘meaning’ by being understood as a part of a larger schema: the crucifixion was the beginning of the ascent to the Father. . .”, in Nicholson, *Death as Departure*, 142–43.

<sup>73</sup> Note also the repeated use of the “Son of Man” who is glorified (12:23; 13:31–32) and “lifted up” (3:14; 8:28; 12:32 [via 12:34]). The designation “Son of Man” most likely alludes to Daniel 7:13–14, and Peter Ensor argues that this five-fold statement not only shows that Jesus’ divine qualities would be revealed, but that he would “begin to fulfil the role of the ‘one like a son of man’ delineated in Daniel 7:13–14, in Ensor, “The Glorification of the Son of Man,” 237–40. See also Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. Reynolds compares the Son of Man sayings in the Gospel of John with his exploration of the characteristics of “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7, in Jewish apocalyptic texts (*1 Enoch* 37–71; *4 Ezra*; *2 Baruch*; and also 4Qpseudo-Dan<sup>d</sup> [4Q246]), and in other early Christian texts. Reynolds identifies these common characteristics, “this figure was understood to be a heavenly, messianic figure who shared similarities with God, had a role in judgment and salvation, would be recognized by humanity, and would gather the righteous” (p. 214). He finds that John’s usage of the Son of Man corresponds in several ways with the Jewish apocalyptic and Synoptic interpretations of the “one like a son of man” from Daniel 7, and concludes that the Johannine Son of Man can be “fittingly referred to as an apocalyptic Son of Man” (p. 216). He also rightfully notes that John differs from these other interpretations of the Danielic son of man in that the glorification of the Son of Man is depicted as a present reality rather than only in the future. If the Johannine Son of Man is the Danielic Son of Man, we may compare John’s presentation of the Son of Man with Danielic expectation and other Second Temple texts, and propose that the Son of Man designation plays a role in highlighting the depth of love for God’s people. In reference to Daniel 7:13–14 directly, the use of “Son of Man” in the Gospel serves to reinforce the heavenly origin of Jesus (cf. John 3:13), his messianic identity, the kingdom and authority he ought to receive (cf. John 5:27; 8:28), and the service all peoples should render him (cf. John 12:32–34). In ref. to Second Temple texts, the “Son of Man” may call to mind a heavenly, pre-existent (*1 Enoch* 48:2–3, 8; 62:7; *2 Baruch* 30:1), messianic (*1 Enoch* 48:10; *4 Ezra* 12–13; *2 Baruch* 53:1) figure, who exercises divine prerogatives (*1 Enoch* 46:5; 48:7; 62:3; *4 Ezra* 13:10–11, 26; *2 Baruch* 72:2–3). Therefore it becomes all the more striking when “the Son of Man” comes only to willingly lay down his life for the sheep (John 10:11) and give his flesh for the world (6:51). When the “Son of Man” designation is used in both lifting up (3:14; 8:28; 12:32–34) and glorification (12:33; 13:31–32) statements (in reference to the death of Jesus, not only his return to the Father), there is a depth to God’s love that is further plumbed and revealed in this unexpected paradox of glorification in death. Therefore the “Son of Man” designation may contribute further to the depth of love revealed in Jesus’ climactic sign.

and thus is the Son.<sup>74</sup> Jesus's heavenly origin, and eventual destination, reinforces his unique relationship with God and thus his divine identity. John 3:14's "lifting up saying" is certainly in the context of descent and ascent (3:13), but that descent and ascent schema reinforces that it is the *Son* who has come to declare heavenly things,<sup>75</sup> and that it is this Son who is given by God for the life of the world, thereby demonstrating just how great God's love is (3:14–16).<sup>76</sup> He is the creator of all things and the Logos become flesh (1:1–3, 14), he works just as the Father works (5:17), is one with the Father (10:30), and is the one whom Isaiah saw (12:41). Jesus himself, as the Son of God, is God (1:1). The one who is about to be willingly arrested and crucified (18:1ff) is the same one who had glory by the Father's side before the world began (17:5, 24). He lays down his life for his friends (15:13)<sup>77</sup> and accomplishes the work God gave him to do (19:28–30). The death of Jesus is an act of great love, and the death and resurrection together are the climactic sign in the Gospel of John that reveals glory, the radiance of God's character. For God the Son has come and is willingly giving himself to die on the cross for the life of the world.

---

<sup>74</sup> The confusion among the Jews regarding Jesus' origin in 7:25–31 and 7:40–52 revolves around his earthly origin, but the issue is that they do not recognize he comes from above (7:28). This is not to say John disassociates "Son of God" from the expectation that the Davidic messiah will be a "son" to God (2 Sam 7:14; Psalm 2:7) (see Nathanael's confession in 1:49, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the king of Israel!"), but that the emphasis in his narrative leans towards the Son as the one sent from the Father.

<sup>75</sup> The language of Jesus in 3:14, "no one has ascended into heaven except the one who has descended from heaven, the Son of Man," (οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) alludes to Proverbs 30:4, "Who has ascended into heaven and descended?" (LXX τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κατέβη). In John 3:10–12, it would seem more straightforward for Jesus to indicate he has descended from heaven, but instead he uses ascent and descent language, which mirrors the verbal pattern in Proverbs 30:4.

<sup>76</sup> As Udo Schnelle observes, "The Sent One not only represents the Sender, but the sending is as though the Sender himself has come; he not only brings a message, but is himself the message," in *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 681.

<sup>77</sup> Jesus calls his disciples his "friends" and indicates that he lays his life down for them, but in John the death of Jesus is interpreted as the greater laying down his life for the lesser. The foot-washing account is emblematic of this (John 13:14–16). Although Jesus says he no longer calls them "servants" (δούλους) but "friends" (φίλους) in 15:15, this is linked to access to the Father rather than in eliminating any hierarchical structure. That a structure still remains is shown in Jesus' statement, "You are my friends if you do what I command you" (15:14). For an argument that in John 15:1–17 Jesus invites his disciples into a "royal friendship," whereby John presents "Jesus as a royal figure who transforms his relationship with his disciples from being servants to being his friends," see Mark Zhakevich, "The Compensatory Benefits of Discipleship in the Gospel of John" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2017), 145–95, esp. 195.

The theme of Jesus's departure to the Father, so prominently highlighted beginning in 13:1, serves then not only to mark the completion of his mission, or to make his return to the Father as part of his exaltation and glorification, but also to accentuate who it is who is about to give his flesh for the life of the world.<sup>78</sup>

### A New Revelation of God

The prologue sets the revelation of God's glory through Jesus in the larger framework of God's prior revelation to his people Israel through Moses (John 1:14–18). In doing so the new acts of God which reveal glory through Jesus are compared to, given significance in light of, and transcend the prior acts of God which reveal glory in the time of Moses. Just as God revealed himself in the context of forgiving Israel's sin, in proclaiming his name and expounding his character before Moses (Exodus 34:6–7), God has now revealed himself in the context of forgiving sin, in proclaiming his name and expounding his character through Jesus (12:23, 28; 17:4, 6).

There is growing recognition that many Jews expected a "New Exodus" in Jesus's time.<sup>79</sup> Wright explains that kingdom expectation is tied up with the New Exodus,

---

<sup>78</sup> The scenes of chapter thirteen to seventeen continue to highlight who it is that is about to die. He is one who knows it will happen (13:1–3), foretells who will betray him (13:17–20), willingly sets in motion the events toward his arrest (13:27), interprets the significance of his own death (13:31–32), foretells Peter's denial (13:38), and that is in chapter thirteen alone. This portrayal of Jesus reminds the readers that he is in control and willingly lays down his life for the sheep (10:18). The Farewell Discourse finishes with the prayer of Jesus, and the reader is reminded in unmistakable terms who it is that is about to die—the one who had glory with the Father before the world existed (17:5). The Logos enfleshed is about to let himself be arrested, and he repeatedly describes what is about to take place with glorification language (13:31–32; 17:1–5). Right before his death, Jesus describes his earthly ministry as one that revealed the Father's name and glorified him (17:4, 6), and he asks that in this "hour" which has "come," that the Father glorify the Son so that the Son may glorify the Father (17:1). The effect of the repeated references to coming from God and returning to God does not downplay the significance of the passion but must deepen its import in highlighting who it is who is about to die.

<sup>79</sup> For example, see Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*, WUNT II 88 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997); David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, WUNT II 130 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Paul S. Coxon, *Exploring the New Exodus in John: A Biblical Theological Investigation of John Chapters 5-10* (Eugene, OR: Resource, 2015). Knibb's survey of intertestamental literature concluded that "all seem to share the view that Israel remained in a state of exile long after the sixth century, and that the exile would only be brought to an end when God intervened in this world order to establish his rule," in Michael A. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *Heythrop Journal* 17, no. 3 (1976): 271–72. Most influential is N. T. Wright who argues that Second Temple expectations for the coming king and kingdom would be bound up within a story-line that contained three themes which form the metanarrative implicit in the language of the kingdom: that Israel would "really" return from exile; YHWH would finally return to Zion; and that evil, usually in the form of Israel's enemies, must be

a complex of expectations in regards to the return of Yahweh to Zion, a “real” return from exile, and victory over evil.<sup>80</sup> Brunson examines these themes in the Gospel of John and concludes that “the main strands of New Exodus thought – the return from exile, defeat of Israel’s enemies, and return of Yahweh – are at the core of the Fourth Gospel.”<sup>81</sup> In the Gospel of John, the revelation of God’s glory in a new act of redemption contributes to this New Exodus theme. A new act of God has occurred in Jesus whereby the people are delivered from their sins through the death of a new Passover lamb. This signals a new Exodus whereby God’s people will no longer identify God as the one who has brought them out of Egypt, but as the God who sent his only Son to remove sins and grant eternal life (John 1:29; 3:16; 17:2).<sup>82</sup> Thus John identifies in Jesus a new manifestation of God’s glory and name (1:14–18; 12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 17:1–2; 17:6). A new act of God reveals the radiance of God’s character in an unprecedented way and demonstrates his abiding presence in the person of Jesus. After Jesus has come, John bears witness that all previous revelation has been transcended, and in Jesus there is a new reference point for who God is and what he is like. This is a new revelation of God’s name (17:6), not one that negates

---

defeated, in N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 206.

<sup>80</sup> Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 204–6. See also Brunson’s exploration of this theme as it regards Second Temple expectations in Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalms 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament II 158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 63–82. Exile from the land was due to the sin of the people in breaking the covenant, which was already anticipated in the curses of Deuteronomy 28 and in Moses’ words to Israel in Deuteronomy 30:1–10, yet within 30:1–10 was a promise of restoration. Since exile was the result of sin, the restoration of Israel involved more than a return to the land but also inward heart renewal and the forgiveness of sin, thus the promised new covenant (Jer 31:31–34). Although the people returned to the land and rebuilt the temple, it was clear this was not the glorious temple of Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 40–48; cf. Ezra 3:10–13). Israel was still in a period of judgment from the Lord, even though they were in the land. The end of this judgment, and thus exile, linked with the iniquity bearing of the servant of Isaiah 52:13–53:12, is located by John in the glorification and lifting up of Jesus through his double-quotation of Isaiah 6:10 and 53:1 in John 12:37–40.

<sup>81</sup> Brunson, *Psalms 118 in the Gospel of John*, 153–79, 155.

<sup>82</sup> See my argument in chapter 2 for how one revelation transcends the other as indicated through the preposition ἀντί in John 1:16. I pointed to Jeremiah 23:7–8 as an apt analogy.

prior revelation, but one which prior revelation points to and finds its full significance in light of.

John's use of *σκηνώ* in conjunction with a vision of *δόξα* in 1:14 clothes his witness to Jesus's glory in terms related to the dwelling of God with Israel in the temple.<sup>83</sup> The expectation of the return of the king and the restoration of the kingdom included God's presence in the temple (Ezek 37:24–28; 43:1–9). John's gospel witnesses to the glory of Yahweh in the person of Jesus, and in light of the temple's destruction in AD 70, shows that John locates the fulfillment of temple hope in Jesus.<sup>84</sup> Therefore the glorification of Jesus on the cross, as the glorification of God, reveals a depth to the revelation of God's glory that had hitherto been unseen. What it reveals about God's glory is bound up with how Jesus fulfills the OT Scriptures and the hopes and expectations therein. I will briefly highlight only two aspects of his death, Jesus's death as the paschal lamb and his depiction as king in chapters 18–19.

The signs that Jesus performs reveal his glory and also reveal the fulfillment of the promises of the kingdom of God (2:11; 3:3).<sup>85</sup> Jesus's glory as the Son of God is tied

---

<sup>83</sup> See the brief discussion in chapter 2. For the temple motif in the gospel, see Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001); Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006); Joseph R. Greene, "Integrating Interpretations of John 7:37–39 into the Temple Theme: The Spirit as Efflux from the New Temple," *Neotestamentica* 47, no. 2 (2013): 333–53.

<sup>84</sup> See Köstenberger's discussion on the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 and its potential impact in shaping John's Gospel "as occasioning John to think of Jesus as the fulfillment of these expectations, that is, as the permanent solution to the loss of the Jerusalem sanctuary. John may have seized on the crisis of belief resulting from the destruction of the Second Temple and formulated his Christology in part to commend Jesus as Messiah who fulfilled the various strands of OT messianic expectations, including those centering on God's visiting his people and dwelling with them in a more permanent way than had previously been the case," in Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*, 60–71, esp. 71. It is difficult to speculate as to whether the temple destruction in A.D. 70 was the occasion for John to think of Jesus as fulfilling these messianic expectations. It seems more sensible to me that the Spirit of truth, who would have been sent to John after Jesus departed (John 16:7), would have led John into this conclusion far before that. Therefore, the destruction of the temple was likely not the occasion for John to come to such conclusions, but forms a likely background against which to write his Gospel.

<sup>85</sup> Brunson comments, "Indeed, when one looks at the Gospels through the lenses of Jewish expectation, it makes sense that Jesus' messiahship is interpreted in light of restoration thought – it would seem strange if this were not the case," in Brunson, *Psalms 118 in the Gospel of John*, 154–55. The context of Brunson's comments are his discussion on the expectation of many Second Temple Jews for the return from exile; the defeat of Israel's enemies; and the return of Yahweh to live and reign among his people, the

to his glory as the promised Christ. He is the Messiah who ushers in a new age of abundant life in the promised kingdom (2:11). Although glory and glorification language are absent in chapters 18–19, Jesus is referred to as either “King” (βασιλεὺς) or the “King of the Jews” (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων) no less than eleven times in these two chapters (18:33, 37 [2x], 39; 19:3, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21 [2x]). Earlier Jesus hid himself when the Jews desired to make him king (6:15).<sup>86</sup> But in view of the “hour” of his passion, when Jesus approaches Jerusalem, he freely receives the designation the King of Israel (ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, 12:13).<sup>87</sup> John presents the Jews as rejecting their king in 19:15 (cf. 1:11), and Jesus is lifted up on the cross with the inscription that he is the King of the Jews written in three languages (18:19–22). John presents the cross of Jesus as his exaltation.<sup>88</sup> He is the King who perfectly obeys the Father, and thus honors God, in bringing his plan to completion to grant eternal life (17:2).

Jesus brings about the fulfillment of the kingdom, but he does so by dying as the new Passover lamb. The shame and ignominy of the cross is actually his glory.<sup>89</sup> After

---

complex of which he refers to as the New Exodus.

<sup>86</sup> As Chibici-Revneanu rightly observes, Jesus’ withdrawing from the Jews in 6:15 does not contradict Nathanael’s assertion that Jesus is the King of Israel, nor is it based upon the fact that Jesus was not the king or did not want to be king over his people. But rather it was about the timing and also the manner or motivation in making him king, in Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 530.

<sup>87</sup> For an analysis on the use of Psalm 118 in John 12:13, in concert with the quotation of Zechariah 9:9 in John 12:15, see Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, 180–239.

<sup>88</sup> Frey writes, “The cross is, in truth, the kingly throne, and in his death the king accedes to his βασιλεία, which he speaks of before Pilate (18.36 – 37). This, at the same time, the dawning of the reign of God, the eschatological event in which the victory over the world and its ruler takes place (16.11, 33),” in “The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John,” 175. The exaltation or “lifting up” statements also factor into how Jesus’ death fulfills OT pattern and prophecy. Jesus is lifted up on the cross just as Moses lifted up the serpent on the pole, in order that all who look upon him may have life (John 3:14; Num 21:4–9). Jesus’ “lifting up” will also demonstrate his divine identity as “I am,” and identify him with Yahweh the only God and Savior of Israel in Isaiah 43:10 (John 8:24, 28). In all the lifting up sayings it is the “Son of Man” who is lifted up (3:14; 8:28; indirect in 12:32 via 12:34), possibly linking with the Danielic Son of Man in Daniel 7:13–14 who is prophesied to receive “dominion, glory, and a kingdom; that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him” (cf. John 12:32, “and I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself.”).

<sup>89</sup> For the shame of crucifixion see Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977); David W. Chapman, *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), originally published in the WUNT II series by Mohr Siebeck in 2008 under the same title. Bauckham points out how, in contrast to the Synoptics, John does not recount supernatural

the prologue, the first title given to Jesus is the “Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). This use of lamb imagery is connected with Jesus as the servant of Isaiah 53:7, who is pictured as a lamb to be slaughtered after having the iniquity of those he would make righteous laid upon him (Isa 53:6, 11). Jörg Frey detects in this passage a “programmatically reference” to Jesus’s identity, “for it is evident that the death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is understood as a ‘salvation-creating’ act of God, through which the removal of sin, salvation from death, and the opening of new life takes place.”<sup>90</sup> The double-quotation in John 19:36–37, which caps off a string of fulfillment statements beginning in 12:38 (cf. 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24),<sup>91</sup> points to Jesus’s fulfillment of the pattern of the Passover lamb in his death.<sup>92</sup> The Passover theme is prominent in the Gospel and Jesus is presented as the new Passover lamb who dies to free his people from slavery to sin (2:13; 6:4; 11:55; 19:36; 8:21, 34–36).<sup>93</sup> Just as the Exodus events of deliverance from Egypt “formed the robes of God’s glory,” demonstrating his power (Exod 15:1–18),<sup>94</sup> and the forgiveness given to the Israelites revealed his great mercy and compassion (Exod 34:6–7), so the death of Jesus on the cross, for John,

---

accompaniments in the event of the crucifixion, “no darkness at noon, no earthquake, no tearing of the temple veil. What happens is just what always happened at crucifixions, in all their pain and humiliation . . . The paradox of the cross—honor in humiliation, visible splendor in disfigurement and death—exists to make us reckon with a love that is sufficient to resolve the paradox,” in Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 60–61.

<sup>90</sup> Frey, “The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John,” 195.

<sup>91</sup> Both 12:38–40 and 19:36–37 are double-quotations, linked together by *πάλιν* and introduced with a single instance of *πληρωθῆναι*.

<sup>92</sup> See Porter for several other features in chapter 19 that may portray Jesus as the Passover lamb, Porter, “Jesus, the Passover Theme, and John’s Gospel,” 220–24.

<sup>93</sup> For the Passover theme in John see Porter, “Jesus, the Passover Theme, and John’s Gospel.” On how freedom from bondage to sin in 8:36 may relate to the Passover theme see Paul M. Hoskins, “Freedom from Slavery to Sin and the Devil: John 8:31–47 and the Passover Theme of the Gospel of John,” *TrinJ* 31, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 47–63.

<sup>94</sup> Perkins writes, “In Greek Exodus Yahweh’s remarkable actions to liberate Israel and constitute it as his special people form the ‘robes’ that display his unique and unparalleled splendor,” in Larry Perkins, “‘Glory’ in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations,” in *“Translation Is Required”: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 56 (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 103. See my discussion on glory in Exodus in chapter 2.

reveals the love of God (12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 17:1–2). The sacrifice is not simply of an innocent lamb, but the innocent Son of God, and the effect of his sacrifice is not simply for the people of Israel, but for Jew and Gentile alike (4:42; 10:16; 11:51–52; 12:20–23).

The glory that is revealed on the cross is inextricably linked with Jesus as the Son of God who fulfills OT pattern and prophecy and dies as the Lamb of God. His path as king is the way of self-sacrifice. His suffering, as the Son of God who is the Lamb of God, does not only lead to his glory but is his glory. Thus when John gives “these signs” (20:31) so that the hearers of the Gospel may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the climactic sign is the cross where John paints a picture of the Son of God who dies as the Lamb of God to be crowned as the Christ of God, and in all this there is the love of God put on display to draw all people in and include them as those who are loved just as God has loved Jesus (12:33; 17:23). As a result of Jesus’s entire ministry and his crowning work on the cross, John bears witness in the prologue, “we have seen his glory, glory as of the only begotten, full of grace and truth” (1:14).

### **Conclusion**

The use of *δόξα* (16x in chapters 1–12) drops from view after John brings Jesus’s public ministry to a close (only to surface again 3 times in John 17). Conversely where *δοξάζω* was used sparingly prior to 12:23 (4 times), John utilizes it eighteen more times beginning in 12:23, declaring that “the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified.” Last chapter I proposed that this inverse pattern may indicate that John uses *δοξάζω* to pickup where *δόξα* left off, continuing the theme of the revelation of the Father in the Son through signs. The difference is that John uses *δόξα* to primarily describe the life and ministry of Jesus, whereas he reserves a majority of his uses of *δοξάζω* to refer to Jesus’s death, resurrection and return to the Father. The use of *δοξάζω* signals a change of events, for with the anticipated “hour” (cf. 2:4) a climactic revelation of glory was to occur. The uses of *δόξα* and *δοξάζω* overlap, however, as sometimes Jesus’s glory ministry



is also characterized by  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  (11:4; 12:28; 17:4) and Jesus's death on the cross should be in no way excluded from John's witness to God's glory in Jesus (1:14). Both terms carry forward the theme of Yahweh's glory revealed in Jesus's signs, the former characterizing the life of Jesus and the latter specially used to describe his passion and return to the Father.

If this overarching understanding of the Gospel provided by the terminology of glory and glorification exists, then it provides a larger framework to understand the life and death of Jesus as presented by John. Jesus's entire life (and death) is one of revelation, revealing the  $\delta\omicron\xi\alpha$  of the Father. The division of terminology, glory to describe the public ministry of Jesus in chapters 1–12, and glorification as largely reserved for “the hour,” elucidates how John himself interprets the ministry of Jesus and shows that John intentionally positions the death and resurrection of Jesus as the climactic sign revealing Yahweh's glory most fully.

In this chapter I sought to show how  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , being primarily used in the context of “the hour,” can plausibly carry both meanings of honor and glory, so that at the cross of Jesus he both reveals God and honors God (13:31–32). If Jesus's death and resurrection should be understood as a “sign,” then that lends further weight to the argument that the glorification of Jesus is the climactic event of John's Gospel in which Yahweh reveals his glory in a new historical act of redemption. Therefore glorification carries forward the theme of glory introduced and elucidated as the revelation of the Father in the Son via 1:14–18. The signs of Jesus give way to the sign of Jesus's glorification, a climactic sign that reveals the glory of Yahweh in the glory of Jesus through an act of self-giving love. This vision of glory must be understood in light of OT patterns and prophecies, for it not only signals the New Exodus in Jesus but is also a new manifestation of the radiance of God's character. He is “full of grace and truth” in a way that the OT spoke of and anticipated.

Since the disciples are given Jesus's  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22, it must in some way conform to or depart from the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of Jesus and his mission of revealing the Father's  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ . Before understanding how John 17:22 fits into this theme of glory and glorification in the Gospel, we turn our attention in the next chapter to  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  and the disciples.

## CHAPTER 5

### GLORIFICATION AND DISCIPLESHIP

In the Gospel of John glorification occurs in two contexts, in the work of the Son and in the continuing work of the disciples. Apart from the disciples beholding Jesus's or God's  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  (1:14; 2:11; 11:40), the only direct link between  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and the disciples is in John 17:22. In contrast, there are several passages in the Gospel connecting  $\delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  and discipleship. For example, in 12:23–26 and 13:31–35, we note the juxtaposition of Jesus's glorification and implications for discipleship:

Table 12. Jesus's glorification and discipleship

	John 12:23–26	John 13:31–35
Jesus's Glorification	And Jesus answered them, "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified. Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit. (12:23–24)	When he had gone out, Jesus said, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God is glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself, and glorify him at once. Little children, yet a little while I am with you. You will seek me, and just as I said to the Jews, so now I also say to you, 'Where I am going you cannot come.' (13:31–33)
Discipleship	Whoever loves his life loses it, and whoever hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life. If anyone serves me, he must follow me; and where I am, there will my servant be also. If anyone serves me, the Father will honor him. (12:25–26)	A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another: just as I have loved you, you also are to love one another. By this all people will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another. (13:34–35)

In two significant passages regarding Jesus's glorification (12:20–36; 13:31–38), Jesus draws direct implications for discipleship. Additionally, after Jesus departs: he will continue to glorify the Father through the disciples (14:13), the disciples are to glorify God by bearing fruit (15:8), the Holy Spirit will glorify Jesus to the disciples (16:14), and Peter will glorify God in his death (21:19). The mission of the disciples does not only stem from Jesus's glorification but involves continuing Jesus's work of glorification in some way. Therefore, when John 17:22 indicates a granting of glory in the context of the disciples' mission (17:18), the connection between glorification and discipleship must be accounted for if we are to successfully interpret John 17:22. In this chapter we will examine the relationship between glorification and discipleship in 12:23–28, 13:31–38, 14:13, 15:8, 16:14, and 21:19.<sup>1</sup>

I have argued that John frames Jesus's public ministry as one of revealing the glory of Yahweh through signs (chs. 1–12), and that John positions the death and resurrection as the climactic sign of glory, revealing the love of God. In this chapter I propose that the disciples carry forward Jesus's mission of glorifying the Father. Just as Jesus glorified the Father in his climactic act of love, so the disciples carry forward the mission of glorifying the Father through their love for one another. Also included is their task is to bear witness to Jesus. Thus the mission of the disciples, or the task of discipleship, is to glorify the Father through bearing witness and loving one another just as Jesus has loved them. When they do, they will both reveal God and honor God, just as Jesus did in his glorification.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a recent literature overview on discipleship in the Gospel of John see Mark Zhakevich, "The Compensatory Benefits of Discipleship in the Gospel of John" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2017), 19–40.

### John 12:23–28: Following Jesus unto Death

In John 12:23 Jesus says, “The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified” (ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 12:23). Previously, “the hour” (ἡ ὥρα) had not yet come when Jesus’s mother approached him at the wedding (2:4), and although the authorities sought to arrest Jesus, “the hour” had not yet come so no one laid a hand on him (7:30; 8:20). This anticipated “hour” is now called the hour where Jesus will be glorified. But rather than a great act of glory and honor, Jesus talks about a grain of wheat falling into the earth and dying. The emphasis of his description is on death and what it brings forth, “Truly, truly I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit” (12:24). Jesus points to the necessity of death in order to bring forth fruit, and thus the grain of wheat producing much fruit refers to Jesus’s death and its necessity to bring forth life (cf. 3:14–16; 6:51; 10:11–12; 17:2).<sup>2</sup> In chapter 12 Jesus is portrayed as the servant of Isaiah 52:13–53:12, he will be struck down for the wayward sheep, his death will make many righteous.<sup>3</sup>

Jesus’s own pattern of being glorified in a death that bears fruit is then applied directly to his disciples who would follow him (12:24–26). The grammatical subject shifts from “a grain of wheat” (12:24) to “the one who loves his life” (ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ) and “the one who hates his life in this world” (ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

---

<sup>2</sup> Schnackenburg sees “much fruit” (πολὺν καρπὸν, 12:24) corresponding to Jesus’ statement in the near-context to draw all men to himself through his lifting up 12:33, Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 2:383.

<sup>3</sup> The following elements cumulatively contribute to the portrayal of Jesus as the suffering servant of Isaiah 52:13–53:12: the “Greeks” seeking to “see” Jesus (John 12:20) and the Pharisees comment that the “world” has gone after Jesus (12:19; cf. Isa 52:15); Jesus’ statement about glorification in John 12:23; the “lifting up” of Jesus and drawing all people to himself in 12:32 (Isa 52:13); and John’s use of Isaiah 53:1 in John 12:38. See my discussion of δόξα in chapter 3, addressing John 12:41, 43. For connections between John 12:20–36 with Isaiah 52:13–53:12, see Johannes Beutler, “Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12:20f),” *Biblica* 71, no. 3 (1990): 342–45; Daniel J. Brendsel, “*Isaiah Saw His Glory*”: *The Use of Isaiah 52-53 in John 12*, BZNW 208 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 137–60. Brendsel argues that the coming of the Greeks recalls Isaiah 52:15 and anticipates the fulfillment of Gentile salvation. Additionally, Brendsel points out the contrast between Israel who is blind and does not understand (Isaiah 6:9–10; cf. John 12:37–40 and the quotation of Isaiah 6:10) and the nations who see and understand (Isa 52:15; cf. John 12:20). In this contrast, Brendsel asserts John may have found biblical precedent for linking Jewish rejection and Gentile mission, in Brendsel, *Isaiah Saw His Glory*, 157–60.

τούτω) (12:25).<sup>4</sup> The result is a shift from Jesus's example by way of his analogy to a general principle, which is then particularly applied in 12:26 to his followers, "If anyone serves me, he must follow me; and where I am, there will my servant be also."<sup>5</sup> Jesus does not glorify himself nor seek his own glory but always seeks the glory of the Father (7:18; 8:54).<sup>6</sup> Therefore whoever desires to serve Jesus must follow Jesus in the pattern of his life and death. Jesus's disciples are not to love their own lives, but they are to love Jesus and keep his commands (14:15, 23). His primary commandment in John, "to love one another," is itself patterned after self-sacrifice, "as I have loved you" (13:34; 15:12), thus as they obey him, they must be willing to lose their lives as well. The implication is that the one who hates his life in this world is willing to die like the grain of wheat. As a result of their willingness to follow Jesus unto death, the Father will honor (τιμήσει) them

---

<sup>4</sup> The contrast is between ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ and ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ. The prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ clarifies Jesus' intent for his disciples. The meaning of κόσμος cannot be a simple reference to the physical world but must refer to a set of values and beliefs, a way of living and thinking that is opposed to God. Carson describes it as "the created order (especially of human beings and human affairs) in rebellion against its Maker," in D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 122–23, also 439. Those "from the world" would be those who are oriented towards one another and not towards God, and thus the disciples are those who are not "of the world" (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, 17:14). This is the "world" that is in opposition to Jesus and his disciples (8:23; 12:31; 15:18; 17:14). Jesus is not indicating that those who follow him must have a joyless life, nor is he calling for his disciples not to value "life," for Jesus came that the disciples' joy may be full (14:11) and that they might have life in abundance (10:10, ζῶν ἔχουσιν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχουσιν). Therefore, as the disciples remain "in the world" but are not "of the world" they are also not to live like the world.

<sup>5</sup> For Jesus' language of "where I am, there will by servant be also," (ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται, 12:26) see also 14:3, 17:24. In 14:3 and 17:24 the emphasis is on the future where the disciples will be with Jesus, beholding his heavenly glory (17:24), or in the Father's house where Jesus goes to prepare a dwelling place (14:3). It may be that 12:26 also points to the future heavenly reward of the believers and their presence with Jesus in heaven, for both εἰμὶ and τιμάω are future tense. Schnackenburg interprets it this way such that the honoring of the disciples by God is the gift of heavenly glory, that is, the Father taking the disciples into perfect communion with him and the Son, Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 385–86. Alternatively, the expression may indicate that following Jesus (being where he is) entails living and dying in similar fashion (see Carson, *The Gospel of John*, 439), and when the disciples live thus, in turn God grants honor to them (that is, the true honor they ought to seek and have before God, rather than men, 5:44; 12:41–43).

<sup>6</sup> Thus they should seek glory only from God (5:44, as opposed to glory from others, cf. 12:41–43) and glory for God (7:18). See my discussion in chapter 3 on John 7:18, 8:54. Bauckham rightly observes in these passages regarding glory and honor before others (e.g., 5:44; 7:18; 8:54), "what goes largely unsaid in these particular passages (but cf. 8:49) but certainly is implied is that Jesus, by seeking God's glory and not his own, actually incurs dishonor and disgrace in the eyes of humans but approval from God. Seeking God's glory is the path of self-humiliation that Jesus follows to the cross," in Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 58.

(12:26; cf. 8:54). As Jesus dies as the servant of Isaiah, is slaughtered like a new Passover lamb, is enthroned on the cross, and brings about the new exodus, it follows that his death is unique. But the pattern of his self-giving love is what should be followed. As we will see in later passages (e.g., 13:31–38; 14:13), it is not until Jesus is glorified and sends his Spirit that the disciples can follow in his example. Therefore Jesus’s death is completely unique in what it accomplishes and fulfills (e.g., 12:31–32), and when the disciples follow in his pattern, they bear witness to Jesus’s glorification on the cross.

Jesus’s following words in 12:27 continue to illustrate the principle he stated in 12:25. Jesus does not love his own life but loves the Father and seeks to do his will above all. Even though Jesus is “troubled” (12:27), he is an example of one who “hates his life in this world” (12:25). Jesus commits himself to obey the Father and fulfill the purposes of God in “the hour” of his crucifixion, “Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? ‘Father, save me from this hour? But for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father glorify your name’” (12:27–28a). The glorification of the Father’s name (12:28) occurs in the glorification of the Son of Man (12:23), and likewise as the disciples follow Jesus in his glorification, they too will both honor and reveal the name of God.

In 12:23–28 we see a statement about discipleship (12:25–26) sandwiched in between declarations of Jesus about the glorification of Jesus (12:23) and the glorification of the Father’s name (12:28). In particular, the disciples are to follow Jesus in his glorification. Even in the face of difficulty and personal distress, Jesus willingly goes to the cross to die and draw all people to himself (12:32). This self-giving of Jesus is the plan of God but also the pattern of discipleship.<sup>7</sup> The disciples must be willing to lose

---

<sup>7</sup> The pattern of life-giving sacrifice may mean believers will be martyred (cf. John 21:19) but should not be limited to a willingness to die physically. It is not so much about the act of dying as the willingness to give of oneself to another. See the logic presented in 1 John 3:16–18: “By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us [ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν], and we ought to lay down our lives for the brothers [ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς θείναι]. But if anyone has the world’s goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God’s love abide in him? Little children, let us not love in word or talk but in deed and in truth.” The language in 1 John 3:16 is taken from Jesus’ own saying about the good shepherd (τίθημι + τὴν ψυχὴν + ὑπὲρ, cf. John 10:11 and Peter’s words in 13:37). The logic of 1 John 3:16–18 is that laying down one’s life does not necessarily entail dying (literally), but a sacrificial

their lives as they commit themselves to God’s plan through following Jesus. This indicates that the mission of the disciples, in correspondence to the mission of Jesus, will also reveal the Father’s glory as they honor him with their obedience. Therefore the glorification of Jesus’s hour and discipleship are linked closely together as one sets the pattern for the other.

### John 13:31–38: Loving as Jesus Loves

Jesus begins his “farewell discourse” to his disciples with a five-fold declaration of glorification and then issues a new commandment to his disciples.<sup>8</sup> We will first analyze the glorification statements (13:31–32) and then how they should impact our interpretation of Jesus’s comments on discipleship (13:33–35).

#### Glorification and Jesus

νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ  
εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ<sup>9</sup>

Now is the Son of Man glorified,  
and God is glorified in him.  
If God is glorified in him,

---

love towards one another that involves opening one’s heart to brothers and sisters in need.

<sup>8</sup> I use “farewell discourse” to describe all the content of 13:31–16:33. On how 13:31–38 is a fitting introduction for 13:31–16:33 see L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31-16:33*, JSNTSup 256 (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 150–56; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 476–77. Many understand 13:31–38 to introduce the farewell discourse, Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible Commentary 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 2:605; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 476; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 449; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, Revised edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 558; Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 381; Edward W. Klink, *John*, ZECNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 600–603. For examples of other views, see Moloney who argues for 13:1–38 as a self-contained narrative, and Michaels, who identifies the beginning of the discourse in 13:36. Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 371, 385; J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 719. Although 13:31–38 opens the farewell discourse, as Ridderbos notes, “verses 31–38 form a fluid transition between 13:1–30 and ch. 14,” Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 473. The going out of Judas marks an important point in the plot, signaled also by “and it was night” (13:30). Thus it was after Judas had gone out that Jesus begins to address the disciples who will stay faithful to him (13:31ff), and 13:31–38 introduces some major themes that will be discussed through the farewell discourse, including glorification (13:31–32; 14:13; 15:8; 16:14), love (13:34–35; 14:15, 21, 23, 24; 15:12; 16:27), and Jesus’ departure (13:33; 14:3, 12, 28; 16:5, 16, 28). Additionally, Peter’s assumption that he can follow Jesus now fits into the theme of the disciples’ misunderstanding throughout the discourse (13:36–38; 14:5, 8; 16:18, 29–31).

<sup>9</sup> This clause is missing from some important manuscripts (such as  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$  and Vaticanus) so



καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ  
καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν

God will glorify him in himself,  
and glorify him at once.

This passage has puzzled exegetes in terms of the use of νῦν “now” in 13:31 and εὐθὺς “at once” in 13:32, and in regards to the meaning/referent of ἐν αὐτῷ in 13:32b. Related to these issues are to what time period the instances of δοξάζω refer (three aorist indicatives followed by two future indicatives).

The first two statements are straightforward. The first indicates the imminence of Jesus’s death: “now” is the Son of Man glorified (cf. 12:23).<sup>10</sup> The aorist indicatives are best explained by how the context already set the events of Jesus’s passion into motion,<sup>11</sup> and in light of the adverbs “now” (νῦν) and “at once” (εὐθὺς), must refer to the imminent events of the hour which are even now beginning to take place.<sup>12</sup> Judas has just

---

Comfort thinks this clause a scribal expansion, Philip Wesley Comfort, *A Commentary on the Manuscripts and Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2015), 266. Many others opt for its originality, accounting for its loss in some manuscripts due to homoioteleuton, see Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:606; Wilhelm Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 21 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 235. The presence of the conditional clause explicitly strengthens the connection between the first two clauses and the last two, but if the conditional clause was missing the latter two clauses may still assume it.

<sup>10</sup> The adverb νῦν commonly refers to the present time of the speaker (4:18; 6:42; 9:21), and sometimes to events that had just occurred (21:10), but as in John 12:31 (cf. 16:5; 17:5, 13), it may refer to a future event that is imminent. In these contexts, the use of “now” contrasts with the past and signals that it is time for a condition or event to begin. The “now” indicates the hour is imminent as opposed to the “not yet” of the hour repeated several times throughout the gospel. For νῦν referring to a future yet imminent event in Homer and Euripides see the examples in Montanari, Franco Montanari, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, ed. Madeleine Goh, et. al. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), s.v. “νῦν.” Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, ed. and trans. Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilber Gingrich [BDAG], 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. “νῦν.” Peter W. Ensor, “The Glorification of the Son of Man: An Analysis of John 13:31–32,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 58, no. 2 (2007): 232, 244–45.

<sup>11</sup> See John 13:30, “So, after receiving the morsel of bread, he immediately went out. And it was night.” Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 403.

<sup>12</sup> Although the aorist indicative prototypically encodes perfective aspect and past time, there are contexts where non-past aorists occur. Wallace includes John 13:31 in his examples of a “proleptic” aorist indicative, Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 563–64. Chris Fresch argues this point from linguistic typology, showing that other languages (including English) that have a recognized “past tense” also have contexts where the “past tense” verbal form is used in a nonpast context, Christopher J. Fresch, “Typology, Polysemy, and Prototypes: Situating Nonpast Aorist Indicatives,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 379–415. Whether one views the aorist indicative traditionally (encoding time and aspect) or not (Porter’s view, aspect-only), both sides recognize that the aorist can occur as non-past referring. For a list of examples where the aorist can be present-referring, future-referring, omnitemporal or atemporal, see Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1999), 35–39. Porter

gone out from their presence in order to betray Jesus (13:21, 30), setting into motion the Jews' plot to kill Jesus. Just as in 12:23, glorification here includes reference to the death of Jesus and the fruit it will bring, which is linked with the glorification of the Father's name ("Father, glorify your name," 12:28). Therefore the second statement, "and God is glorified in him" affirms that in the glorification of the Son of Man, God is also glorified. The first statement also establishes that the coming arrest, death, and crucifixion of Jesus should be understood in terms of glory and not shame.

The second statement establishes that in the glorification of the Son of Man, God is glorified as well. The first statement characterizes the events of the hour as glorification, and the second adds another layer of interpretation upon those events; in addition to the glorification of the Son is *also* the glorification of the Father. In using glorification language for the Father, it is not that the Father is about to be put on the cross, for it is ἐν αὐτῷ "in him," in the Son, that the Father is glorified.<sup>13</sup> Therefore the glorification of the Son is in line with how the ministry of Jesus has been presented, one where Jesus, in revealing his own δόξα (1:14; 2:11), is revealing the δόξα of God (1:14–18; 11:40). Instead of an ignominious death on the cross at the hands of men, the coming hour of glorification is the crowning of Jesus as King, who dies as the servant and lamb

---

classifies John 13:31 under "present-referring."

<sup>13</sup> Whether "ἐν αὐτῷ" is locative or instrumental, the result is similar. The difficulty of being certain can be illustrated in Schnackenburg's appeal to other instances of δοξάζω ἐν (14:13; 17:10) to justify a local sense, while Ensor appeals to the same texts (14:13; 17:10; and also refers to 3:21, ἐν θεῷ) to argue for the instrumental sense. It seems Schnackenburg is not too different from Ensor, though, when he says that it is "local in the extended sense, that is, to be glorified in the person of someone," Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 3:51; Ensor, "The Glorification of the Son of Man," 241–42. The meaning differs slightly depending on how one interprets the semantics of the passive-form δοξάζω. If δοξάζω carries the true passive sense, then it means "God is glorified by him" (instrumental) or "God is glorified in him" (locative). Either Jesus is the active agent through whom God is glorified (instrumental), or in Jesus, that is, in the events of the hour, God is glorified (locative). As Jesus actively obeys the Father and goes to the cross, whether ἐν is locative or instrumental makes no fundamental difference. If δοξάζω carries the middle sense, then the options are, "God reveals his glory by him" (instrumental) or "God reveals his glory in him" (locative). Either Jesus is the means through whom God reveals his glory (instrumental), or God reveals his glory in Jesus, that is, in the events of the hour (locative). Again, there is no fundamental difference. In light of the events of the hour, and the mutual statements of glorification also found elsewhere (17:1–2), what is clear is that Jesus glorifies the Father, and the Father glorifies Jesus in "the hour."

to redeem his people, and who will return to his place by the Father's side, and in all this God himself is glorified.

The third statement is a conditional that connects the first two statements with the last two statements. The first two statements describe the coming death of Jesus as glorifying the Father in the Son. The third statement restates this in the form of a conditional. If the first two statements are indeed true (third statement, "if God is glorified in him"), then God himself will accordingly glorify the Son (last two statements). Interpreters are divided how to take the referent of  $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  since it is future tense. If the first two clauses already refer to the complex of the hour, then to what do these future indicatives of  $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  refer? Barrett thinks the switch from aorist indicatives to future indicatives is a shift from the setting of Christian life at the end of the first century to the narrative point of view in its original setting, so when the future indicatives in 13:32 are used, "John reverts to the historical position of the last night of Jesus's life."<sup>14</sup> Vargas sees the aorist indicatives referring to the cross while the future indicatives point to the resurrection.<sup>15</sup> Chibici-Revneanu argues that the aorist indicatives refer to the death, resurrection, and return as if it has already taken place, while the futures refer to an open-ended, continuing glorification between Father and Son that look past the events of the cross, resurrection and return to the Father.<sup>16</sup> Beasley-Murray observes that "now" ( $\nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ , 13:31) and "immediately" ( $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma$ , 13:32) hold the past and future tenses of 13:31–32

---

<sup>14</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 450.

<sup>15</sup> Niceta M. Vargas, "Agapaō, Hypagō, and Doxazō: Juxtaposed, yet Tightly-Knit Themes in John 13,31-35," in *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology: Festschrift Gilbert van Belle*, ed. Joseph Verheyden et al., BETL 265 (Leuven; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014), 388. Also Murray J. Harris, *John*, EGGNT (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 251.

<sup>16</sup> Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, "Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine Δόξα-Language," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Gilbert Van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 223 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 519–20.

closely together, thus all occurrences refer to the collective events of “the hour.”<sup>17</sup>

Beasley-Murray’s position makes the most sense.

It is difficult to see a sharp divide between the occurrences of  $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  purely based upon their future and aorist tenses if: (1) we consider the logical flow of Jesus’s statements, and (2) how 13:31 is a characterization of what is about to come rather than a statement on something that has happened. Several translations of John 13:32 render the first  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  as an additive, “also” (e.g. NRSV, NET, HCSB). This may contribute to the interpretation that the future tense must be referring to a different event than the aorist, “if God is glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself” (ESV, emphasis added). However,  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  can also function to introduce the apodosis,<sup>18</sup> and if this is so in 13:32 then it can be rendered as “if God is glorified in him, God will glorify him in himself. . .” This if / then statement need not make a sharp distinction between “glorified” and “will glorify,” but rather functions to affirm God’s desire that glorification will take place. The first two statements in 13:31 serve to characterize the event about to take place, *not* to indicate that it has *already* taken place. The characterization of the hour as “glorification” (13:31) provides the basis for which God will ensure the events take place, thus the last two statements function to show that God will actively bring about the events of the hour. The logic of 13:31–32 can be explained thus: since the hour is indeed God’s glorification in the Son’s glorification, then God “will glorify him in himself,” that is, God will make sure it comes to pass.<sup>19</sup> Since “him” ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ ) is clearly in reference to Jesus, then “in him” ( $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ ) is in reference to God, as “in himself.”<sup>20</sup> “In himself” can be instrumental, such

---

<sup>17</sup> G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, WBC 36 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 246. For a brief survey of other opinions see Benjamin E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 249 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 207–10.

<sup>18</sup> See BDF §442 (sub-section 7). For NT examples see Luke 2:21; Rev 3:20 (for  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \dot{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon$  in an apodosis see Luke 7:12; Acts 1:10). BDAG s.v. “ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ .”

<sup>19</sup> See also Ensor, “The Glorification of the Son of Man,” 243–45.

<sup>20</sup> The variant reading of  $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ( $\aleph^{2a}$  A D K L W, etc.) for  $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  may show how scribes attempted to clarify the referent, and further confirms the interpretation of its reference to God.

that God will glorify Jesus by God's own power.<sup>21</sup> For added emphasis, the fifth statement concludes, "God will glorify him at once." The "at once" does not contradict the "now" of 13:31, but both point to the imminency of the cross, resurrection, and departure to the Father.<sup>22</sup> The "now" of 13:31 is going to take place because God himself will do it "at once" (13:32). There is no contradiction, and in all five occurrences of *δοξαζω*, the events of the hour are in view.<sup>23</sup> In the context of Judas going out to betray Jesus, an emphasis on the coming crucifixion is warranted.<sup>24</sup> The first two statements

---

Alternatively, Michaels understands both the object (*αὐτόν*) and prepositional phrase (*ἐν αὐτῷ*) as reference to Jesus, such that "God will glorify him in him" refers to how God will glorify Jesus "in his death," Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 756–57. Brown suggests that "in himself" may be the same thought as found in 17:5, "Glorify me, Father in your presence," Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:606. Whether the prepositional phrase *ἐν αὐτῷ* refers to God or Jesus, in either case God is still the active agent glorifying Jesus, whether it is in Jesus' death (which the context already affirms), or by God's own power (which the verse implies, for God is the subject of the active verb).

<sup>21</sup> So Ensor, "The Glorification of the Son of Man," 246. Chibici-Revneanu interprets the difficulty with reference to the pronouns as intentional ambiguity on the part of the author, that "John creates a pronominal confusion *on purpose*, using repetition and variation as literary tools to blur the borders between Father and Son," in Chibici-Revneanu, "Variations on Glorification," 513. Although 13:31–32 presents difficulties, it is not entirely confusing, and apart from the meaning of "in himself," the rest of the referents in 13:31–32 can be clarified without issue. Upon encountering *ἐν αὐτῷ* in 13:32, Revneanu states, "As it is most unlikely that God should glorify Jesus in Jesus himself, we have to assume that John is changing the reference to *αὐτός* mid-sentence – without any further help for his readers to realize it." She then concludes that John intends to blur the borders between the Father and Son, making them less distinguishable. However true it is that 13:31–32 speak of the mutual glorification of the Father and Son, it seems that her own analysis (that it doesn't make sense to glorify Jesus in Jesus) makes it plain that the referent to the pronoun is indeed distinguishable. Though it is a difficult phrase, nonetheless interpretive options are available. As to whether John intends to blur the borders between Father and Son, everywhere else he makes clear distinctions between the two, even while presenting Jesus' claims that they are "one" (10:30), so it is difficult to envision a deliberate blurring between the two here.

<sup>22</sup> Keener proposes that *εὐθύς* "probably functions as a rough equivalent of 'now' in 13:31, emphasizing the imminence of the events," in Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 2:921. Ensor is in agreement when he finds that the change in terminology from *νῦν* (13:31) to *εὐθύς* (13:32) coheres with John's tendency to employ small stylistic variations, Ensor, "The Glorification of the Son of Man," 245.

<sup>23</sup> Those who also take all instances of glorification as having the same referent: Beasley-Murray, *John*, 246; Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 3:50–51; Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 756–57; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 482–83, 486–87; Klink, *John*, 603–4; Ensor, "The Glorification of the Son of Man," 245.

<sup>24</sup> The emphasis on the cross amongst the events of the hour is likely also because of the unexpected characterization of it in terms of glory rather than shame. The statements of glorification function similarly to the foot-washing account, where the greater one stoops to serve the lesser, re-interpreting what is honorable. Chibici-Revneanu considers how easily one can attribute glory to the "resurrection" and how it is more difficult to see glory in the passion of Jesus, and thus she finds it to be a kind of "lectio difficilior" in identifying death as part of the glorification of God / Jesus, in Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 614. See also Keener, commenting on John 12:23–24, "The cross was the epitome of shame in the Roman world; in light of Isaiah, however, this worldly shame becomes Jesus' honor, his 'glorification,'" in Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:873. For the shame of

characterize the cross (and resulting events) as the glorification of the Father in the Son, the third restates it in a conditional, and the fourth and fifth assumes that conditional is true and states that God will ensure the cross will take place. This five-fold statement functions to assure the disciples (and the readers of the gospel) that the coming crucifixion is not a shameful death at the hands of men, but a glorification of God brought about by God himself. The death and resurrection of Jesus will reveal the love of God in a climactic sign of glory. The glorification of God is both an honoring of God in Jesus's obedience and a revelation of God's glory, the radiance of his character in particular reference to his love.<sup>25</sup>

### **Glorification and Discipleship**

The glorification of Jesus means he is leaving, thus he addresses his disciples endearingly ("little children," 13:33) and provides them with instruction on how they are to live in light of his departure (13:34–35). He gives them a "new commandment" (ἐντολὴν καινὴν), which is to love one another as he has loved them (13:34). In the wider context of the Gospel it becomes clear that "just as I have loved you" (13:34) must inevitably refer to the laying down of Jesus's life for those who would believe in him (3:16; 15:12–13), but already in the immediate context there are indications of this as well.

---

crucifixion see Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977); David W. Chapman, *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010). We must note, however, that the glory of the cross is only understood in light of the resurrection. Bauckham rightly notes that it is the crucifixion of Jesus *in light of the resurrection* which makes it glorification, "It is the degradation and the death, in the light of the resurrection, that constitute the ultimate manifestation of God's glory to the world," in Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 60–61.

<sup>25</sup> *Contra* Reynolds, who follows Loader's interpretation in the passage that the glorification of the Son of Man "most likely comes through his obedience in his hour of death, resurrection, and return" and detects no revelatory features in the assigning of glorification to the cross itself, Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, 212.

John remarks that Jesus loved his disciples “to the end” (εἰς τέλος, 13:1), which may have a double-meaning, “fully” as well as “to the death.”<sup>26</sup> The foot-washing account looks forward to the self-giving of Jesus on the cross.<sup>27</sup> Additionally, Jesus’s knowledge about his departure (13:3) and his setting into motion his own death (13:18–19, 27), contributes to the picture of his willingness to give up his life for others, later called the greatest kind of love (15:13). Jesus’s impending death, and the love he will show by it, is also underscored when Peter responds to Jesus’s command by stating his own willingness to die only to be corrected by a prophecy of Jesus that Peter will fail (13:36–38).

Therefore the command to love “just as I have loved you” (13:34) is tied to Jesus’s imminent glorification on the cross. What is “new” about the commandment is not that “love” is a new commandment, for it is not.<sup>28</sup> What is “new” is the *standard* of this love and the *context* of this love. First, they are to love “just as” (καθώς) Jesus has loved them in laying down his life.<sup>29</sup> Second, through Jesus’s glorification, there is the granting of eternal life (17:2) and the Spirit being poured out (7:39). In conjunction with the forgiveness of sins (1:29; 20:23), and the promise of resurrection life (11:25–26, 40), the New Covenant and life in the eschatological kingdom is the new context of this new commandment (Jer 31:31–34; Ezek 36:24–30; 37:12–14).<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:899; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:550; Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 284.

<sup>27</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 436.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18; see Jesus’ own summing up of the OT law as loving God and neighbor, Mark 12:28–31

<sup>29</sup> Keener is right to identify the “newness” of the command in that it is to be measured by the standard of Jesus’ love for them as shown through the cross, Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:924. M. M. Thompson thinks it “new” simply because it is the first time Jesus commanded his disciples to do so, but also identifies that it is “new” because the measure of their love must be Jesus’ love for them, Thompson, *John*, 300.

<sup>30</sup> As Beasley-Murray writes, “The ‘new command’ may be viewed as the obligation of the people of the new covenant in response to the redemptive act of God and his gracious election which made them his new people,” in Beasley-Murray, *John*, 247. Others also identify a new covenant context, Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:614; Rekha M. Chennattu, *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant*

Jesus's glorification fulfills the kingdom promises of God and will create a new people who have the Spirit and obey his commands from the heart. The King has come but he dies as a servant, which both opens the fountain of life and sets an example for the disciples to follow. Just as in 12:23, where Jesus's glorification, linked explicitly with death, is then shown to be a paradigm for the disciples to follow, here in 13:31–35 Jesus calls them once again to imitate him in his glorification of the Father. The juxtaposition of the five-fold glorification statements with Jesus's new commandment connects the glorification of Jesus with the task of the disciples. John 13:31–32 and 13:34–35 can be mutually interpretive. The glorification of God in Jesus, in 13:31–32, is described as an act of love for his disciples via 13:34–35. Conversely, when the disciples obey Jesus's new commandment in 13:34–35, by way of 13:31–32, they too can be said to glorify God. As the new people of God, the disciples are to honor God by doing what Jesus commands, and they reveal God by loving as Jesus loved.<sup>31</sup>

The disciples, however, are not able now to follow Jesus in glorifying the Father (13:36–38).<sup>32</sup> Peter's desire to "follow" (ἀκολουθέω) Jesus in his hour of glorification mirrors Jesus's words back in chapter 10:

---

*Relationship* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 96–98; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 484–85. The interiority of the New Covenant and the forgiveness of sins is mentioned in Jeremiah 31:31–34, the granting of the Spirit and of resurrection life is present in Ezekiel 36:24–27, 37:12–14. For a study on the interiority expressions in 1 John (εἶναι ἐν and μένειν ἐν) as evidence of a New Covenant context, with implications for the Gospel of John, see Edward Malatesta, *Interiority and Covenant*, *Analecta Biblica* 69 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978).

<sup>31</sup> Dodd comments, "Such love, among Christians, is a revelation to the world . . . [here he quotes 17:21, 23] . . . the revelation of the divine love in Christ, as it is active in the loving unity of His people," in Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 405–6.

<sup>32</sup> Peter's response in 13:36–38 seem to directly respond to Jesus' statement in 13:33. Because of this, and six other reasons, Schnackenburg considers 13:34–35 an interpolation, Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 3:53. See Kellum's insightful critique of Schnackenburg's reasons, Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 153–56. Kellum rightly points out how Peter's abrupt reply to Jesus, which seems to ignore 13:34–35, may demonstrate the intention of the author to show that Peter (like all the disciples) is ill-prepared to follow Jesus at the moment. Peter's reply would highlight one of the themes of the farewell discourse—the lack of preparation of the disciples for what is to come and their need for the Paraclete's ministry. This is another indicator, then, of how Jesus first needs to be glorified before the disciples are able to follow him in glorifying the Father. Similarly, see Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 475.



τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω – Peter (13:37)

“I will lay down my life for you”

τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων – Jesus (10:15)

“I lay down my life for the sheep”

Peter expresses his desire to follow Jesus by proclaiming his willingness to lay down his life for him. The use of τίθημι + τὴν ψυχὴν μου + ὑπὲρ alludes back to Jesus’s own words and how Jesus will lay down his life for the sheep as the good shepherd.<sup>33</sup> Jesus indicates that Peter cannot follow him “now” but will do so “later,” foreshadowing how Peter will glorify God in death, which is related to Peter following in the pattern as a shepherd-leader as well (21:19). Until Jesus is glorified, the disciples will not be able to glorify God like Jesus did. For Peter, the shame of following Jesus will overwhelm him to the point of his denying Jesus (18:15–1, 25–27), for he does not yet understand 13:31–32, how Jesus’s passion is also his glory. This inability highlights the unique, unrepeatable nature of Jesus’s own glorification while also underscoring that the disciples’ glorification of the Father is derived from and enabled by Jesus’s glorification of the Father.

### **John 14:13: Jesus Continues His Work of Glorification through the Disciples**

Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καὶ κεῖνος ποιήσει καὶ μείζονα τούτων ποιήσει, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι· καὶ ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω.

“Truly, truly I say to you, whoever believes in me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these will he do, because I am going to the Father. Whatever you ask in my name, this I will do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If you ask me anything in my name, I will do it.” (14:12–14)

This passage introduces how the Father will continue to be glorified in the Son even after Jesus departs. This glorification of the Father is linked to the “greater works”

---

<sup>33</sup> See also 10:11, ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων “The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep” (10:11).

(14:12) that the disciples will do in connection with their dependence on God through prayer. The “works” of Jesus may include a particular act (e.g. 5:30, 7:21) but encompass his words as well (14:10–11).<sup>34</sup> The “works” of Jesus bear witness about him that he is sent from the Father (5:36), that he is in the Father and the Father is in him (10:26, 37–38; 14:10–11). The “works” of Jesus are what the Father shows Jesus, and thus Jesus does them (5:17, 19–20, 36; 14:10). Before further defining what “greater works” means, we can affirm that insofar as the disciples are to do works like Jesus did, they have a revelatory feature by disclosing the Father in the Son. Jesus himself links his works, the witness they bear, and seeing the Father in Jesus, when he tells Philip in the immediate context, “Whoever has seen me has seen the Father” (14:9).

### How Are They “Greater Works”?

Jesus identifies these works as “greater works” precisely “because” he is “going to the Father” (ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι, 14:12). In view of how Jesus must go away so that the Spirit can come, the “greater works” must be so in relation to both his glorification and the coming of the Spirit (7:39; 14:25–26; 15:26; 16:7, 12–15). At one point Jesus says to the disciples that “it is better for you” (συμφέρει ὑμῖν) that he goes away, so that the Spirit will come to them (16:7). Therefore we can trace out what

---

<sup>34</sup> John also presents Jesus referring to “greater works” (μεῖζονα τούτων) in 5:20. There Jesus speaks to how he has done a work in healing the invalid at the pool (5:1–9), only to claim that he will do greater works. The “greater works” in 5:20 include raising the dead and giving life (5:21). In the more immediate context of 14:8–11, the works of Jesus also include the words that the Father has given Jesus to speak (14:10–11). Ensor notes how in 14:10 Jesus “works” stand in parallel with his “words,” and considers the following positions: (1) the “works” are the words Jesus speaks; (2) the “works” are not the words Jesus speaks but the miracles he performs; (3) the “works” stand for the ministry of Jesus as a whole, both his words and deeds, and may in certain contexts of the Gospel have special reference to the miracles. Ensor concludes that in 14:10 the third position is best, so that the “works” of Jesus are both his miracles and words, while in 14:11 there is a special reference to the miracles. The logic of 14:10–11 is as follows, in Ensor’s words: “Jesus [is appealing] to his disciples to accept his claim to a uniquely close relationship with the Father – a relationship in which his ‘works’ (including his words) are done (or spoken) at the initiative and through the power of the Father who dwells within him – and urging them to accept this claim on the evidence of the ‘works’ he performs (especially the miracles), if they are not persuaded by Jesus’ self-testimony on its own,” in Peter W. Ensor, *Jesus and His “Works”: The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective*, WUNT II 85 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996), 240–41.

the Spirit will do for them and connect that with how the works can be “greater works” than what Jesus does.<sup>35</sup>

Jesus will send the Paraclete,<sup>36</sup> who will dwell in them, thus also the Father and Son will dwell in them (14:17, 20, 23).<sup>37</sup> The Spirit will teach the disciples “all

---

<sup>35</sup> Woll rightly observes that Jesus’ role as the agent of the works of God “is grounded in his unique relation to the Father, a relationship of mutual indwelling.” Woll then connects the ability of the disciples to do the works of Jesus with sharing in that relationship of mutual indwelling, which he identifies as present in 14:20 and connected to the promised Paraclete, see D. Bruce Woll, “The Departure of ‘the Way’: The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 2 (June 1980): 231.

<sup>36</sup> “The Paraclete,” ὁ παράκλητος (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7) occurs four times in the Gospel, and once in 1 John 2:1. He is also called τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας “the Spirit of truth” (14:17; 15:26; 16:13), τὸ πνεῦμα “the Spirit” (e.g., 1:32, 33; 3:8; 7:39), and τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον “the Holy Spirit” (1:33 [anarthrous]; 14:26; 20:22 [anarthrous]). For a discussion on the term παράκλητος and an exploration on its background see Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 6–41. The term is used in some legal settings, thus “Advocate” may be appropriate in 16:7, but doesn’t seem to apply so appropriately in the other instances, where the context is of providing comfort, guidance, and help (14:16, 26; 15:26). Köstenberger finds that “helping presence” captures the import of the term and provides the following reasons: (1) this is what Jesus was while with the disciples; (2) this encompasses the various functions laid out for the Spirit in John 14–16; (3) this transcends (but may include) the legal context of the term (see esp. 16:7–11), Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 436n70.

<sup>37</sup> What is meant by Jesus “coming” in 14:18 is debated. Carson lists three possibilities: (1) the resurrection; (2) the gift of the Spirit; (3) or the Parousia. Carson argues for the resurrection, Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 501–2. Thompson believes Jesus’ coming refers both to his resurrection appearances and his enduring presence through the Spirit, Thompson, *John*, 314. Barrett thinks it impossible that it refers to the gift of the Spirit because that means John “confounds Jesus with the Holy Spirit,” but that is not a necessary implication, Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 464. Keener sees the “coming” in reference to Jesus’ coming in 20:19–23 to impart the Spirit to them, Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:973. Brown finds several correspondences between 14:15–17 and 14:18–21, and interprets the parallels as the strategy used to communicate to the reader that Jesus’ presence with the disciples after Jesus’ return to the Father is in and through the Paraclete, Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:644–45. See also Woll, “The Departure of ‘the Way,’” 233–34. It is difficult to make a clear-cut distinction. The juxtaposition of Paraclete-sending passages on either side of Jesus coming to be with the disciples (14:18–24; cf. esp. 14:23) implies that it is through the gift of the Spirit that the Father and Son will be “in” the disciples. The language of indwelling, “We will come to him and make our home [μονήν] with him” (14:23), and “In that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you” (14:20) also points to the abiding presence of the Spirit enabling the presence of Jesus and the Father in the believer, which a resurrection appearance would not account for. However, correspondences between 14:18–24 and 16:16–24 may argue for the resurrection appearances, since 16:22 says “I will see [ὄψομαι] you again, and your hearts will rejoice [χαρήσεται],” (see 20:20, “the disciples were glad [ἠγάπησαν] when they saw [ἰδόντες] the Lord”). Perhaps Thompson’s approach to include both the resurrection appearances and Jesus’ enduring presence through the Spirit is best. This issue is bound up with the more complex *crux interpretum* in the Gospel of John of when does Jesus ascend to the Father and when is the Spirit given. For the view that the giving of the Spirit in 20:22 is a fulfillment of 7:37–39 and 14:16–17 see James M. Hamilton, *God’s Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*, NAC Studies in Bible & Theology (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2006), 199–202. For a summary of interpretive options, and also for Bennema’s (unlikely, in my opinion) three-part Spirit-giving view see Cornelis Bennema, “The Giving of the Spirit in John’s Gospel - A New Proposal?,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 74, no. 3 (2002): 195–213; Cornelis Bennema, “The Giving of the Spirit in John 19–20: Another Round,” in *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology: Essays in Honor of Max Turner*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, Volker Rabens, and Cornelis Bennema (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 86–104.

things” and help them remember all Jesus has said (14:25–26). When the Paraclete comes, he will bear witness about Jesus (15:26). The Paraclete will also convict the world concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment (16:8).<sup>38</sup> The Paraclete is also the “Spirit of truth” who will guide them into “all the truth” and declare to the disciples “things that are to come” (16:13). He will take what belongs to Jesus and declare it to the disciples and thus glorify Jesus (16:14). The Spirit plays an important role in teaching the disciples, guiding them into truth, and helping them remember what Jesus had said (14:25–26; 16:13–14). After Jesus goes away, there will be a Spirit-enabled clarity about who Jesus is and what he did.

Additionally, it is in the going away of Jesus, that is, his lifting up, that all will be drawn to himself and eternal life can be granted (3:14–16; 12:32). Only when Jesus is glorified will rivers of living water flow forth, that is, will the Spirit be given (7:39). However one interprets 7:37–39, it is clear that John points to the glorification of Jesus as bringing about eschatological fulfillment, a new age of abundant life in the pouring out of the Spirit (e.g., Isa 32:15; 44:3).<sup>39</sup> Therefore in Jesus’s going away, there is the granting

---

<sup>38</sup> For the issues in interpreting 16:8–11 see Carson’s detailed article, D. A. Carson, “The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7–11,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, no. 4 (1979): 547–66. He makes a strong case for the meaning of ἐλέγχειν περί as both “convict of” and “convince of,” and for a consistent reading of the ὅτι clauses as causal in relation to ἐλέγχειν. Carson argues for a symmetry such that the Paraclete convicts the world concerning its sin, its (wrongly conceived) righteousness, and its judgment. Ultimately, Carson argues that the Spirit plays an evangelistic role here, without which the mission of the disciples would fail. See the discussion also in Burge, who largely agrees with Carson but doesn’t think a “perfect symmetry” is necessary, resulting in an interpretation of the Paraclete convicting the world of its sin, of (Christ’s) righteousness, and of (the world’s) judgment, in Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*, 208–10.

<sup>39</sup> The two main interpretive issues are (1) whether Jesus or the believer is the source of the living waters, and thus who is the referent of ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ “from his belly”; (2) to what Scripture does Jesus refer. Solving the first question involves a discussion on punctuation and whether ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ is a *casus pendens* to the Scripture citation, and thus the believer is the source of living water, or whether ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ is the subject of the prior πινέτω, making Jesus the source of living water. The debate is long and protracted and need not be recounted here. In favor of the believer as the source see: Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 322–28; Gordon D. Fee, “Once More - John 7:37–39,” *The Expository Times* 89, no. 4 (January 1978): 116–18; Zane Hodges, “Rivers of Living Water: John 7:37–39,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136, no. 543 (September 1979): 239–48; Henry M. Knapp, “The Messianic Water Which Gives Life to the World,” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 19, no. 2 (December 1997): 109–21; Larry Paul Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 145 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 154. In favor of Christ as the source, see Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*, 88–93; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:320–21; A. T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 113. In either case, the question of which Scripture is cited remains unsolved, and a variety of passages are proposed. The

of life and the giving of the Spirit, which is in the context of a new eschatological age that has dawned in the promised Christ.

It is possible that the “greater works” refers to Spirit-indwelt disciples going far and wide to bear witness to Jesus, many men bearing witness in many places as opposed to one man in one location.<sup>40</sup> But in light of the emphasis on Spirit-enabled post-resurrection clarity, it makes more sense to affirm with Carson that these “greater works” are “greater” because they belong to an age of clarity and power made possible by Jesus’s departure. The works the disciples will do “more immediately and truly reveal the Son.”<sup>41</sup> In addition, at that time the life-giving Spirit issues forth from the new temple, Jesus Christ (John 2:21; 7:39). It is not simply that the Spirit brings intellectual knowledge, but in revealing the Son, the Spirit grants life itself (cf. 17:3). Therefore in connection with Jesus’s works which reveal him to be the Son sent from the Father, the “greater works” of the disciples are “greater” because of they are carried out in a post-resurrection age of the

---

setting of the Feast of Tabernacles is important (John 7:2, 14, 37), and the water pouring ceremony symbolizing Israel’s eschatological hope is often pointed out (cf. *m. Sukkah* 4.9; 5.4). Grigsby points out that the water pouring ceremony at the Feast of Tabernacles: (1) may have anticipated the “living water” (and life-giving water) promised to flow from the eschatological temple of Ezekiel (47:1–2, 12; *t. Sukkah* 3.3–9); (2) could have been a reenactment of the miracle in the wilderness of the riven rock (Exod 17:1–7; Num 20:8–13; Ps 78:16–20), because the miracle was interpreted typologically as a forerunner for the ceremony (*t. Sukkah* 3.11–12); (3) could have represented the Jews’ hope of the age of messianic salvation poured out upon a thirsty people (*Pesiq. Rab.* 52.4, 6). See Bruce H. Grigsby, “‘If Any Man Thirsts’: Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7:37–39,” *Biblica* 67, no. 1 (1986): 101–8. Carson considers a swath of OT texts as possibilities (Isa 12:3; 44:3; 49:10; 58:11; Ezek 36:25–27; 47:1; Joel 3:18; Amos 9:11–15; Zech 13:1), narrows to Neh 8–9 and the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles, identifies its recollection of the riven rock (Exod 17:1–17; Num 20:8–13), and notes the connection of “living water” to Ezek 47:1–12. He finally concludes, “taken together, they richly anticipate the eschatological blessing of the Spirit on the believer’s life,” Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 326–28. I lean towards understanding Christ as the typological fulfillment of the riven rock (John 7:38, *ῥεω* for “will flow”, cf. its use in the wilderness rock-splitting passages in LXX Ps 77:20 [ET 78:20]; LXX Ps 104:41 [105:41]; Isa 48:21; also Tabernacles is itself a re-enactment of wilderness wanderings), who, in his glorification and sending of the Spirit, becomes the new temple from which life-giving water issues (John 2:21; Ezek 47:1–2, 9, 12; cf. Zech 14:8). In sending the Spirit, Christ fulfills the hopes of OT Israel for the Spirit to be poured out in connection to the reign of a righteous king, a new exodus and a return from exile (Isa 32:15; 44:3), they will be filled with the Spirit, have their sins forgiven, and obey God from the heart. Thus they will dwell safely in the land without threat of further exile (Deut 30:6; Jer 31:31–40; Ezek 36:25–28 = John 3:5).

<sup>40</sup> Loader thinks these “greater works” to be “not more fantastic miracles but greater spread and effect,” in William R. G. Loader, “John 5,19–47: A Deviation from Envoy Christology,” in *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology: Festschrift Gilbert van Belle*, ed. Joseph Verheyden et al., BETL 265 (Leuven; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014), 161.

<sup>41</sup> Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 496.

life-giving Spirit and of Spirit-remembered clarity. When Jesus did his works, even his disciples were unsure of what they signified, as signaled by the immediate context of 14:12–14. But after Jesus completes his work on the cross and sends the Spirit, the disciples are tasked to do “greater works” which will clearly reveal the Father in the Son.<sup>42</sup>

These “greater works” are also carried out in connection with the disciples dependence on God through prayer. Beasley-Murray rightly understands that the “grounds” for the “greater works” are twofold: because Jesus is going to the Father, and because Jesus will, through his disciples, perform the greater works.<sup>43</sup> The disciples, after Jesus leaves, are to “ask” in Jesus’s name,<sup>44</sup> and when they do, Jesus will do it, “that the Father may be glorified in the Son” (ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ, 14:13). Here in 14:13 Jesus indicates that the glorification of the Father “in the Son” (ἐν τῷ υἱῷ) will continue even after he leaves (cf. 13:31). The disciples’ “greater works” are enabled by prayerful dependence on God and performed by the Son. Jesus therefore continues his work through the disciples who will remain on earth after he departs.

### **What Are the “Greater Works”?**

What are these works in particular? Nowhere in the Gospel are the disciples told to replicate the signs and miracles of Jesus, nor can it be that their “greater works” are the same “greater works” of Jesus in judging and giving life (cf. 5:20).<sup>45</sup> What they

---

<sup>42</sup> See also the discussion in Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel’s Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 170–75.

<sup>43</sup> Beasley-Murray, *John*, 255.

<sup>44</sup> For praying “in Jesus’ name,” see Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:947–50. He concludes, after surveying a range of ancient prayer practices, that “most likely, asking ‘in his name’ signifies asking ‘as his representative, while about his business,’ just as Jesus came in his Father’s name (5:43; 10:25). It involves prayer ‘in keeping with his character and concerns and, indeed, in union with him.’” For a brief discussion on the theme of asking and receiving in the farewell discourse and comparison with some synoptic passages, see Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:633–36.

<sup>45</sup> The contrast between “greater works” than “these” in 5:20 is between the works of healing Jesus had been doing, of which the paralytic in 5:1–9 is a part, and the life-giving and judgment that the

are told to do, however, is to bear witness (15:27; cf. 17:20) and to keep Jesus's commandments (14:15). The chief "commandment" (ἐντολή) given is that they ought to love one another (13:34; 15:12). Their words (of witness) and their actions (chiefly, that they love one another) must then, enabled by the Spirit and prayer, reveal the Father in the Son.<sup>46</sup>

How are the works revelatory? In terms of witness, the disciples are to play a role in the vein of John the Baptist, who was sent to bear witness about the light (1:6–8). They themselves are not the light, but they bear witness that all might believe in the light through them. If the Gospel is indeed written by an eyewitness and disciple of Jesus, then it in itself is evidence of the "greater works" the disciples are to do. For it testifies right from the beginning of how the Father is revealed in the Son (1:1–18) and calls on all to believe in the Son and have life in his name (20:31). As the disciples bear witness with their words, through the Spirit, Jesus is disclosed before those who hear them. In terms of action, there may be a revelatory feature in the "love" the disciples are to have. Since it is a love "just as" Jesus has loved them (13:34; 15:12), it in itself must be a sacrificial self-giving love. The character of this love reflects the character of Jesus, which reflects the radiance of God's own glory. The examples of the Beloved Disciple bearing witness and Peter glorifying God through death are illustrative of "greater works," witness and action that glorifies the Father in the Son (21:18–19, 24–25).<sup>47</sup>

The "greater works" inform the mission of the disciples, or the task of discipleship. They are to continue the work of Jesus in glorifying the Father, specifically

---

Father has given to the Son (5:21–22). For a brief discussion of "greater works" in 5:20 see Ensor, *Jesus and His "Works": The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective*, 221–22.

<sup>46</sup> *Contra* Salier who only identifies the works given them to do as a message of testimony concerning Jesus, in Willis Hedley Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 186 (Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 144–46. Thüsing identifies these works as those of the exalted Christ, Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, 59–61, 115.

<sup>47</sup> Peter's glorifying the Father through death is likely as a shepherd who lays down his life in love, just as Jesus did before him. See discussion below under John 21:19.

by bearing witness and loving one another. As the disciples love one another as Jesus loved them, the world sees something of the love of God. Complemented by the verbal witness of the disciples and the power of the Holy Spirit, others too can be included in the “we” of “we have seen his glory” (1:14).<sup>48</sup> This love for one another testifies to the reality of Jesus’s love for them, and thus the Father’s love for the world (cf. 17:20–23). Both testimony and deed point back to the life-giving work of Jesus on the cross, which in itself glorifies the Father by revealing the supreme love of the Father in the Son.

### **John 15:8: Fruit-Bearing Israel Glorifies God**

ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε καὶ γένησθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί.  
“By this my Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit and so prove to be my disciples.” (15:8)

John 15:8 is the most direct statement on glorification and discipleship. There are connections between prior passages and 15:8 that bring the relationship between discipleship and glorification into clearer focus. The connections between glorification and death (12:23–26), glorification and love (13:31–35), glorification and prayer (14:12–14) are taken up again and recast together through the imagery of Jesus as the true vine. The disciples ought to obey Jesus’s commandment to love one another, even to the extent of laying down their lives for one another just as Jesus is about to do for them (15:12–13). In their obedience to Jesus’s commandment they glorify the Father, thus glorification and death and glorification and love are here presented together (15:8). As they abide in Jesus and his words in them, they are to ask and it will be done for them (15:7), recalling

---

<sup>48</sup> The complement of verbal witness and action can be seen also in Jesus’ ministry. Koester helpfully points out how the signs of Jesus interact with the teaching of Jesus. “Jesus says he is the bread of life but feeds the five thousand with barley loaves (6:11, 35). He calls himself the light of the world, then brings light to the eyes of a man who was born blind (8:12; 9:4–7). When he says that he is the resurrection and the life, he calls Lazarus out of the tomb (11:25–26, 44) – and his claim to be the resurrection is finally borne out by his own resurrection from the dead . . . Without verbal testimony people interpret what they see within other frames of reference, and regularly come to misguided faith or unbelief.” Craig R. Koester, “Jesus’ Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John,” in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 55.



14:13–14. These prayers are in connection to the disciples’ abiding in Jesus, and thus prayer and glorification are once again linked. As the disciples abide in Jesus and he in them, they will bear fruit, prove to be his disciples, and “in this” (ἐν τούτῳ) the Father is glorified (15:8). Once again, John connects glorification with the pattern of sacrificial love and prayer. In John 15 the Father’s glorification entails revealing the Father (the disciples exhibit a Jesus-like and Jesus-enabled love) and honoring him (obeying commands).

The contribution of 15:8 and its wider context (15:1–17)<sup>49</sup> to our understanding of glorification and discipleship is on several fronts. First, the disciples’ absolute dependence upon Jesus is further emphasized and underscores the nature of discipleship. One may be tempted to think that when Jesus goes away, he will lay down his life like a seed, and thus grant eternal life and send the Spirit, such that the disciples can *then* follow Jesus and do greater works as they love one another (12:23–24; 13:34–35; 14:12). But John 15:1–17 makes clear they are unable to do *anything* unless they fully depend on Jesus. They cannot glorify God unless they continually abide in Jesus.<sup>50</sup> Therefore the nature of discipleship, defined as an abiding relationship with Jesus, enables the task of discipleship, the glorification of the Father (15:8). Second, the connection between glorifying God and sacrificial love for one another is made once again (15:8, 12), and the

---

<sup>49</sup> Interpreters vary on how to divide up this passage. Kellum identifies 15:1–17 as a unit, and part of the larger discourse of 15:1–16:4a, further dividing the passage into 15:1–11 and 15:12–17, Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 169–73. Ridderbos understands that vv. 9–17 fills in the framework described in vv. 1–8, Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 518–19. Morris hesitantly identifies 15:17 as the start of the next paragraph, Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 601. It is best to take 15:17 as closing out the section, with ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν “these things I command you” and ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους “that you might love one another” both referring back to what was just discussed in 15:1–16. The whole of 15:1–17 must be considered together, even if one opts to sub-divide it further (either 15:1–8, 9–17 or 15:1–11, 12–17). The use of μένω and fruit-imagery recur throughout (15:2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16) and so does mention of love (15:9, 10, 12, 13, 17). The emphasis of the passage (15:1–17) is not so much on “abiding” as it is in the purpose of abiding, which is the glorification of the Father in the bearing of fruit.

<sup>50</sup> The perfective aspect of the present-tense substantive participle (ὁ μένων, 15:5), and present-tense subjunctives (μένῃ, 15:4, 6) is significant, for “abiding” is not something that can be done once or twice. The command of Jesus indicates that one must continually depend upon Jesus, as illustrated by the vine / branch analogy.

fruit which God seeks ought to be viewed primarily as love. Third, the glorification of the Father is set in the context of the disciples who are attached to the vine, Jesus, who is true Israel. Through the disciples' glorifying of the Father, Jesus and his disciples begin to fulfill the role of eschatological Israel in filling the world with fruit (Isa 27:2–6). The second point reinforces the task of discipleship as it relates to loving one another and glorifying God, and the third point indicates that as the disciples obey Jesus they fulfill OT expectations for Israel. The rest of this section will be an argument for the last two points.

### **Fruit and the Love Command**

Where God found wild grapes with Israel (Isa 5:4), he will now find the fruit he is looking for in Jesus and those who are connected to him (John 15:5). Fruit-bearing is the goal of the vine-dresser, for bad branches are evaluated based on whether fruit comes, and good branches are pruned for more fruit (15:2). As John 15:16–17 rounds out this passage, it also is clear fruit-bearing is the emphasis, “I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit” (15:16). The reason for such an emphasis can be explained in verse eight, when a branch bears much fruit, he proves to be a disciple and glorifies the Father (15:8). What does “fruit” encompass? Some interpreters do not find a definition for it in the passage.<sup>51</sup> Others define it widely in terms of the obedience of faith or general commandment keeping.<sup>52</sup> There is good reason for identifying the command to “love one another” as the primary fruit in view.

The verb “abide” (μένω) is re-iterated throughout the passage (15:4, 5, 7, 9, 10).<sup>53</sup> The imperative form is only used twice: the initial command, “Abide in me”

---

<sup>51</sup> Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 595; Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 800.

<sup>52</sup> E.g., Bultmann indicated that “it is every demonstration of vitality of faith, to which, according to vv. 9–17, reciprocal love above all belongs,” in Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 532–33.

<sup>53</sup> The verb is used 10 times in the span of 15:4–10. Kellum notes the repetition of μένω and

(μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, 15:4); and “Abide in my love” (μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ, 15:9). Rather than a new or separate command, it is best to view this second command as further developing the first.<sup>54</sup> Abiding in Jesus as a branch abides in the vine already indicates an intimate connection of absolute dependence.<sup>55</sup> With this second imperative, Jesus clarifies that they must also abide in Jesus’s *love*. We must note, first of all, that this second imperative brings Jesus’s love into focus as a crucial aspect of abiding. Jesus then further clarifies how they are to abide in Jesus’s love: “If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love, just as I have kept my Father’s commandments and abide in his love” (14:10). Keeping commands sustains abiding in Jesus’s love. If keeping the commands of Jesus can be correlated with the fruit God seeks, then there seems to be a general nature to the fruit.<sup>56</sup> But two reasons indicate that “love one another” is the primary fruit in view.

First, Jesus’s only explicit “commandment” identified in John is the one to love one another (13:34–35; 15:12). Considering that Jesus follows almost immediately with the love commandment confirms that “love one another as I have loved you” is the primary commandment in view:<sup>57</sup>

---

other rhetorical factors, and indicates that within the farewell discourse, Robert Longacre’s discourse analysis method yields 15:1–17 as the discourse “peak,” marking the importance of and the relationship of abiding, loving, and bearing fruit. See Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 145–46, 193–96.

<sup>54</sup> See also Marianus Pale Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 108; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 273.

<sup>55</sup> Earlier the disciples are said to abide “with” Jesus (1:39), but now they are called to abide “in” Jesus (15:4). This is analogous to how the Spirit dwells “with” the disciples and then will be “in” the disciples afterwards (14:17). The disciples are to be so connected to Jesus that they are described as inhabiting the same space as Jesus. Thus “abiding” points to the intimate, close relationship that can be had between God and his people, and combined with the vine and branch imagery, points to the absolute dependence the disciples must have upon Jesus.

<sup>56</sup> Köstenberger identifies fruit as an “all-encompassing reference to the manifold evidences of growth and results in the lives of believers. This would seem to include love, Christian character, and outreach,” Köstenberger, *John*, 2004, 454.

<sup>57</sup> *Contra* Lincoln who finds that 15:12 is less directly connected to the figure of the vine, Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, 406. As I noted above, the passage should be interpreted together as fruit imagery in 15:16 links back to the vine imagery introduced in 15:1, and the love commandment should be understood as continuing the theme of love first broached in 15:9. So also Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 424. Ball also acknowledges that while the importance of bearing fruit is

This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you (15:12–14).

Jesus here anticipates what he will do in laying down his life for his friends by going to the cross (cf. 10:11).<sup>58</sup> He calls it an act of love, and then directs his disciples to love in the same way. Second, keeping the commandment is a means of abiding in *love*, therefore it makes sense that the commandment to *love* is directly and organically related to abiding in Jesus's *love*. Therefore, when Jesus calls them to abide in his love by keeping his commandments, and then directly identifies the commandment to love one another, we are right to identify love as the primary commandment in view.<sup>59</sup> The logic of Jesus is clear: the disciples of Jesus abide in his love by loving one another.<sup>60</sup>

Here we run into what seems to be a paradox. I am arguing that “love one another” is the primary fruit in view, but it has just been identified by Jesus as a means of

---

emphasized in 15:1–11, what it means to bear fruit is the subject of 15:12–17, David Mark Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 131.

<sup>58</sup> See Martin M. Culy’s work for his argument that friendship is the main image of discipleship in the Gospel of John, *Echoes of Friendship in the Gospel of John*, New Testament Monographs 30 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010). Mark Zhakevich critiques this view while still arguing friendship is a key motif of the Gospel, and bases it upon exegesis of John 15:12–17, Zhakevich, “The Compensatory Benefits of Discipleship in the Gospel of John,” 177–80.

<sup>59</sup> Hera interprets the love command as that which summarizes obedience to Jesus’ commandments, and Beasley-Murray goes further when he suggests that in this command to love, love for God and neighbor are both subsumed and so “the commands of Christ . . . are comprehended in the one command to love one another.” Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17*, 108; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 274. See also Morris, who states that “the ‘commands’ of verse 10 are reduced to one, the command to love one another as Christ has loved them,” in Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 598. Ridderbos also interprets 15:12’s love command as clarifying or explaining 15:10’s “commandments” (τὰς ἐντολάς), Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 519–20. Klink does not find in 15:12 a “summation” of the obedience called for in 15:10 but one of its “primary expressions,” Klink, *John*, 656. In light of other NT passages that relate love for neighbor as the fulfillment of the law (Gal 5:14) or love for God and neighbor as that which the Law and the Prophets hang on (Matt 22:40), love for one another in John may very well sum up the commandments of Jesus. It is better, however, to affirm that it is the primary commandment, rather than a summation of all commands. There is an outward missionary impulse that cannot be accounted for if “love one another” is the sum of all commands (e.g., 4:35–37; 17:18; 20:22). If 17:22–23 can be understood as unity in love which leads to effective mission, then love for one another leads to effective mission, but still in itself doesn’t account for Jesus’ call to “go” (cf. 15:16).

<sup>60</sup> This all begins, of course, with the love of God in sending the Son into the world (3:16), and the disciples can be branches who remain because of Jesus’ word which has cleansed them (15:3).

abiding. If abiding leads to fruit-bearing, how can “love one another” be both the means of abiding and the fruit of abiding?

First, it is not simply my interpretation that runs into this problem, for if fruit-bearing retains a general definition, then fruit surely includes “love for one another.” The paradox of equating root and fruit remains. Second, the metaphor of the vine, branches, and fruit cannot be pressed too far. If we remain in the metaphorical image it seems nonsensical to identify “love for one another” as both root and fruit. The reality to which that metaphor points, however, can accommodate such a paradigm. The metaphor is used to demonstrate a relationship of dependence—the disciples must fully depend on Jesus just as branches do a vine (15:5). Depending on Jesus includes obeying his commands, not simply believing in his name.<sup>61</sup> The metaphor of fruit is used as that which pleases God. It is the purpose for which a vinedresser plants and cultivates a vine. When we take the realities that the metaphor points to, we can make sense of Jesus’s reasoning. What pleases God is not only the fruit, but also the dependence of the branches upon the vine. Looked at another way, the only kind of fruit God desires is the kind that stems from dependence on Jesus. Therefore, the fruit that God looks for consists in the abiding process as well as what it may lead to. Jesus here prescribes a way of life that is enveloped and characterized by love. The disciples’ new life (eternal life, 17:3) begins with God’s love (in sending the Son, 3:16), is granted through the Son’s love (in his sacrifice, 15:13), and is sustained by love for one another (enabling them to abide in Jesus’s love, 15:9). It is a life that can never “move on” from the love of the Son but must continually abide in it. Moreover, this abiding cannot happen apart from loving one another. Love for God and love for one another are vitally interconnected (cf. 1 John 4:7–

---

<sup>61</sup> It is a persevering faith that issues forth in obedience. This is seen not only in “if you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love” (15:10) but also “if you abide in me, and my words abide in you . . .” (15:7). Cf. John 8:31, “So Jesus said to the Jews who had believed him, “If you abide in my word, you are truly my disciples.”

8) such that Jesus indicates love for one another simultaneously keeps one in the love of God, which then bears more fruits of love. Therefore it is not nonsensical to think that loving one another is both a means to abiding and the fruit of abiding.

The phrase “and so prove to be my disciples” (καὶ γένησθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί, 15:8) also links abiding and fruit-bearing strongly with obedience to the love commandment. In the immediate context, Jesus has indicated “you are my friends if you do what I command you,” having commanded them to love one another. This is like 13:34, where Jesus stated that those who love one another “just as I have loved you” (13:34) are the ones who will be known as his disciples: “by this all people will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another” (13:35). If love is the primary fruit,<sup>62</sup> then both passages correlate love as the identifying mark of disciples in the context of glorifying the Father. Therefore an important aspect of how the disciples are to glorify God is brought out by these two passages (13:35; 15:8). There is a particular way of life that reveals and honors the Father, the way of self-giving love for one another. Fruit should not be limited to “love one another,” for it can include general command keeping, or the joy that comes from abiding (15:11).<sup>63</sup> However the emphasis on love one another is clear. Jesus indicates that the world will recognize the disciples of Jesus when they *love one another* like Jesus, and thus God will be glorified. The logic is that the world will perceive or *see* the love of Jesus in the disciples, and then conclude they must be Jesus’s followers. The pattern of Jesus’s own glorification of honoring God and revealing God in sacrificial love is to be continued in the disciples. Their abiding in Jesus leads to fruit, which has an outward, missionary-like orientation (15:16, “I chose you that you should

---

<sup>62</sup> Even when identifying fruit or the bearing of fruit in very general terms, several remain favorable to identifying loving one another as a primary aspect. For example, Barrett writes, “The bearing of fruit is simply living the life of a Christian disciple (see vv. 5, 8); perhaps especially the practice of mutual love (v. 12), Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 474.

<sup>63</sup> Peterson identifies the “fruit” of abiding as obedience, love, and also joy, see Robert A. Peterson, “Union with Christ in the Gospel of John,” *Presbyterion* 39, no. 1 (2013): 25.

go and bear fruit”) even as the fruit is love, which is oriented towards loving one another.<sup>64</sup> The love of the disciples for one another makes clear *who* they are, the disciples of Jesus, and their love both reveals the Father’s love in Christ and honors the Father in their obedience of the commandment.<sup>65</sup>

### The True Vine and Fruit

Jesus said, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinedresser” (15:1).<sup>66</sup> A vine or vineyard would have been a common part of ancient Mediterranean life. It appropriately serves as a clear illustration for the dependent relationship between branches (the disciples) and vine (Jesus). Yet the words, “I am the true vine,” reveal a deeper connection to explore. Previously, Jesus’s use of the “I am” (ἐγώ εἰμι) statement in context with the use of the adjective “true” (ἡ ἀληθινὴ) led us to compare him as “true bread” with the manna given in the wilderness (6:32, 35, 55).<sup>67</sup> Other “I am” + predicate statements also find connection to the OT.<sup>68</sup> Israel’s identification as a “vine” or

---

<sup>64</sup> Ridderbos sees a tension between fruit-bearing as loving one another (the view he takes in agreement with what I argued above) and the “missionary mandate” possible in the “Go” of 15:16. Therefore he writes, “In this passage fruitbearing represents the disciples’ love for one another, and this argues against a specifically missionary intent here, so that few have followed that interpretation,” Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John*, 521–22. However, if love for one another as Jesus loves reveals God and honors God, then Jesus may be prescribing a “missionary mandate” which includes revealing the Father in the Son, through both verbal witness and obedience to commandments. We should not link a “missionary mandate” with only verbal testimony. Thus the two ideas (loving one another, or missionary mandate) are not contradictory. As I argue below, bearing witness to Jesus verbally is complementary to the sacrificial love the disciples are to have for one another.

<sup>65</sup> Moloney also recognizes the revelatory import of 15:8, “To abide in Jesus is to make the *doxa* of the Father visible,” Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 421. Moloney also emphasizes the importance of the love command in respect to John 15:8.

<sup>66</sup> Some opt to see a Eucharistic reading from the image of the “vine,” such as C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (London, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 411. It seems too strained to see a reference to the Eucharist, for no reference is made to drinking of the fruit of the vine, nor of the breaking of Jesus’ body.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. John 6:32, “Truly, truly, I say to you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven, but my Father gives you the true bread from heaven”; 6:35, “I am the bread of life”; and 6:55, “For my flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink.”

<sup>68</sup> Jesus’ other “I am” + predicate statements: I am the bread of life (6:35); I am the light of the world (8:12); I am the door (10:7); I am the good shepherd (10:11); I am the resurrection and the life (11:25); I am the way, the truth, and the life (14:6). For Jesus’ statement “I am the light of the world” and its connection to Isaiah see Kai Akagi, “The Light from Galilee: The Narrative Function of Isaiah 8:23–9:6 in John 8:12,” *Novum Testamentum* 58, no. 4 (2016): 380–93. For Jesus as the good shepherd in relation to

“vineyard” in the OT is pervasive (Ps 80:8–16; Isa 5:1–7; 27:2–6; Jer 2:21; 12:10; Ezek 15:1–8; 17:1–10; 19:10; Hos 10:1). A common denominator in these passages (other than Isa 27:2–6) is that Israel is presented as a failed vine. In Ezekiel 15 Yahweh is going to use the wood of the vine for fire as judgment upon it (cf. John 15:6). In Isaiah 5 Yahweh came to his vineyard looking for grapes, but it yielded wild grapes (Isa 5:2). In judgment upon the vineyard, he will remove its hedge, break down its wall, and it shall be trampled down (Isa 5:5). For Jesus to be the “true vine,” he contrasts himself with Israel’s lack of faithfulness and fruitfulness. Israel, via Abraham, was called out from the nations in order to be a blessing to the world (Gen 12:3; 18:18). The role of Israel was to be a light and beacon to the world, they were destined to draw all the nations to Yahweh (Isa 2:1–4). In lieu of Israel’s failure Jesus comes as the true Israel, he is the “paradigmatic vine, the channel through whom God’s blessings flow.”<sup>69</sup>

Jesus as “true vine” implies that those who are united to him by believing are part of the true people of God, through whom God will bless the world. If it is true that loving one another is a primary fruit then loving one another (or the lack thereof) should find precedent in Israel’s failure as well.

The emphasis on fruit-bearing finds precedence in Isaiah 5:1–7, and its counter-passage in Isaiah 27:2–6.<sup>70</sup> Interpreters often link Jesus’s claim to be the “true

---

OT prophecy see Andreas J. Köstenberger, “Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12, no. 1 (2002): 67–96. Jesus as the “resurrection and life” (John 11:25) has connections to John 5:25–28 and its likely allusions to Daniel 12:2, see Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, 140–42. See also Stanley E. Porter, “Jesus and the ‘I Am’ Sayings in John’s Gospel,” in *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 120–148; Ball, “*I Am*” in *John’s Gospel*. There is a possible connection as well to Sirach 24:17, where Wisdom is portrayed as a vine (ἄμπελος) However, as Keener points out, Wisdom is compared to a variety of trees in that context (24:13–17), and the person is invited to eat Wisdom’s fruit rather than bearing them (24:19), see Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:991.

<sup>69</sup> Köstenberger, *John*, 448.

<sup>70</sup> Other possible OT passages for the background to vine imagery: Psalm 80:8–16; Jeremiah 2:21; 12:10–13; Ezekiel 15:1–8; 17:3–10; 19:10–14; and Hosea 10:1–2; 14:7. Israel as a vine or vineyard is such a pervasive descriptor for Israel that it is not necessary to posit connection to one passage to the exclusion of others. Jesus’ designation of himself as “true vine” makes all the references to Israel as a failed vine and under the judgment of God highly relevant. However, one or two passages may rise to the fore in



vine” to the negative evaluation of Israel through vineyard imagery in Isaiah 5:1–7, yet rarely account for the positive counter-passage in Isaiah 27:2–6 which prophesies of a time where Israel will take root and fill the world with fruit.<sup>71</sup> A recent dissertation by Grant Taylor argued for this overlooked connection.<sup>72</sup> Independently and around the same

---

terms of its correspondence to other themes found in John 15. The pervasive emphasis on bearing fruit (15:2, 4, 5, 8, 16), the mark of love as the defining commandment of the new community of God (15:12), and Jesus’ guarantee that fruit will indeed come as the disciples abide in him (15:5), lead us to the vineyard songs of Isaiah 5:1–7 and 27:2–6. Not only do we have in Isaiah 5:1–7 the contrast between Jesus as the true vine and Israel as a failed vineyard, but in Isaiah 5:1–7 the fruit God was looking for is distinctly defined. God was looking for righteousness and justice, and instead found bloodshed and oppression. The people of Israel failed to show brotherly love. As evidenced in Isaiah 5:8ff, they oppressed their neighbors and took advantage of one another. In contrast, the vineyard song of Isaiah 27:2–6 promises a time when Israel will take root and be planted such that they will fill the world with fruit, they will practice righteousness and do justice. In sum, they will love one another as they should have, God will harvest the fruit from the vineyard he desired. These cohere very well with the picture in John 15:1–17 of Jesus, the true vine who bears the fruit of love through his disciples. He will fill the world with fruit through their obedience to him (cf. John 15:16 and the universal effect and intent of Jesus’ death, 3:16; 4:42; 6:51; 10:16; 11:51–52; 12:32). The other OT candidates listed above serve well to illustrate how Jesus is “true vine” versus faithless Israel, but do not correspond as neatly in terms of the other themes. Some do not mention fruit at all (Ezek 15:1–8; Jer 2:21; 12:10–13; Hos 14:7). Psalm 80:8–16 expresses the desire of the psalmist to have God look upon the “vine” once again, which was once sprawling over the land and even provided shade for mountains. Fruit is mentioned only indirectly and only as what passersby “pluck at” in the wake of the vine’s ruin (see the use of אֵרֶב “to pluck,” in Ps 80:13 [ET 80:12]). For Ezekiel 17:3–10, the imagery of the vine is given not in reference to its fruit (although fruit is mentioned) but in reference to its roots and branches, symbolizing the vine’s dependence on the second eagle rather than the first. For interpretation of this “riddle” (Ezek 17:2, חֲדָה) see Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 522–47. Among the passages that do mention fruit-bearing (LXX Jer 2:21, “fruitful vine” [ἄμπελον καρποφόρον] cf. ESV “choice vine” [שֵׁרֶץ]; Ezek 19:10–14; Hos 10:1–2), Isaiah 5:1–7 and 27:2–6 remains the most pronounced in emphasizing the theme and in distinctly defining fruit in terms of actions Israel takes in relation to one another. For an argument for Psalm 80:8–16 as the primary allusion see Streett, and for a detailed discussion on the connections between Ezekiel 15:1–8, 17:1–10, and 19:10–14 see Manning. Andrew Streett, *The Vine and the Son of Man: Eschatological Interpretation of Psalm 80 in Early Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), 209–21; Gary T. Manning Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 135–46.

<sup>71</sup> The connection to Isaiah 5:1–7 is widely acknowledged by scholars, yet its corresponding passage in Isaiah 27:2–6 has been neglected. Sometimes 27:2–6 is listed amongst the passages for John 15:1’s possible OT background, but it is rarely discussed. See Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 472; Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, 402; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 419; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 513–14. Others do not even list it, Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 801; Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 593; Manning, *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, 135–37. For exceptions see Klink, *John*, 650; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 491–92; Thompson, *John*, 323.

<sup>72</sup> Grant D. Taylor, “The Fruitful Vineyard of God: Jesus and His Disciples at John 15:1–17” (PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014). I have only found two others that have discussed the significance of Isaiah 27:2–6 in relation to John 15. In his monograph on Jesus’ “I am” statements, Ball indicates that the possible connection with Isaiah 27:2–6 means the restoration of Israel as a fruitful vineyard is fulfilled in Jesus. Ball, “*I Am*” in *John’s Gospel*, 243–44. Nielsen goes a step further and makes a comparison between the fruit in John 15 and the fruit in Isaiah 5 and finds a correlation between the “wild grapes” denounced in Isaiah 5 and the positive fruit-bearing the disciples have in John 15. Kirsten Nielsen, “Old Testament Imagery in John,” in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel Århus 1997*, edited by

time I also came to the conclusion that Jesus as “true vine” is not simply in contrast to Isaiah 5:1–7 (and other OT passages) but also inaugurates the fulfillment of prophecy in Isaiah 27:2–6. The upshot of this connection for our study is both in the connection of fruit-bearing with love for one another, and of Jesus/the disciples with Israel. When the disciples bear the fruit God is looking for, they begin to fulfill the prophecy about how Israel shall blossom and fill the world with fruit. Applied in the Johannine context, the disciples will reveal the glory of God in the world as they “go” and bear fruit, that is, fill the world with the revelation of God’s character through their interactions with one another. In all this God is glorified, he is both revealed and honored.

In Isaiah 27:2–6 there is clearly a reversal of the judgment in Isaiah 5:1–7:

- (1) Again, there is a song for the vineyard (5:1, 27:2);
- (2) instead of removing its protection (5:5), Yahweh will protect it (27:3);
- (3) instead of briars and thorns arising (5:6), Yahweh threatens to burn them (27:4);
- (4) instead of withholding rain (5:6), Yahweh will water it constantly (27:3);
- (5) instead of judgment (5:5–6), Yahweh has no wrath (27:4);
- (6) instead of their fruit being acts of unfaithfulness (5:7), Israel shall blossom and fill the whole world with fruit (27:6).<sup>73</sup>

Isaiah 27:2–6 prophesies of a time when Israel will finally bear the fruit God desires, and Israel will fill the whole world with fruit. It is the fruit that God was looking for in Isaiah 5:1–7 but did not find. The fruit God was looking for is defined in Isaiah 5:7 as *מִשְׁפָּט* (“justice”) and *צְדָקָה* (“righteousness”), a word-pair which described the ethical, equitable behavior the Israelites should have toward one another.<sup>74</sup> In the immediate context Isaiah

---

Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen, *JSNTSup 182* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 72–76.

<sup>73</sup> For others who also trace a reversal see Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp, Continental Commentaries (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 583; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 493–95; Kirsten Nielsen, *There Is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah*, JSOTSup 65 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 117–19. On the difficulty of the phrase *מִי יִתֵּן* in Isa 27:4 and the options of interpretation see Benjamin J. M. Johnson, “‘Whoever Gives Me Thorns and Thistles’: Rhetorical Ambiguity and the Use of *מִי יִתֵּן* in Isaiah 27.2-6,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 36, no. 1 (2011): 105–26.

<sup>74</sup> The word-pair occurs together frequently throughout Isaiah (1:21; 1:27; 5:7; 5:16; 9:7 [9:6 MT]; 16:5; 26:9; 28:17; 32:1; 32:16; 33:5; 58:2 [2x]; 59:4; 59:9; 59:14), as identified by Gregory Polan, “Still More Signs of Unity in the Book of Isaiah: The Significance of Third Isaiah,” *SBL Seminar Papers* 36 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997): 225–26. Oswalt writes of the pairing of righteousness and justice together, “Righteousness is a kind of living which is in accord with the norms of justice,” John N. Oswalt,

inveighs against greed, gluttony, drunkenness, injustice, and excess (5:8–23). There are those who take advantage of their neighbors (5:8–10) and who pervert justice (5:18–23).<sup>75</sup> To do “justice” and “righteousness” was to treat one another according to God’s own ways.<sup>76</sup> It is not a far leap to conclude that Israel should have exhibited love for one another.<sup>77</sup> Therefore when Israel takes root and fills the world with fruit in Isaiah 27:6, they should be pictured as filling the world with righteousness and justice.<sup>78</sup>

---

“Righteousness in Isaiah: A Study of the Function of Chapters 56–66 in the Present Structure of the Book,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition, Vol 1*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, vol. 1, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 70 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), 185.

<sup>75</sup> What the Lord found instead was מִשָּׁפַח “bloodshed” and צַעֲקָה “an outcry” (Isa 5:7). The terms are a wordplay off the word-pair מִשְׁפָּט (“justice”) and צְדָקָה (“righteousness”). מִשָּׁפַח is a *hapax leg.* and it is difficult to know the meaning with certainty. Some have noted a possible connection with Arabic *safaha*, “pour out, spill (blood),” and after a brief survey of discussion, Wildberger concludes it is best to stay with the meaning “bloodshed,” while Oswalt prefers “oppression.” Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp, Continental Commentaries (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 185; Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*. The intention, though, is clear enough, as Motyer writes, “Justice is the righting of wrongs while bloodshed is the inflicting of wrongs,” J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1993), 69. The other term, צַעֲקָה “an outcry” is better attested (Gen 27:34; Exod 3:7, 9; 1 Sam 9:16; Neh 5:1; Ps 9:12), it “is the cry of woe coming from someone who is politically and socially oppressed,” Wildberger, *Isaiah*, 185.

<sup>76</sup> See the word-pair used of God in Isa 5:16. Nielsen writes of the wild grapes in Isaiah 5:7, “According to Isaiah, the people’s offences are thus of a social nature, which on the one hand answers well to the social accusations in the preceding chapters and on the other hand to the subsequent lamentations,” in Nielsen, *There Is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah*, 103.

<sup>77</sup> Thus in the only other study I have found to correlate fruit in Isaiah 5:1–7, 27:2–6 with fruit in John 15, Nielsen writes, “For while Isa. 5:1–7 is followed by a succession of denunciations that interpret in a colourful fashion what it means to bear wild grapes and denounce those who exploit the weak in society and live in luxury without giving a thought to Yahweh, so Jn. 15:1–8 is followed by a defining explication of what it means to bear good fruit. Fellowship with Jesus shows itself in a life of love and obedience,” Nielsen, “Old Testament Imagery in John,” 75.

<sup>78</sup> A survey of how צְדָקָה (“righteousness”) is employed in Isaiah yields the understanding that Israel is called to have it, yet consistently fails. Only with God’s intervention can “righteousness” and “justice” be in the land. It will take the Spirit being poured out from on high (Isa 32:15), then “justice (מִשְׁפָּט) will dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness (צְדָקָה) abide in the fruitful field” (32:16). This also accords with the Gospel’s portrayal of the disciples only being able to glorify God *after* Jesus’ glorification and the sending of the Spirit. Oswalt observes that, in general, the basic usage of צְדָקָה in Isaiah 1–39 is in reference to morally correct behavior, in accord with the norms of justice (מִשְׁפָּט). But in Isaiah 40–55 righteousness has more to do with salvation or deliverance (45:8, 45:25; 46:13; 50:8; 51:5; 53:11). Thus chs. 40–55 speak of God’s faithfulness and his commitment to deliver his people, though they fail to have the righteousness and justice that is called of them. Chapters 40–55 then, highlight the grace of God in promising deliverance for his people. Broadly speaking, the justice/righteousness that the people lack (chs. 1–39), God provides for richly in his righteousness/salvation (chs. 40–55). Only in Isaiah 56:1, are the two word-pairs (righteousness/justice and righteousness/salvation) used together. Due to the righteousness/salvation God promises, the people of God can שָׁמְרוּ מִשְׁפָּט וְעָשׂוּ צְדָקָה (“keep justice and do righteousness”). In Isaiah, this righteousness/salvation comes through the work of the servant, in particular in Isaiah 52:13–53:12. This too accords with the Gospel of John. If righteousness/justice can be correlated with love and glorification, then the disciples can only do so after the righteousness/salvation Jesus provides in his lifting up and glorification on the cross as the servant. For the tracing of righteousness/justice and righteousness/salvation through Isaiah see Oswalt, “Righteousness in Isaiah”;

If Jesus is the “true vine” in contrast to faithless Israel in connection with passages like Isaiah 5:1–7, then it follows that he also fulfills the prophecy of Isaiah 5:1–7’s reversal in Isaiah 27:2–6. Jesus’s command for his disciples to love one another in John correlates to the fruit God desired from his people in Isaiah. The people failed to bring about righteousness and justice in the land of Israel. They neither worshiped Yahweh nor demonstrated his character, taking advantage of one another for personal gain. But the disciples, through Jesus, will obey God (primarily in loving one another) and bring about the fruit God desires. As they are sent into the world and demonstrate this kind of love for one another, they begin to fill the world with God’s glory as they reveal his character through their actions towards one another. Jesus being the “true vine” and the disciples’ carrying out of the commandment to love one another is the inauguration of the fulfillment of Isaiah 27:6, “In days to come Jacob shall take root, Israel shall blossom and put forth shoots and fill the whole world with fruit.” As the disciples obey Jesus to “go and bear fruit” (ὁμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε, John 15:16), they as branches, in Jesus as the vine, begin to fulfill the role of Israel in filling the whole world with fruit. Just as Jesus’s display of glory and his glorification of the Father fulfills Scripture, so the disciples’ display of Jesus’s glory in acts of love both honors God and reveals God (John 15:8), fulfilling the vision for who the people of God should be.

Therefore John 15:1–17 contributes in at least three ways to our understanding of glorification and discipleship: (1) the nature of discipleship is defined as an abiding relationship with Jesus, which enables the task of discipleship to glorify the Father; (2) The task of discipleship is further confirmed as glorifying the Father in obedience to Jesus’s commands, the primary one of which is to love one another; and (3) as the disciples carry out this task, they begin to fulfill the role of Israel in blessing the world.

---

Polan, “Still More Signs of Unity in the Book of Isaiah: The Significance of Third Isaiah,” 225–27.

## John 16:14: The Holy Spirit will Glorify Jesus

Ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι· ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστίν· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth, for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you. (16:12–15)

Jesus indicates that it is better for the disciples that he leaves, for if he leaves he will send the Paraclete to the disciples.<sup>79</sup> Why is it better that he leaves? Two general reasons are provided. First, because of what the Spirit will do in the world (16:8–11) and second, what the Spirit will do in the disciples (16:12–15).<sup>80</sup> For the world, the Spirit will convict the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment.<sup>81</sup> For the disciples, the Spirit will glorify Jesus, guiding them into all truth.

### What Does “Glorifying Jesus” Mean?

The statement that the Holy Spirit will glorify Jesus is immediately followed with ὅτι: “For he will take what is mine and will declare it to you” (ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν, 16:14). I have argued that glorifying God in John involves the honoring of God in the revealing of God.<sup>82</sup> This can be the case in 16:14 as well, that

---

<sup>79</sup> John 15:18–16:4a describes the hatred of the world while 16:4b–15 outlines the advantage that Jesus’ departure will give to the disciples in the face of such hatred. In light of their call to be witnesses before a world (15:27) that may respond with hatred, Jesus assures them that the sending of the Spirit is something that is “better” than his own physical presence with them (16:7).

<sup>80</sup> These two reasons are related. What the Spirit does in the world is likely *through* the disciples, see the end of 16:7 and how it transitions into 16:8, “But if I go, I will send him to you. And when he comes, he will convict the world . . .” (16:7–8a). See Fernando F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 228. For a detailed structural analysis of 16:7–15 see pp. 227–45.

<sup>81</sup> On the Spirit’s convicting work in 16:8 see note 38 above.

<sup>82</sup> See Chibici-Revneanu’s discussion on the “multidimensionality” of the Johannine glory terminology, in *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 329–30.

the Holy Spirit is revealing Jesus to the disciples as well as honoring him.<sup>83</sup> The ὅτι clause functions to explain how it is that the Holy Spirit does this, he “will take what is mine and declare it to you.” John 16:14–15 parallels with 16:13:

Table 13. Parallels between John 16:13 and 16:14–15

John 16:13	John 16:14–15
<p>ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,</p> <p>ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση·</p> <p>οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ’ ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.</p>	<p>ἐκεῖνος</p> <p>ἐμὲ δοξάσει,</p> <p>ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστίν· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.</p>

It is likely that John 16:14–15 elaborates on what was stated in 16:13, such that “he will glorify me” further explains “he will guide you into all the truth.” If it is possible to link “the truth” (ἡ ἀλήθεια) with Jesus himself, who earlier is stated to be “the way, the truth, and the life” (ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, 14:6), then it becomes clear that the Holy Spirit’s glorifying of Jesus involves a disclosing of who Jesus is.

---

<sup>83</sup> Usually the Spirit’s revelatory function is highlighted by interpreters, for he will take what is Jesus’ and disclose it to the disciples. Yet the glorification of Jesus also entails an honoring of Jesus. Chibici-Revneanu points out how the Spirit, in taking what is Jesus’ and declaring it to the disciples, further confirms what Jesus has said. In this way there is an “honor” bestowed upon Jesus, or an enablement of his recognition. Likewise, when the Spirit convicts the world of their sin and puts them in the wrong, the Spirit vindicates Jesus and reveals the prince of this world as judged. Chibici-Revneanu argues that this is the Holy Spirit confirming “that it is not the world but Jesus who is right, and thereby pays tribute to the person and revelation of Jesus,” see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 248–50, esp. 249. Carson writes, “Glory comes to Jesus as the truths of the gospel are established in the lives of men,” D. A. Carson, *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus: An Exposition of John 14-17* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), 151.

Whether “the truth” (ἡ ἀλήθεια) that the Holy Spirit will guide them is “into” (εἰς) or “in” (ἐν)<sup>84</sup> the truth, and whether πάση is adjectival such that it is “all truth” or the recently proposed adverbial<sup>85</sup> use, “guide you completely into all the truth,” the most crucial point is that “the truth” is centered on Jesus, who himself is “the truth” (ἡ ἀλήθεια, 14:6). Tops thinks that the adjectival use of πάση (thus “all truth”) implies that the truth was not complete in Jesus. The adverbial view, Tops contends, places the emphasis “on the completeness of the guidance, which implies that truth was already complete in Jesus, but that the conditions for understanding the truth were not yet given.”<sup>86</sup> The problem with the adverbial use of πᾶσα lies primarily in its grammatical improbability. For πᾶσα is in the feminine dative, clearly modifying τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. If the adjective was used adverbially,

---

<sup>84</sup> The NA<sup>28</sup> has “ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση”, the reading found in  $\aleph$  and D, while the NA<sup>25</sup> had “εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν”, agreeing with codices A and B. For the discussion on reading ἐν or εἰς see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1994), 247; Reimund Bieringer, “The Spirit’s Guidance into All the Truth: The Text-Critical Problems of John 16,13,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux, BETL 161 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 183–207. Bieringer writes, “the choice between these variants has potential to make a theological difference. If one takes the prepositions ἐν and εἰς in their strong meanings, the first refers to the ‘place where’, the second to the ‘goal where to’. Consequently one can read John 16,13ab as speaking about the role of the Spirit of truth to guide the disciples in the truth where they already are or (in)to the truth where they are not yet,” (Bieringer, 183). On the issue of whether the prepositions lead to a view that the Spirit will impart “new” revelation, it is not likely that the prepositions themselves will be determinative for interpretation. If the context (e.g. 16:12, 13) suggests that there is an aspect of the Spirit’s ministry which entails “new” words Jesus will say to the disciples through the Spirit, then that would take precedence over giving too much weight to a precise meaning of the preposition. It is possible that the Spirit leads the disciples into truth they already have in Christ, yet to a greater understanding of it (Morris, “As the days go by, the Spirit will lead them deeper and deeper into the knowledge of the truth,” in *The Gospel According to John*, 621). What Morris says is surely true, but that may not fully account for 16:12–13. If there is “new” revelation, how might it square with what Jesus said in 15:15, “all that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you”? Porsch suggested that the perspective found in 16:25 may provide a solution, where “the hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures of speech but will tell you plainly about the Father.” Jesus there indicates two time periods, the one contemporaneous with Jesus where he has spoken figuratively, and the later period, which Porsch takes to be identical with the Spirit’s revelatory work (see the recounting of Porsch’s argument in Burge, *The Anointed Community*, 214–15). However, 16:12–13 speaks of a future period where the Spirit will tell them things that Jesus has yet to tell them. For this reason Burge allows that these verses speak of new revelation, but indicates that it must be constrained by the truth which has been revealed in Jesus and thus cannot deviate from it, see *Anointed Community*, 215–16. Köstenberger interprets “the things that are to come” (16:13) in the period following Pentecost (giving of the Spirit) and that the emphasis may not be so much on predictive prophecy but on helping the disciples understand their situation in light of Jesus’ prior revelation, Köstenberger, *John*, 2004, 473–74. Carson detects an anticipation of the New Testament Canon, Carson, *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus*, 149.

<sup>85</sup> Proposed by Thomas Tops, “The Orientation of the Teaching of the Paraclete in the Gospel of John: Retrospective or Prospective?,” *NTS* 66, no. 1 (January 2020): 80.

<sup>86</sup> Tops, “The Orientation of the Teaching of the Paraclete in the Gospel of John: Retrospective or Prospective?,” 80.

we would expect a neuter singular. Additionally, in the context of 16:13, there are things Jesus has *not* said, since the disciples “cannot bear them now” (16:12). This implies that through the Spirit, Jesus will say yet more things to the disciples, which may include “things that are to come” (16:13). The adjectival use of *πᾶσα* makes sense in 16:13, and contrary to Tops, it need not imply that the truth is not complete in Jesus, but only that the disciples are not ready to receive all of it yet prior to Jesus’s glorification. Furthermore, the Holy Spirit’s guidance into “all truth” parallels 14:26, where “he will teach you all things [διδάξει πάντα] and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you.” In both cases, whether “all truth” or “all things,” the “all” is qualified by their contexts as that which Jesus has done, has said, or will say. In the context of the farewell discourse, what is in view is the Spirit’s enablement for the disciples to bear witness to Jesus (15:26–27), that is, his actual life in the flesh.<sup>87</sup> The “truth” is Jesus himself. To be led into “all truth” or to be taught “all things” must refer to fully understanding Jesus, the mission he came to accomplish, the Father he reveals, and “the new order of things that has issued from the death and resurrection of Christ.”<sup>88</sup>

The Spirit is like Jesus (cf. 14:16) in that just as Jesus does not speak on his own authority (ὁ ἄφ’ ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν, “the one who speaks on his own authority,” 7:18), the Spirit does not speak on his own authority (οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἄφ’ ἑαυτοῦ, “He will not speak

---

<sup>87</sup> The work of the Holy Spirit is described to *these* disciples of Jesus. The Spirit brings to remembrance what Jesus has told them (14:26); they will bear witness with the aid of the Holy Spirit because they have been with Jesus from the beginning (15:27); and here in chapter 16 the Spirit of truth will say yet more things because the disciples could not “bear them now” (16:12). The ministry of the Holy Spirit in view, then, is first in regards to these particular disciples of Jesus and their enablement to bear witness to his life and mission.

<sup>88</sup> See Ignace de la Potterie, “The Truth in Saint John,” in *The Interpretation of John*, ed. and trans. John Ashton, Second Edition, Studies in New Testament Interpretation (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 67–82, esp. 82. First published in *RivB* 11 (1963): 3–24. Hurtado interprets the Holy Spirit’s work of revealing Jesus to the disciples to involve revelatory and prophetic experiences, which were “likely focused on (or at least heavily included) christological insights into biblical texts, ‘finding’ Jesus in the Scriptures of Israel with the aid of the Spirit, Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 376–77, 388. From connections he finds in John, Hurtado hypothesizes it must have included christological readings in Isaiah 40–66.



on his own authority,” 16:13).<sup>89</sup> Just as Jesus hears from God and speaks (3:32; 5:30; 8:26, 40; 15:15), so the Spirit hears and speaks (16:13). Just as Jesus has heard from the Father and makes it known to the disciples (15:15), the Spirit will take what is Jesus’s (and thus the Father’s) and declare it to the disciples (16:14–15). Just as Jesus brought glory to the Father and revealed his Father’s name (12:28; 17:6), the Holy Spirit presses home for the disciples “all the revelation bound up in Jesus’s person and mission.”<sup>90</sup> The need for the Spirit’s work of revelation to the disciples is made apparent in the disciples’ own misunderstandings of Jesus through his ministry and in particular the farewell discourses (2:22; 11:16; 12:16; 13:7, 36–37; 14:5, 8; 16:17–18, 29–32). The disciples will be able to bear witness to Jesus only if the Spirit comes. The Spirit’s instruction is not merely information but entails understanding and believing (2:22; 12:16). The Spirit, then, plays an important revelatory role as he makes Jesus known to the disciples even after Jesus departs.

### **Why Is Jesus Glorified?**

Whereas in 12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 17:1, 4, glorification is taking place in “the hour,” here we have a clear instance of glorification happening after “the hour.”<sup>91</sup> This post-“hour” glorification follows in the pattern of 14:13 and 15:8, where in connection with the disciples the Father will be glorified after Jesus leaves. Only four occurrences of *δοξάζω* (14:13, 15:8, 16:14, 21:19) refer to post-“hour” activity. However, 16:14 stands out for two reasons. First, the Holy Spirit here is the active agent of glorification, and

---

<sup>89</sup> In 7:18 Jesus does not seek his own “glory” (*δόξαν*) because he does not speak on his own authority, just like the Spirit does not glorify himself but glorifies Jesus, and speaks only what he hears from Jesus (16:13–15).

<sup>90</sup> Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 541.

<sup>91</sup> *Contra* Chibici-Revneanu, who finds the future verb forms of *δοξάζω* in 12:28 and 13:32, in contrast to the aorist, as referring to post-hour glorification. She argues that “the hour” in John never ends and extends into the time of the disciples. She sees this event as evidence of the Spirit being sent “in” the hour, in *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 245, 327–28.

second, Jesus is the one glorified. The other three occurrences have the Father (14:13, 15:8) or God (21:19) glorified. This instance stands out all the more when we consider that in the Gospel of John the glorification of the Son is usually linked to the events of the hour.<sup>92</sup> We have in 16:14 the only occurrence of Jesus being glorified in reference to post-“hour” activity. This stands in contrast to 14:13, 15:8, and 21:19, where post-“hour” activity has God or Father as the one glorified. The pattern of God being glorified makes sense, because Jesus’s mission was not to glorify himself but to glorify the Father (8:54), and his disciples are to continue in that glorification after Jesus departs (14:13; 15:8; 21:19). Why does 16:14 break the pattern and identify Jesus as the one glorified?

The answer is that the glorification of the Father, even post-Easter, must still occur in connection with the Son. As 14:13 made clear, even in the context of the continuing work of the disciples after Jesus leaves, the Father is to be glorified “in the Son” (14:13). If the disciples are to continue the work of Jesus in glorifying the Father, the revelation of the Son must be made clear to the disciples and endure in their ministry. The Holy Spirit enables this. The disciples need the Spirit if they are to bear fruit and glorify the Father (15:8). The fruit they bear is distinctly shaped by Jesus’s love, and is to resemble it (15:4, 8, 9, 13), and cannot come about unless the Spirit glorifies Jesus to them. Therefore just as in the cross-work of Jesus, where the Son of Man is glorified, thus thereby God is glorified “in him” (13:31), so too in the post-“hour” activity of the disciples the glorification of God takes place in relation to the glorification of the Son,

---

<sup>92</sup> Out of the twenty-three occurrences of *δοξάζω*, in twelve of them the Son is glorified. In the remaining occurrences God is glorified. And out of the twelve occurrences where the Son is glorified, eight of them are in connection with the hour (7:39, 12:16, 12:23, 13:31 [3x]; 17:1, 5). The remaining four are these: two occurrences in John 8:54, where Jesus makes clear he does not glorify himself, and it is the Father who glorifies him; in 11:4 the Son of God is glorified in connection to the raising of Lazarus from the dead and the events of the hour to which it leads; in 17:10 Jesus “has been glorified” (*δεδοξασμαι*) among his disciples (or is it “by them”?). In these four instances, glorification language is always used in reference to the Father. In John 8:54 Jesus is defending his “honor” by contrast with his opponents, for Jesus does not seek his own honor nor glorify himself, but the Father is the one who glorifies Jesus, because Jesus seeks the Father’s honor (8:49). In 11:4 the Son of God being glorified is occurs with the glory of God being revealed, and in 17:10 the context is Jesus revealing the Father’s name to the disciples (17:6), the disciples knowing that all that Jesus does and says is from the Father, and the disciples knowing that Jesus was sent from the Father (17:8).

and in two particular ways. First, the glorification of God continues to take place in relation to the glorification of the Son's "hour," for "the hour" remains the focal point of revelation and salvation. Second, the knowledge and full import of this "hour" must be made known among Jesus's disciples, thus the glorification of God takes place also in relation to the continuing glorification of the Son through the Spirit (16:14).

John 16:14 contributes in at least four ways to the relationship between discipleship and glorification. First, 16:14 reinforces the necessity of the Holy Spirit if the disciples are to succeed in their mission of glorifying the Father. If they are to understand the truth of who Jesus is, to remember his words, and to follow him in glorifying the Father, Jesus must send the Spirit. Second, we are reminded that the glorification of the Father happens in the glorification of the Son, even after Jesus departs. If the disciples are to glorify the Father, it will be through the Holy Spirit glorifying Jesus. Third, John 16:14 implies the success of the disciples. Jesus will be present with them even though absent, via the Spirit, another Paraclete. And fourth, the sending of the Spirit once again links the work of the disciples with the new context they will find themselves in, an age where Jesus has been glorified and all are invited to come to Jesus for life-giving water in fulfillment of Scripture (7:37–39).

### **John 21:19: Discipleship unto Death**

Ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω σοι, ὅτε ἡς νεώτερος, ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν καὶ περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσῃ καὶ οἴσῃ ὅπου οὐ θέλεις. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι. "Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were young, you used to dress yourself and walk wherever you wanted, but when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and another will dress you and carry you where you do not want to go." (This he said to show by what kind of death he was to glorify God.) And after saying this he said to him, "Follow me." (21:18–19)

Chapter twenty-one of John has repeatedly been thrown into question as to how it properly belongs to the Gospel of John.<sup>93</sup> The seemingly fitting conclusion of 20:30–31 makes chapter twenty-one look like an afterthought. Barring evidence that John ever existed without what is commonly called the epilogue, it is preferable to explore the reasons why twenty-one is included rather than to provide reasons why it should not be. The difference between “many other signs” (πολλὰ . . . ἄλλα σημεία, 20:30) and “many other things” (ἄλλα πολλὰ, 21:25) shows that in 20:30–31, John draws to a close the particular presentation of Jesus’s signs. Viewed in this way, 20:30–31 does not necessarily entail a conclusion to the book as a whole, but the end of John’s presentation of Jesus as the one who reveals the glory of God. The fact that this presentation arguably encompasses all of what has come before certainly argues for 20:30–31 as a conclusion to the Gospel,<sup>94</sup> but does not preclude that the writer has more to say outside of this

---

<sup>93</sup> Dodd expresses the common view of modern scholarship: “It seems pretty clear that [the Gospel of John] was originally planned to end at xx. 30–1, where it is provided with a formal conclusion. Ch. xxi, whether the work of the evangelist or another, has the character of a postscript, and falls outside the design of the book as a whole,” in Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 290. For a brief summary on this issue see Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:1219–23. Some read the emphasis on Peter and the mention of the Beloved Disciple as indicators to the historical milieu of the Fourth Gospel’s composition, and hypothesize different historical scenarios that would account for the addition of John 21. For example, Maynard argues that the Redactor has, in adding the appendix of John 21, made the Fourth Gospel acceptable to the larger church of his day by restoring primacy to Peter, in Arthur H. Maynard, “The Role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 30, no. 4 (October 1984): 531–48. Blaine dedicates a chapter in his monograph in order to argue that John 21 was written by a community scribe, in lieu of a crisis precipitated by the death of the Beloved Disciple, in Bradford B. Blaine, Jr., *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple*, Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 127–42. There have, however, been a number of works seeking to make sense of John 21 as part of the Gospel. Gaventa proposes that chapters 20 and 21 provide dual endings to the gospel and that while chapter 20 brings closure, chapter 21 ends as a sort of “anti-closure,” showing the “ongoing, never-ending character of the disruption created by the descent of Jesus from the Father,” in Beverly Roberts Gaventa, “The Archive of Excess: John 21 and the Problem of Narrative Closure,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 240–52, esp. 249. Wiarda argues for the narrative unity of 21:1–23 and how it provides lessons for discipleship, Timothy Wiarda, “John 21.1–23: Narrative Unity and Its Implications,” *JSNT* 14, no. 46 (April 1992): 53–71. Bauckham examines the issue from a different angle, arguing for the significance of the 153 fish using numerology to demonstrate the unity of John 21 with the rest of the gospel. Richard Bauckham, “The 153 Fish and the Unity of the Fourth Gospel,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 271–84. For a brief discussion on style and the role it should play (or not play) in determining whether John 21 is “original,” see Bauckham’s discussion on pp. 272–73. Bauckham’s essay is a revised version of his work originally published in *Neotestamentica* 36 (2002): 77–88.

<sup>94</sup> If it is true that Jesus’ public ministry of revealing δόξα through signs gave way to his hour of δοξάζειν, in which the climactic sign of glory was through his death and resurrection, then 20:30–31 is indeed a fitting conclusion to what had come before.

presentation, and evidently he does. The difference between 20:30 and 21:25 then, marks how chapter twenty-one is no longer about signs for belief, but an appearance of Jesus (21:1, ἐφάνηρσεν ἑαυτὸν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς) narrated for a different purpose. The difference lies in a shift from Christology to discipleship and is further comment on how the glorification of God will continue in his disciples after he departs.

Peter is the main focus of chapter twenty-one. Like in the Synoptics, John presents Peter as a complex character,<sup>95</sup> one who responds with faith at one point (6:68–69), and dithers at another (18:17). Yet the presentation of Peter in John 21 establishes him as a shepherd-like leader, similar to Jesus, who will also glorify God in the manner that Jesus did. Peter’s glorification of God is also presented in complement to how the Beloved Disciple bears witness (21:20–25).

We find in John 21 the restoration of Peter as Jesus questions Peter three times in the presence of a charcoal fire (ἀνθρακιᾶν, 18:15; 21:9), contrasting Peter’s three denials (21:15–17; 18:15–18, 25–27).<sup>96</sup> Jesus also likens Peter to a shepherd, one who is given the directive to “feed the sheep”<sup>97</sup> by the good shepherd himself.<sup>98</sup> When Jesus goes on to prophesy of Peter’s death (possibly in the manner of crucifixion, 21:18),<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> R. Alan Culpepper writes of the Gospel of John, “Next to Jesus, Peter is the most complex character,” in *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 120. For character studies on Peter, see Michael Labahn, “Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career,” in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*, ed. Steven A. Hunt, D. F. Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmerman, WUNT 314 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 151–67; Cornelis Bennema, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), 111–26. See van Belle for an extensive listing of secondary literature on Peter in the Gospel of John, Gilbert Van Belle, “Peter as Martyr in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Martyrdom and Persecution in Late Antique Christianity: Festschrift Boudewijn Dehandschutter*, ed. J. Leemans, BETL 241 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 281n3.

<sup>96</sup> Labahn, “Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career,” 165; Bennema, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*, 118.

<sup>97</sup> See threefold response of Jesus to “Feed my lambs” (βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου, 21:15), “Tend my sheep” (ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατά μου, 21:16), and “Feed my sheep” (βόσκει τὰ πρόβατά μου, 21:17).

<sup>98</sup> Many have observed the link between Peter’s commissioning and impending death with Jesus and shepherding, e.g., Bennema, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*, 121–22.

<sup>99</sup> Whether Jesus references crucifixion in particular is not clear, but there are possible indicators. The correlation with Jesus’ own death through the use of the verb δοξάζω and his call to “Follow

John then adds the editorial comment that this was the kind of death Peter was to glorify God (21:19).<sup>100</sup> The correspondences between Peter and Jesus are many. Just as Jesus is a good shepherd (10:11), Peter is likened to a shepherd; just as Jesus laid down his life for the sheep (10:11) on the cross and glorified God (13:31–32), Peter will lay down his life and glorify God (21:19; cf. 13:37).<sup>101</sup> Earlier, where Jesus indicated that his coming death would glorify God (13:31–32), Peter desired to follow but could not (13:36–38), but now Jesus tells him immediately after signifying the kind of death Peter was to die, “Follow me” (21:19). The parallel between Jesus and Peter is unmistakable. Although we cannot make one to one correspondences, for Jesus’s death gives life and the same cannot be said for Peter’s, we may venture a further parallel. Just as Jesus, in love, died for the sheep to glorify God, it is likely that Peter’s death to glorify God is linked to his shepherding role and love for the sheep. For Peter, though it cannot be assumed to be the case for all

---

me” (ἀκολουθεῖ μοι) make it possible on the literary level, since δοξάζω is so closely linked with Jesus’ crucifixion (cf. 12:23 and last chapter’s discussion) and earlier Jesus said that Peter could not follow him now (οὐ δύνασθαι μοι νῦν ἀκολουθεῖν) but will do so after (ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον, 13:36). Historically, Van Belle points out that the phrase ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου (“you will stretch out your hands,” 21:18) implies crucifixion, as crucified individuals had their hands stretched out on the *patibulum*. For references to “stretching out” (ἐκτείνω) and crucifixion see Josephus *Ant.* 19.94; Epictetus *Diatr.* 3.26.22; Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 7.69.2. For a listing of more references see Van Belle, “Peter as Martyr in the Fourth Gospel,” 303–4. For texts describing crucifixion, see the encyclopedic study by Cook, whose original intent was simply to update Hengel’s small book on crucifixion, John Granger Cook, *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*, WUNT 327 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Cook recently argued that John 19:17’s description of Jesus bearing his own “cross” (τον σταυρόν) is surely referring to the *patibulum* and not to the vertical beam, “the probability that John thought Jesus was forced to carry the vertical beam – a practice that the Romans did not use according to all the existing evidence – is nearly zero,” in Cook, *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*, 33–34. See also John Granger Cook, “John 19:17 and the Man on the Patibulum in the Arieti Tomb,” *Early Christianity* 4, no. 4 (2013): 427–53. Barnes contends that the description of Peter being dressed by another (21:18, “another will dress you” [ἄλλος σε ἑώραξει]) precludes a reference to crucifixion, where one would be stripped, Timothy D. Barnes, *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History*, Tria Corda 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 5, 7. But see the discussion by Cook who provides examples of crucifixion where one is “naked” (γυμνός) yet still had some sort of undergarment, in Cook, *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*, 192–93. Some commentators read 21:18 as a reference to crucifixion, Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 585; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 679; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 556; Klink, *John*, 917. Though others acknowledge it as a possibility at best, Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 772–73; Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 1047–48.

<sup>100</sup> Note how the verb σημαίνω is used only three times in the Gospel, each in an editorial comment. The first two (12:33; 18:32) are in descriptions of how Jesus will glorify God through his death on the cross, and this last use strongly suggests that Peter will also die by crucifixion and glorify God.

<sup>101</sup> Note how Peter’s language in 13:37, τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω mirrors Jesus’ in 10:15, τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ πάντων προβάτων.

disciples, his obeying Jesus's commandment to "love one another as I have loved you" will result in his martyrdom. He, like his good shepherd, will end up laying down his life for the sheep as he shepherds them to follow his master. In this way his death glorifies God like Jesus's death did: it reveals the love of God and it honors God.

The glorification of God will also continue as the Beloved Disciple provides another example, as one who bears witness about Jesus's life (21:24; cf. 13:23).<sup>102</sup> Thus we find in Peter and the Beloved Disciple complementary pictures of discipleship.<sup>103</sup> The task of discipleship, or the mission of the disciples, is once again construed as glorifying God through bearing witness and a sacrificial act of love.

### **Conclusion: Discipleship as Glorification**

If we summarize and synthesize our findings from above, a uniquely Johannine understanding of discipleship emerges from these passages. The task of discipleship in

---

<sup>102</sup> I do not find it persuasive to read the characters of the Beloved Disciple and Peter as ciphers for the Johannine Community and Apostolic Churches. Brown thinks Peter and the twelve represent "Apostolic Churches" and are presented in contrast to the Beloved Disciples and the Johannine Community he represents. Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 81–88. Brown, who desires to avoid "overly imaginative deductions" (see pp. 18–20), inevitably resorts to a great deal of speculation about the kind of communities Peter and the Beloved Disciple purportedly represent. Brown finds in John 6:60–69 evidence of two groups among Jesus' disciples who are sharply contrasted, the first group are those who leave the synagogue with him but then draw back over his hard words, while the other group is led by Peter and consists of the Twelve, who refuse to abandon Jesus. Peter and the Twelve, he continues to argue, cannot stand in as representatives for *all* Christians, but only for a group of Christians in distinction from the Johannine community, because of the way the Fourth Gospel consistently contrasts between Peter and the Beloved Disciple (13:23–26; 18:15–16; 20:2–10; 21:7; 21:20–23). It is common for interpreters to understand Peter in contrast to the Beloved Disciple, or in subordination to the Beloved Disciple. Some detect a direct polemic against Petrine authority, see Graydon F. Snyder, "John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition," *Biblical Research* 16 (1971): 5–15. For a more positive view of Peter's presentation in the Gospel see Blaine, Jr., *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple*. Blaine sees the presentation of the Beloved Disciple and Peter as complementary, and as "possessing together the attributes of the ideal Johannine disciple," (143). Culpepper also affirmed that Peter and the Beloved Disciple are presented in complement, "He and Peter each have their own roles. Peter will be a *μάρτυς* (martyr); the Beloved Disciple will give true *μαρτυρία* (testimony)," in Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, 121. See also Chennattu, *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*, 176. For an informative overview on the different views regarding Peter and the Beloved Disciple, see Köstenberger, who affirms that they historical figures with representative roles that are complementary, Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel*, 154–61. For a more recent discussion that also concludes Peter and John have complementary roles see Andrew J. Byers, *Ecclesiology and Theosis in the Gospel of John*, SNTS Monograph Series 166 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 213–23.

<sup>103</sup> Blaine also detects in the presentation of the Beloved Disciple in 21:20–25 an alternative way to glorify God, Blaine, Jr., *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple*, 175–79.

John can be understood as glorifying God through bearing witness and loving one another. We can see this in how discipleship is defined by and depends on Jesus's hour of glorification.

Johannine discipleship is defined by the glorification of Jesus's hour. Jesus issues two statements about his own glorification on the cross and then makes direct application for his disciples to follow in the same pattern (12:23–28; 13:31–38). Jesus's own glorification was a climactic act of love that revealed the Father's glory as Jesus obeyed God and honored him in going to the cross. The Christ, the Son of God laid down his life as the servant and lamb in order to take away the sins of the world. Just as Jesus made himself known through this climactic sign as the Christ and the Son of God, so too the disciples make themselves known as the disciples of Jesus (13:34–35; 15:8), the children of God (1:12), when they love one another with Jesus's love. As they love one another they both honor God and reveal God, they glorify the Father (15:8). They show themselves to be Jesus's friends (15:14) when they obey his command to love one another (15:12), enabling them to abide in Jesus and bear fruit that glorifies God. Their acts of love constitute part of the "greater works" they are to do after Jesus departs (14:12), and are the primary shape of the fruit that God desires in planting the vine and tending to the branches (15:1ff). Their obedience to Christ, therefore, is defined by Christ's obedience to the Father, particularly in the hour of glorification.

John's gospel gives discipleship a particularly revelatory aspect, just as Jesus's death reveals and honors the Father, so the disciples reveal and honor the Father through abiding in Jesus and bearing the fruit of love. Both witness and action are defined by Jesus's glorification but in differing ways. The actions of the disciples are to be shaped by Jesus-like love, in their love of one another the love of God is revealed. Their testimony, driven by the same impulse that sent Christ into the world (God's love, 3:16), is defined by glorification in the sense that the glorification of Jesus on the cross is the primary content of their message. As others believe through their word (17:20), it is because they



bear witness like Isaiah to a glorified crucified Messiah. They locate a new vision of glory, not in a re-built temple in Jerusalem, but in the new temple of Jesus's resurrected body (1:14). The disciples bear witness that a new revelation of Yahweh has taken place in a new act of salvation, brought about through the lifting up and glorification of the Son. The complementary roles of the Beloved Disciple and Peter illustrate the glorification of God through the disciples, as one testifies to the love of God in Christ and the other demonstrates it in his self-giving death.

Discipleship also depends on Jesus's hour of glorification. Of course, Jesus needs to go to the cross otherwise there is no example to follow. But moreover, his glorification is what enables the disciples to have life and receive the Spirit (7:37–39; 17:2). Peter could not follow Jesus into his hour (13:36–38), but after Jesus's glorification Peter is called to follow (21:19). It was necessary for Jesus to first die and depart. He must be exalted as King and return to the Father glorified and crucified so that rivers of living water can issue forth from the new temple of his body (7:37–39). Thus the disciples are only able to do “greater works” (14:12) after Jesus departs and sends the Holy Spirit to glorify him (16:14). As a result of the glorification of Jesus, John portrays his disciples as those who have the Spirit (20:22), have resurrection life (11:24–25); are able to love the Lord (14:27), obey Jesus's commands, bear the fruit of a faithful vineyard (15:4; 16), and offer the forgiveness of sins (20:23). This sounds like the New Covenant community, sprinkled clean, given a new heart and Spirit, gathered under one shepherd (Ezek 36:24–28; 37:11–14, 24–28; Jer 31:31–34; 33:7–8). John's repeated references to Jesus as the fulfillment of OT images and symbols connects with the larger story of Israel and how God planned to bring world-wide salvation and glory to his name through Israel (Gen 12:3; Isa 2:1–4; 42:6; 49:6; Ps 72:8–11). Israel was not able to bear the fruit God desired, for their manner of life did not match the righteousness and justice God looked for in his vineyard (Isa 5:1–7; Jer 2:21). But through Jesus, the true vine, the disciples are now able, through the Spirit and in constant dependence upon Jesus, to bear the fruit God

desires. As the children of God (1:12), and true children of Abraham (cf. 8:31–47), who abide in Jesus, they will take root and fill the world with fruit (Isa 27:6).

Jesus's glorification, his death on the cross as the King of the Jews, brings about a kingdom that is not of this world yet extends into all the world. He is lifted up to draw all people to himself (12:32; Isa 52:13–15), to gather all the sheep into one under one shepherd (John 10:16; 11:51–52; cf. Ezek 37:24). In the Gospel of John, the task of discipleship is conceived of as glorifying the Father through bearing witness and loving one another. As the Holy Spirit discloses Jesus to the disciples, making known the full import of his life, death, and resurrection, they abide in Jesus, and he in them, such that they love one another as Christ loved them. They go and bear witness to what God has done in sending his Son, both revealing God and honoring him in their acts of love for one another. As they do these “greater works,” the exalted Christ continues his work of glorifying the Father through his disciples (14:13). As John 17:22 is in the context of Jesus sending his disciples (17:18), we anticipate that the granting of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  to them will enable their task of glorifying the Father.

## CHAPTER 6

### GLORY GIVEN TO THE DISCIPLES

After surveying glory and glorification in the Gospel of John, we can finally turn our attention to glory and glorification in John 17 and the giving of glory to the disciples in 17:22. We will proceed by first overviewing the purpose and structure of the prayer. Then we will examine glory and glorification as found in the first two major sections of the prayer (17:1–5; 17:6–19) before devoting the rest of the chapter to analysis of glory in John 17:22.

#### Overview of John 17

##### Purpose of the Prayer

The purpose of the prayer can be understood from a few different perspectives. First, there is the purpose of the prayer itself, which ostensibly would be to petition the Father for specific requests. In this sense, the purpose of the prayer is what Jesus actually asks for, namely, that: the Father would glorify him (17:1, 5); would keep the disciples in the Father's name (17:11); keep them from the evil one (17:15); sanctify them in the truth (17:17); establish their unity with one another and their unity with God (17:21, 22–23); and that the disciples would be with Jesus to see his glory (17:24). We may summarize these requests under two major headings, the completion of Jesus's own mission in the world (17:1–5) and the continuation of his mission through sending the disciples into the world (17:6–26).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For how the prayer presents Jesus' mission and the delegation of its continuation to his disciples, see Dirk G. van der Merwe, "John 17: Jesus Assigns His Mission to His Disciples," *Skirf En Kerk* 19, no. 1 (1998): 115–27. He breaks down the structure from an "agency standpoint" as follows: the report of the agent (17:1–8); the return of the agent (17:9–16); the appointment of disciples as agent (17:17–19); the revelatory-salvific commission of the disciples (17:20–23); the revelation continues (17:24–26). One

Then there is the purpose with regards to why Jesus prays in his disciples' hearing and additionally why John includes it at this point in his narrative.<sup>2</sup> These will be tackled together. The prayer marks the end of Jesus's private instruction to his disciples (13:1–17:26).<sup>3</sup> In this greater section of John's Gospel, John has slowed his narrative to a standstill. The narrative of Jesus's public ministry tracked over several years, marking Jesus's movements geographically and chronologically in accordance with the different Jewish feasts.<sup>4</sup> But beginning in 12:1 John effectively zooms in on the last week of Jesus's life, drastically slowing narrative time. And from 13:1 onwards, the focus is wholly on the night before Jesus's death. The prayer of Jesus is situated in the context of instruction to his disciples and functions not only to instruct them further but also to encourage them prior to his arrest.<sup>5</sup> Jesus repeatedly reminds his disciples, by way of his

---

need not adopt his particular structure to affirm that the prayer focuses on the mission of Jesus and the continuing of that mission through his disciples.

<sup>2</sup> See Wendland for a consideration of the prayer from a speech-act perspective. Wendland affirms that Jesus prayed such a prayer, but also considers how it is situated in the narrative and how it was prayed aloud with his disciples present, such that it has a "prominent didactic element," Ernst R. Wendland, "Rhetoric of the Word: An Interactional Discourse Analysis of the Lord's Prayer of John 17 and Its Communicative Implications," *Neotestamentica* 26, no. 1 (1992): 59–88, esp 67.

<sup>3</sup> On the unity of chapters 13–17 see Judith A. Diehl, "The Puzzle of the Prayer: A Study of John 17" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2007), 119–36.

<sup>4</sup> Geographically: Jesus begins in Bethany across the Jordan (1:28–29, most probably Batanea in the north-east [Bashan in the OT], John likely transliterated the Aramaic in this way to correspond with the other Bethany where Jesus ends his public ministry and also begins his Passion week [11:18; 12:1], see Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 147; Richard Bauckham, "Dimensions of Meaning in the Gospel's First Week," in *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015], 137–38; goes to Galilee (1:43); goes up to Jerusalem for the Passover (2:13); returns to Galilee (4:46); goes up to Jerusalem (5:1); returns to Galilee (6:1, 17); goes up to Jerusalem (7:10, 14); back to Bethany beyond the Jordan (10:20); goes up to Bethany in Judea (11:17; 12:1). Chronologically, by the feasts: Passover (2:13); Unspecified Feast (5:1); Passover (6:4); Feast of Booths (7:2); Feast of Dedication (10:22); Passover (12:1–19:42).

<sup>5</sup> In light of Jesus' departure, their need for assurance is evident (14:1, 18, 27). In particular, Jesus assures them of his continuing presence even though he will leave. He tells them he will come again to them (14:28; 16:16, 22) and also that he will send them the Paraclete (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7). He promises that the Father and Son will make their home with those who love Jesus (14:23), and that the disciples will later understand all things (14:26; 16:13). He also instructs them to understand his coming death and resurrection as glorification (13:31–32), and that his leaving is his return to the Father (14:2–4, 12, 28; 16:5, 28). Added to this is instruction (and with that, assurance) as to how the disciples will continue the work of glorifying the Father after Jesus leaves. They are to wash one another's feet (13:12–17), love one another as Jesus has loved them (13:34–35; 15:12–14), do greater works than Jesus did (14:12), bear witness to Jesus (15:27), and bear fruit to glorify God (15:8). This continuing work requires them to depend on Jesus in prayer (14:13; 15:7), abide in Jesus continually (15:4, 7, 9), and it will require the ministry of the Paraclete (14:26; 16:13–15). In short, Jesus is providing for them lessons in Christology

prayer, who they are, namely, that they belong to both Father and Son (17:2, 6, 9, 10, 24). Jesus's coming death and return to the Father is the means by which eternal life will be given to them (17:2–3), is part of Jesus's revelation of the Father to the disciples (17:6, 26), and it is for their sake that Jesus has consecrated himself (17:19). Jesus's prayer stands as testimony that the Father will keep the disciples in his name (17:11), guard them from the evil one (17:15), sanctify them as he (Jesus) sends them into the world (17:17–18; cf. 10:36), and will help them be “one” (17:11, 20, 22). The disciples are repeatedly characterized as those who have responded rightly to Jesus (17:6, 7, 8, 10, 25), and thus are the beneficiaries of the Son's prayer to the Father.

In the original context of the passion week, the disciples who heard such a prayer, even if not lucidly understanding all that Jesus was saying (cf. 14:5; 16:17–18, 29–33), would undoubtedly be encouraged to some degree. Later, when the Spirit of truth led them to remember Jesus's words and gave them understanding of all things, they would surely have been assured and instructed. They would have been reminded that they securely belong to God and were kept by him, and that even after Jesus left, he continued to reveal the name of the Father and his love to them (17:26).<sup>6</sup> The impact on John's hearers or readers would be similar if they believed in Jesus, and if there is any opposition from the world to them, as Jesus said there would be (15:18–25), they would be strengthened as a community in the face of hatred.<sup>7</sup> They would also be reminded as to

---

and also in discipleship, which function both to exhort and assure them. On the connection between Christology and discipleship, and in particular how discipleship flows from Christology, see Marianus Pale Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

<sup>6</sup> Lincoln also detects that the prayer reflects the belief “that even after his departure Christ's advocacy in prayer supports the mission of his followers. . . . He gives the Spirit as the advocate who is present on earth. But he himself also remains an advocate with the Father (cf. also 1 John 2:1, 2),” in Andrew T. Lincoln, “God's Name, Jesus' Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, McMaster New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 171.

<sup>7</sup> I find no basis to Ferreira's conclusion that John 17 may be regarded as “an apologia of the Johannine community for their existence,” in Johan Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, JSNTSup 160 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 55. Ferreira argues that John 17 “may be the compilation of a number of prayers that follow the pattern of the ‘law-court’ prayers,” Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 48–55, esp. 51. He builds off the work of Heinemann, who identifies a “law-court” pattern in some Jewish

what Jesus desires of them: first, that they would not be taken out of the world but remain in it as sent by him for unity and witness (17:11, 18, 20–23); and second, that they would be with Jesus to see him in his glory (17:24).

The purpose of the prayer, then, on one level, as a prayer itself, is to ensure the mission of Jesus in glorifying the Father (17:1–5), and also to secure the disciples in their mission to glorify God (17:6–26). Placed where it is in the Gospel, the prayer instructs and encourages believers.<sup>8</sup> Additionally the prayer may also function as further inducement for potential converts to believe. They would see the love of Jesus in his determination for glorification to take place (17:1–5). Jesus’s willingness to lay down his life is reinforced as he is about to be arrested (18:1ff). They would see that Jesus’s concern is for his disciples, not only for them to have eternal life through his glorification, but for their continued protection even after Jesus physically leaves. Thus potential converts would behold Jesus’s selfless concern for his own, and through his prayer, how he vouchsafes their mission and continued experience of God’s love.

---

prayers of the Talmud. Heinemann identifies three distinct parts of a “law-court” prayer: (1) the address; (2) the plea or justification; and (3) the request or petition. Because Ferreira finds that John 17 presents Jesus praying to God, addressing him as Father, and providing justifications for Jesus’ petitions, Ferreira concludes John 17 has its origin in a number of “law-court” petitions. One result of identifying John 17 as a “law-court” prayer, Ferreira contends, is that it helps ascertain the function or purpose of the prayer. Since “law-court” prayers were given to plead the petitioner’s cause for justice against an adversary, or as a means of defense, then John 17 may be an apologia for the Johannine community for their existence. If bringing petitions to the Father and providing reasons for them is how a “law-court” petition can be identified, then it would seem that most believers over the ages have been unknowingly praying “law-court” petitions.

<sup>8</sup> Black calls the prayer another example *par excellence* of Jesus’ teaching, in David Alan Black, “On the Style and Significance of John 17,” *Criswell Theological Review* 3, no. 1 (1988): 144. It is also common for interpreters to see John 17 as summarizing what has come before or encapsulating the ministry of Christ. For instance, Judith Diehl sees, for the reader of the Gospel, assurance and understanding through the exhortations of Jesus directed to his immediate followers, and then in John 17 an encapsulation of the words and actions of chapters 13–16, Diehl, “The Puzzle of the Prayer,” 132. Dodd indicates that the prayer gathers up much of what has been said in chapters 1–16, and “presupposes everywhere the total picture of Christ and His work.” Barrett sees the prayer as a “summary of Johannine theology relative to the work of Christ.” C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 417–18; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 417; Black, “On the Style and Significance of John 17,” 154. See Boyle for his argument on joy being the center of the prayer, John L. Boyle, “The Last Discourse (Jn 13,31-16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on Their Unity and Development,” *Biblica* 56, no. 2 (1975): 210–22. Diehl argues that “the concluding prayer of these discourses is instructional, edifying, and exemplary,” in Diehl, “The Puzzle of the Prayer,” 6.

Therefore, an interpretation of δόξα in John 17:22 should recognize how it enables the continuing mission of Jesus through his disciples, as well as explain how it contributes to the function of the prayer to instruct and exhort the disciples. Furthermore, the granting of glory may provide further inducement for the potential convert in terms of what Jesus has done for his disciples.

### Structure of the Prayer

The prayer is marked off as a clear unit.<sup>9</sup> There have been various proposals to the structure of the prayer. Carson presents the most “widely adopted” outline as follows:

Jesus prays for himself (17:1–5)  
Jesus prays for his disciples (17:6–19)  
Jesus prays for the church (17:20–26)<sup>10</sup>

However, the structure I find most helpful is the one that divides between Jesus’s prayer for himself (17:1–5) and for his disciples (inclusive of later generations) (17:6 – 26), with the latter being broken up into either two or three sub-divisions:

---

<sup>9</sup> Chapter 17 begins with “Jesus said these things” (ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς) and transitions from Jesus addressing his disciples to addressing his Father (17:1, ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, cf. 11:41), while 18:1 resumes the narrative flow (which effectively paused beginning in 13:1) with “after Jesus said these things” (Ταῦτα εἰπὼν Ἰησοῦς) and Jesus’ movement to the garden. On the style and some literary features of the prayer, including a clausal breakdown see Black, “On the Style and Significance of John 17.” For a discussion regarding the textual variants in John 17 see Hera, who, after evaluating any potential significant variants, opts for the NA<sup>27</sup> text as it stands (which is no different than the NA<sup>28</sup> in John 17), Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17*, 113–16.

<sup>10</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 553. However we break up the section for his disciples, it remains that in 17:6–26 Jesus prays for his disciples, and only certain parts of 17:6–19, and 24–26 are unique to the immediate disciples around Jesus. See discussion below. Hera follows a similar structure I have laid out but opts to separate out 17:6–11a as a self-contained section. But this will not do given how the section provides the direct grounding for the petitions beginning in 17:11b, Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17*, 116–18. Malatesta offers a strophic analysis, Edward Malatesta, “Literary Structure of John 17 (Two Folding Charts),” *Biblica* 52, no. 2 (1971): 190–214. Hudgins breaks it down according to the requests, Thomas W. Hudgins, “An Application of Discourse Analysis Methodology in the Exegesis of John 17,” *Eleutheria* 2, no. 1 (2013): 24–57. For other breakdowns of the structure see Boyle, “The Last Discourse (Jn 13,31–16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on Their Unity and Development,” 219–22; D. F. Tolmie, “Discourse Analysis of John 17:1–26,” *Neotestamentica* 27, no. 2 (1993): 406–8. Wendland makes a helpful observation about the structure of John 17 as it corresponds to the major themes presented in John 13:31–32: Glory (13:31–32; 17:1–5); Departure (13:33; 17:6–19); Love (13:34–35; 17:20–26), see Wendland, “Rhetoric of the Word: An Interactional Discourse Analysis of the Lord’s Prayer of John 17 and Its Communicative Implications,” 66.

Jesus prays for himself (17:1–5)  
Jesus prays for his disciples (17:6–26)  
    His immediate disciples (17:6–19)  
    His later disciples (17:20–23)  
    His immediate disciples (17:24–26)

The two major sections of the prayer are both marked by an *inclusio*. First, 17:1–5 begins and ends with the request of Jesus for the Father to glorify him:

δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν (17:1)  
δόξασόν με (17:5)

Second, 17:6–26 begin and end with statements about how Jesus has made the Father’s name known to the disciples:

ἐφανερώσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (17:6)  
ἐγνώρισά αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου (17:26)

In the first division (17:1–5) Jesus prays for himself. He desires the completion of his mission in the glorification of the hour (17:1–3) and asks for his return to glory by the Father’s side (17:5). In his own glorification, he desires the Father’s glorification (17:1). The granting of eternal life is bound up with Jesus’s glorification in the hour (17:2–3), but Jesus’s entire earthly ministry is also described as one of glorifying the Father (17:4).

The second division (17:6–26) focuses on the revelation of the Father’s name *to the disciples*. They received and kept Jesus’s word (17:6–8), and believed in him as sent from the Father (17:7, 8, 25). This section summarizes Jesus’s ministry in general and the disciples’ positive reception in particular (along with their identification as belonging to God) as the very grounds upon which Jesus prays for *these* and not others (17:9). This division can be further divided into prayer for his disciples (17:6–19) and those who would believe through their word (17:20–23). In 17:25–26 Jesus refers unambiguously to the disciples who are immediately present with him, and perhaps “these ones” (οὗτοι) are also in view beginning in 17:24. Because of that it is possible to view 17:24–26 as a third sub-division referring back to the original disciples.<sup>11</sup> Jesus

---

<sup>11</sup> Schnackenburg notes that these final verses (vv. 24–26) cannot be described as a prayer for



prays that they would also one day be with him to see his glory, but until then he will continue to reveal the Father's name to them (17:24–26). Although there are some aspects in 17:6–19 and 17:24–26 where only the original disciples are in view, the requests can plausibly apply to all Jesus's disciples across the generations. The requests for the disciples in each particular section (17:6–19, 20–23, 24–26) should not be limited to their particular referents. The unity prayed for in 17:20–23 is desired for the original disciples as well (cf. 17:11), and the desire of Jesus for his disciples to be with him and see his glory (17:24–26) surely applies to future generations. The requests to keep them in God's name, keep them from the evil one, and sanctify them in the truth apply uniquely to the original disciples (17:11, 15, 17), but need not imply that future disciples are excluded from these requests.<sup>12</sup>

Glory and glorification figure prominently in this prayer. Ferreira rightly observes that “the concept of glory plays a central role in John 17.”<sup>13</sup> Not only has Jesus glorified God (17:4) and made known the name of God (17:6) in his life and imminent death, but he will continue to do so even after he leaves (17:26). This means that glory and glorification, as far they relate to the revelation of God's name, characterizes not just

---

later believers, but does affirm that later believers, represented by the disciples who are present (v. 25) can be included, Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 3:194.

<sup>12</sup> For example, it can only be true for the original disciples that Jesus kept them in the Father's name while he was with them (17:12). The prayer itself and Jesus' leaving is the transition between him keeping them in the Father's name and the Father keeping them (17:11). But the request for his disciples to be kept in the Father's name can still be extended to apply to all believers, although their contexts differ. Likewise, it can only be true for the original disciples that Jesus has not lost any of them and guarded them while he was with them, except for Judas (17:13). But the truths that Jesus keeps his sheep and that they are in the hands of the Father and Son are true for all disciples, not only those immediately around Jesus (10:29–30). It is possible as well, that Jesus' request for keeping them from the evil one (17:15) has some immediate referent to the coming arrest and crucifixion, which would not be applicable to later generations. But the continuing presence of the “the evil one” (τοῦ πονηροῦ) would necessitate the continued application of the prayer (cf. Matt 6:13; 13:19; Eph 6:16; 2 Thess 3:3). Although there is recognition that “the ruler of this world” is cast out in the glorification of Jesus (John 12:31), and that believers in Christ have overcome “the evil one” (1 John 2:13, 14), the presence and threat of “the evil one” persists (1 John 5:18, 19).

<sup>13</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 138. See also Wendland for a structural and rhetorical analysis of glory and glorification in John 17, Wendland, “Rhetoric of the Word: An Interactional Discourse Analysis of the Lord's Prayer of John 17 and Its Communicative Implications,” 75–76.

Jesus's life and ministry, but even the time after his departure. We will now overview glory and glorification in 17:1–5 and 17:6–19 before turning our attention to 17:20–23 (the analysis of which involves 17:24–26).

### Glory and Glorification in John 17:1-5

Jesus prays in 17:1–5 for his own glorification and the glorification of the Father.<sup>14</sup> Jesus desires the glorification of the Father in the Son *through* the completion of the Son's work on the cross. John has earlier made clear that eternal life comes at the cost of the Father sending his Son to be lifted up on the cross (3:14–16; 12:32–33). Jesus plans to lay down his life for the sheep (10:11) and the bread that he will give for the life of the world is his flesh (6:51). The inescapable conclusion, when Jesus grounds his request in the Father's plan to give eternal life (17:2–3),<sup>15</sup> is that Jesus is asking for the fulfillment of the Father's plan through his own death. Jesus desires to be a seed that dies in order to bear much fruit (12:24). As in 13:31–32, Jesus's own glorification entails the Father's glorification.

This request in 17:1 to the Father calls to mind Jesus's earlier prayer, also spoken out loud for the benefit of those who were near him, in 12:27–28:

---

<sup>14</sup> Malatesta notes the chiasm, δόξασόν - σου τὸν υἱόν - ἵνα - ὁ υἱὸς - δοξάσῃ σέ, and thinks it expresses "the thought that the Father is the source and goal of all glorification through the mediation of the Son," Malatesta, "Literary Structure of John 17 (Two Folding Charts)," 195. However, if the chiasm underscores the center of the structure, then it would highlight the Son as the focal point of glorification.

<sup>15</sup> The καθὼς introducing 17:2 provides the reason for Jesus' request. This request is grounded on one item: because the Father has granted to the Son authority over all flesh, in order that the Son would grant eternal life. The reasoning is as follows: Because the Father's plan is to grant authority to the Son so that he would give eternal life, then the request, "Glorify your son" must be in accord with this plan and is an expression of Jesus' desire to fulfill it. See Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 554–55; Malatesta, "Literary Structure of John 17 (Two Folding Charts)," 176. Dodd understands the background of 17:2, the granting of authority over all flesh (ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός, 17:2) to be the enthronement of the Son of Man in Daniel 7 (OG, ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία), a connection which Hamerton-Kelly agrees with and strengthens by pointing also to John 5:27 (ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν). Hamerton-Kelly concludes, "John 17 tells about the 'enthronement' of Jesus as the Son of Man," R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 220–21; C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 362–63. This accords with the glorification and lifting up of the Son of Man statements in the Gospel (3:14; 8:28; 12:32–34; 12:23; 13:31–32). See also my note on the Danielic Son of Man in chapter 4, footnote 73.

Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? ‘Father, save me from this hour’? But for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father, glorify your name.” Then a voice came from heaven: “I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again.”

His request in 17:1, “glorify your Son that the Son may glorify you” unpacks what he meant in 12:27, “glorify your name.” In both prayers, Jesus addresses the “Father,” mentions the context of the “hour,” and seeks the glorification of the Father’s name in 12:28 and of the Father in 17:1. In both contexts the glorification of the Father is related to the glorification of the Son (12:23; 17:1). There is another significant parallel as well in the Father stating that he has (already) glorified his name (12:28) and Jesus indicating that he has glorified the Father on earth (17:4) and that he has manifested the Father’s name (17:6). Thus we have, in both contexts, glorification as a description of what God has already been doing through Jesus’s earthly ministry and yet a request for a particular glorification to occur in “the hour.” In these parallels the use of  $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  to describe the events of the hour mean that Jesus’s cross and resurrection are not simply about honoring God but revealing God’s name. Jesus has revealed his glory, that is, the radiance of God’s character, in his public ministry (1:14; 2:11; 11:4, 40), and will do so most fully in a climactic act of glorification on the cross. His ministry has honored God by revealing his name, and Jesus desires for the climactic act which will both honor God and reveal his name to take place.<sup>16</sup> For this to happen, he must be crucified, but it also includes his resurrection and return to the Father.

---

<sup>16</sup> This raises the question, if Jesus already manifested glory in his signs, such as at the changing of water into wine at Cana (2:11), then how is it that he can ask to be further glorified, to reveal more glory? Hasn’t his glory already been revealed? Some therefore do *not* see in the cross and resurrection a revelation of glory but locate glorification primarily in the return of Jesus to the Father (e.g., Nicholson, Loader, see the discussion in ch. 4). Hera, in agreement with Ferreira and Brown, sees the glorification of Jesus as the *completion* of Jesus’ glory. Brown writes, “in ‘the hour’ we have passed from Sign to reality,” Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible Commentary 29-29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 2:751; Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17*, 132; Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 92–94. So far as the completion of Jesus’ work that God gave him to do culminates in Jesus’ death on the cross (17:4), this is correct. But so far as it pertains to how God’s glory can be revealed in more than one act, it falls short. The fact that Jesus has revealed glory (2:11) and will reveal glory on the cross need not be surprising in light of Exodus. God revealed his glory over several occasions in the events of the Exodus and in bringing Israel to himself at Sinai (Exod 14:4, 17, 30–31; 16:6–7, 12; 33:18, 21; 34:5–7). See chapter 2 for my arguments on how God revealed his glory in concrete acts, and revealed new aspects of his glory in Exodus 34:5–7. Therefore in the glorification of Jesus on the cross, we can understand that God is revealing new aspects or providing a fuller revelation of his glory, even as he has already been doing in Jesus’ public ministry. It is the one glory of God, so that it is not as if one glory is

The instance of *δοξάζω* in 17:4 is best explained as referring to the ministry of Jesus as a whole. Glorification here refers to the work Jesus was given to do upon the earth (*ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*), in contrast to being with the Father in heaven (17:5). The participial clause, *τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω*, is the means of this glorification, and the singular *τὸ ἔργον* includes the entire ministry of Jesus, inclusive of his passion.<sup>17</sup> The use of *δοξάζω* in 17:10, “All mine are yours, and yours are mine, and I am glorified in them [*δεδοξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς*],” refers also to the ministry of Jesus as a whole. In 17:10 Jesus provides the basis for why he prays for his disciples in particular, and one of the reasons given is that they have responded positively to Jesus, honoring him as they ought to honor the Father.<sup>18</sup> They have received his words as words from the Father, and believe that Jesus is sent from the Father (17:7–8). “I have been glorified in them” refers to the positive response they have given to Jesus as he revealed his glory among them in his earthly ministry. So 17:4 describes Jesus’s work of glorification on earth and 17:10 describes the disciples response to his work.

Glorification in 17:5, however, is about glorification in heaven in the presence of the Father. Jesus’s request for glorification here seems to differ from 17:1. In 17:1–3, Jesus is speaking of the current situation they find themselves in, prior to the cross. It is possible that the reference point has switched in 17:4, so that Jesus is speaking as if all has been accomplished and that he is now returning to the Father. Thus a few verses later, in 17:11, Jesus can say, “And I am no longer in the world, but they are in the world, and I am coming to you.”<sup>19</sup> In 17:1 Jesus asked for God to glorify him, that is, bring about the

---

revealed in 2:11, another in 11:4, and yet another in the hour of glorification. Different aspects of that one glory are perceived as God acts in new contexts and ways. For a discussion on one *δόξα* rather than multiple *δόξαι* in the Gospel of John, but argued along different lines, see Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 325–29.

<sup>17</sup> See also chapter 4, footnote 6.

<sup>18</sup> I argue for this view below.

<sup>19</sup> Based on this verse Black sees the prayer as “atemporal,” in Black, “On the Style and

events of the hour, so that the Son may in turn glorify the Father. In 17:4 Jesus has indicated that he has indeed glorified the Father on the earth (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), by completing that which the Father gave him to do. The language of 17:4 refers then to the work of Jesus on earth in retrospect, and in 17:5, the “now” (νῦν) looks the other way, in prospect, of glorification in heaven, with the presence of the Father. Jesus grounds his request in 17:5, “glorify me in your own presence [παρὰ σεαυτῶ]” upon the fact that Jesus has indeed glorified the Father on earth (17:4). It assumes the completion of Jesus’s work, so Jesus looks forward to being with the Father again.

What, precisely, is Jesus asking for when he asks the Father to glorify him in 17:5? Carson, along with Haenchen, thinks that this verse is evidence for some sort of loss of glory upon the incarnation, and so Jesus is asking for restoration of that glory in the presence of God.<sup>20</sup> This verse seems to support such a conclusion,<sup>21</sup> but that conclusion does not accord with how Jesus has been presented throughout John’s Gospel. From the beginning John has his readers understand that this is the λόγος become flesh who possesses glory as the only begotten from the Father (1:14). When this one performs signs, he reveals his glory (2:11). When the Jews fail to see Jesus’s glory, it is because they have been blinded in their love for glory from one another, rather than any failure on Jesus’s part to possess or demonstrate it (12:41–43). Therefore John indicts the Jews for failing to see what Isaiah saw, namely, his glory (12:41). There is no sense, throughout

---

Significance of John 17,” 144. Chibici-Revneanu thinks the prayer merges hermeneutical horizons such that at times the prayer looks to the hour both in prospect (17:1) and in retrospect (17:4), Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*, WUNT II 231 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 272. Brown observes of the prayer, “one feels that Jesus has crossed the threshold from time to eternity and is already on the way to the Father, or, at least, halfway between this world and the Father’s presence,” in Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:747.

<sup>20</sup> Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 557; Ernst Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Robert W. Funk, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2:502.

<sup>21</sup> Loader makes the following statement because of this verse: “Any discussion must take into account that the incarnation implies both manifestation of glory and departure from glory to which the Son will return,” in William Loader, *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 236.

the gospel, that the Son lost his glory in coming down from heaven. Rather, the Son possesses such glory *because* he came from the Father.<sup>22</sup> It is difficult then to see in 17:5 a restoration of glory lost. Additionally, the wording of 17:5 does not allow for any notion of added glory or achieved glory, for Jesus himself specifies it as pre-existent glory.

What is different, however, is that the λόγος became flesh and dwelt among man (1:14). The sent Son has now accomplished what the Father had given him to do. If it is true that 17:4 is from the vantage point of accomplishing the earthly work God had for Jesus, then the prayer of 17:5, is a prayer of the incarnate, glorified, and crucified Son. Therefore when Jesus prays, “glorify me [δόξασόν με],” the “me” is what is “new.” The “me” is the one who has accomplished all that the Son was sent to do, including being glorified on the cross. It is not added glory that Jesus prays for, but a return to be with the Father in the fullness of glory which he has always had, but now as a glorified crucified Son.

In light of what has been said, it remains difficult to understand fully what Jesus meant in 17:5. There is mystery even as we grasp for clarity. Notions of added glory, or lost glory, do not seem to fit, yet the Son does return as enfleshed λόγος and thus not simply to the original state of things. There is an emphasis in 17:4–5 with regards to *location*. In this short request there is an emphasis on being *with* God. Jesus asks for glorification *with God* (παρὰ σεαυτῶ) and further specifies the kind of glory as that which he had *with God* (παρὰ σοί) (cf. 1:1; 1:18). In addition, there is a clear contrast between glorification *on earth* (17:4) versus glorification in heaven *with God* (17:5). It seems most likely that Jesus is now asking to be restored to his Father’s side, that is, to return to and be with the Father. The return of Jesus does not entail receiving a glory back that he had

---

<sup>22</sup> Thus others have also argued along these lines that the Son did not lose glory by taking on flesh, Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:752; Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 88, 94. Thompson strongly asserts, “Jesus does not surrender his glory at any time,” Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 350.

lost, but entails being *with* the Father in his glory.<sup>23</sup> Perhaps the difference is in what Loader called a “spatial and temporal” distinction, “the author reserves a spatial and temporal distinction between the fullness of divine glory possible on earth and the fullness of divine glory possible in heaven.”<sup>24</sup>

More clarity can be had regarding the function of 17:5, however, because it is an unambiguous statement of Jesus’s pre-existence with the Father and the glory he has always possessed. The glorification of 17:1 surely includes reference to the cross and resurrection, and perhaps to the return as well, while glorification in 17:5 refers unambiguously to the return to the Father. What 17:5 does in the narrative context, at the very least, is reinforce the perspective that it is the Son of God who is willingly dying for the life of the world. The Son who prays for the events of the cross to come about is the same Son who shared glory with the Father before the world existed. That the Son returns to the Father’s side by way of the cross makes the cross all the more remarkable and underscores the deep love of God for the world in sending his Son.

---

<sup>23</sup> John’s presentation of Jesus’ glory and exaltation is different from Philippians 2:4–11 but does not contradict it either. In Philippians 2:4–11, Paul presents God exalting Jesus and bestowing on him the name that is above every name in response to Jesus’ self-humbling. Jesus is presented as a pattern for Christian humility (2:3–4). In the Gospel of John, the self-humbling of Jesus as he gave himself to die on the cross *is* his exaltation (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34) and glorification (12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 17:1–5). God’s name is not bestowed upon Jesus in response to his self-humbling, but his self-humbling is how God’s name is revealed (12:28; 17:6). Thus John 17:5 does not seem fitting to be a restoration of glory in a similar way to Philippians 2:4–11. Other portrayals of Jesus, like Romans 1:3, and Acts 2:33, 36, emphasize the achievement of Jesus as Davidic Son in his suffering, death, and resurrection. As a result of Jesus’ obedience and fulfillment of God’s plan, the Father has exalted him as Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36). John presents an additional angle of revelatory glory *in* those same events. He emphasizes Jesus’ divine Sonship and glory (John 1:1–18) throughout his ministry in order to highlight the revelatory aspect of Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection: to see Jesus is to see the Father (14:9).

<sup>24</sup> Loader, *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 234. Chibici-Revneanu contributes to the study of δόξα in particular by suggesting that although Jesus and the Father share in one δόξα (thus she also rejects notions of lost or added glory), the difference is in their relations. Jesus has glory “from the Father” on earth, while he has glory “with the Father” in heaven, and she finds these notions substantiated by the grammar of the text. Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 265. See my critique below of Chibici-Revneanu. For a helpful overview of how interpreters have tried to grapple with this difficult issue of glory which Jesus has on earth and the glory to which Jesus returns to, see Loader, *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 234–39.

## Glory and Glorification in 17:6–19

Jesus does not open his prayer for his disciples with requests but with background. What he states in 17:6–11a provides the basis for his requests, it provides the reason for why he intercedes for these particular people.<sup>25</sup> Why pray for them? In short, it is because Jesus has revealed the Father’s name to them, they have received it, belong to God and Jesus, and Jesus is glorified by them. Jesus then prays for his disciples because even though he is leaving, he is sending his disciples into the world. Thus the basis for Jesus’s petitions is his own mission completed amongst them and the purpose of his petitions involves their mission as they are sent into the world.

### The Basis for His Prayer: Jesus’s Completed Mission

Jesus begins by indicating that he has revealed (ἐφανερώσα) the Father’s name to those whom God gave him (17:6). The language calls to mind the first sign recorded in the Gospel where Jesus turns water into wine and thus manifested his glory (2:11, ἐφανερώσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ). The same verb is used in 2:11 (φανερώω) and although 17:6 is about manifesting the Father’s name (ὄνομα), rather than manifesting glory (δόξα), both can refer to the revelation of God in Jesus. To reveal God’s name is to reveal God.<sup>26</sup> Exodus 33–34 connects the revelation of God’s glory (33:18) with the proclamation of God’s name (33:19; 34:5–6). If Exodus 33–34 is in the background for John 1:14–18,

---

<sup>25</sup> *Contra* Lincoln, who views 17:6–8 as further basis for the request just given in 17:5, Lincoln, “God’s Name, Jesus’ Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel,” 164–65. The request in 17:5, however, had its grounding already provided for in 17:4. The inclusio between “I have manifested your name” (ἐφανερώσά σου τὸ ὄνομα, 17:6) and “I made known to them your name” (ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου, 17:26) further argue for 17:6–8 as belonging to the larger unit of 17:6–26. Additionally, see my arguments below for how 17:6–8 relate to 17:9–11a. Tolmie separates 17:6–11a into two sections, 17:6–8 (Jesus task with his disciples completed) and 17:9–11a (people for whom Jesus prays for are identified and reasons for prayer are provided), Tolmie, “Discourse Analysis of John 17:1–26,” 411–12.

<sup>26</sup> Hurtado writes, “To speak of Jesus as invested with the divine name, as coming with and in the name of God, as given the name, and as manifesting God’s name in his own words and actions, was to portray Jesus as bearing and exhibiting God in the most direct way possible in the conceptual categories available in the biblical tradition, and within the limits of the monotheistic commitment of that tradition,” Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 385.



then the prologue primes the reader to understand Jesus's δόξα in connection with proclamation of Yahweh's name, making it unsurprising for God to declare he has already glorified his name in Jesus's public ministry of glory (John 12:28). Additionally, throughout the narrative John presents Jesus assigning himself the divine name, "I am" (4:26; 8:24, 28, 58; 18:6).<sup>27</sup> There are also "I am" statements taking the predicate and linked to Jesus's display of glory in signs.<sup>28</sup> Yahweh manifested his name and glory in bringing Israel out of Egypt to himself at Mt. Sinai, linking the revelation of his name and glory with his acts of deliverance. In Isaiah, as the people of God looked forward to a new deliverance they anticipated that the glory of Yahweh would be revealed once again (Isa 40:5).<sup>29</sup> Joshua Coutts points out how in Isaiah 52:6 and 64:1 we find an expectation

---

<sup>27</sup> Some of the "I am" statements may relate back to Isaiah's use of the divine name as Yahweh declares himself to be יהוה (e.g., Isa 43:10; LXX ἐγὼ εἰμι), related to the identification of Yahweh as the only savior (Isa 43:10, 11). Note the parallels between John 8:24, 28 and Isaiah 43:10–11. LXX Isaiah 43:10–11: γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες, καὶ ἐγὼ μάρτυς, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ ὁ παῖς, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην, ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἔμπροσθέν μου οὐκ ἐγένετο ἄλλος θεός καὶ μετ' ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔσται. ἐγὼ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι πάρεξ ἐμοῦ σώζων. John 8:24: ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι; John 8:28: ὅταν ὑψώσῃ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι. See David Mark Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 188–94. Ball also provides helpful discussion on the links between John 8:24, where unless the Jews believe that Jesus is "I am," they would die in their sins, and Isaiah 43:25, where the self-identification of Yahweh as "I am" is related to the blotting out of sins. On the name of God in John see also Franklin W. Young, "Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 46 (1955): 221–24; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 381–92; Joshua J. F. Coutts, *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II 447 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

<sup>28</sup> Jesus performs the sign of feeding the large crowd and indicates "I am the bread of life" (6:35). In the raising of Lazarus from the dead, Jesus declares "I am the resurrection and the life" (11:25). Other contexts do not necessarily link his "I am" statements directly with a miracle, but they are still situated in the context of his overall ministry of revealing God's glory in signs. We may not need to make a sharp distinction, either, between the "absolute" I am statements and the predicate I am statements, for they both, in their own ways, point to Jesus' identity with Yahweh. Lincoln links revelation of the "name" in John 17:6 with Isaiah 52:6 LXX, "Therefore my people shall now my name, therefore in that day they shall know that it is 'I am' who speaks." He sees Jesus' use of "I am" (8:28, 58; 13:12; 18:5, 6) in connection to LXX Isaiah 52:6. Lincoln, "God's Name, Jesus' Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel," 164–65. See also Coutts, who goes into much more detail on the connection between Isaiah 52:6 and Jesus' "I am" statement and name revelation, Coutts, *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*, 111–19.

<sup>29</sup> For expectations of God's glory in a new exodus see also Sirach 36:4–7, "As you have used us to show your holiness to them, so use them to show your glory to us. Then they will know, as we have known, that there is no God but you, O Lord. Give new signs, and work other wonders; make your hand and right arm glorious" (NRSV); and Baruch 4:5–5:9 which looks forward to a return from exile arrayed with glory language (e.g., "They soon will see your salvation by God, which will come to you with great glory and with the splendor of the Everlasting" [4:24], "For God will lead Israel with joy, in the light of his glory" [5:9]). Note also how Baruch 5:7 alludes to Isaiah 40:4–5. For the expectation of God's glory returning to the Temple see Ezek 43:2–5; 44:4. For other references to the glory of the Lord returning to Israel in a second exodus see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 413.

of the revelation of God's name to his people once again.<sup>30</sup> He argues that John finds this future name revelation promised in Isaiah occurring in Jesus. As Jesus brings about the fulfillment of a new exodus, he is manifesting Yahweh's name and glory through new works of God (17:4, 17:6). Jesus manifesting the name of God and Jesus manifesting the glory of God both indicate the revelation of God through Jesus.<sup>31</sup> "I revealed your name" parallels with "I glorified you on earth by completing the work which you have given me to do" (17:4).<sup>32</sup> Whereas in 17:4 it is the grounds for Jesus's return to the Father, in 17:6 it is grounds for why Jesus prays for *these* and not others. There is good reason to believe that Jesus is referring in 17:6 not only to what he has done up until this point in the narrative but includes the events of the hour.

Jesus's description of his disciples here in the prayer does not seem to square with the interactions in chapters 13–16.<sup>33</sup> In 17:6–8 Jesus indicates the following about the disciples' response to Jesus: they have kept the Father's word; they have come to know that all things are from the Father; they have received the words which the Father

---

<sup>30</sup> Coutts, *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*, 119. Coutts notes that Isaiah 63:8–14 includes reflection on the exodus events, referring to how God made for himself an everlasting name (63:12) and a glorious name (63:14). A petition is then made on the basis of God's name (63:16) for a new, future deliverance where God would reveal his name once again (64:2–3 [MT 63:19b – 64:1]). Coutts, *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*, 112n155. The carrying-forward of many Exodus-related themes through Isaiah happens often in John. The typological pattern of Moses lifting up the snake on the pole (John 3:14; Num 21:9) is fulfilled in Jesus being the lifted up and glorified servant (Isa 52:13). Jesus' death as the paschal lamb (John 1:29; 19:36; Exod 12:46) is connected to the Isaianic servant who is pictured as a lamb (Isa 53:7). In contrast to the manna given in the wilderness (John 6:31), Jesus is the bread of life related to the promise that Isaiah gave that they will all be taught by God (John 6:45; Isa 54:13). See also Coutts, *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*, 114n163.

<sup>31</sup> Van der Merwe comments on 17:6 and 17:26, "[Jesus'] incarnation, his teaching, his miracle-working, his encounters with people, and indeed his entire life, are placed within the all-embracing context of revelation," in Dirk G. van der Merwe, "The Interpretation of the Revelatory Events in John 17:24-26: An Exegetical Exercise," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 25, no. 1 (2004): 323.

<sup>32</sup> See chapter 4, footnote 8.

<sup>33</sup> Pace Carson, who thinks that in comparison with the world that rejects Jesus, these descriptions are fitting for disciples who have responded positively to him and do not contradict 16:31–32. I think these descriptions are fitting only when taking into account the resurrection and sending of the Spirit. Carson is inconsistent with his own reading of 17:6, which he agrees as describing the whole of Jesus' ministry, including the cross that lies ahead. If 17:6 describes the whole of Jesus' ministry, then it follows that the disciples' response described in 17:6ff can be the disciples' response to the whole of Jesus' ministry as well. See Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 558–59.

has given Jesus; they truly understand (ἐγνώσαν ἀληθῶς) that Jesus has come from the Father; and they have believed that the Father has sent him. These assertions paint the disciples as unwavering in their confidence and fully understanding who Jesus is and what he has come to do.<sup>34</sup> The previous interactions between the disciples and Jesus in chapters 13–16 demonstrate that the current state of the disciples’ understanding of Jesus is better described as confusion rather than confidence. Several times the disciples are questioning or uncertain about what Jesus says. Thomas is uncertain about where Jesus is going (14:5), Philip fails to understand that seeing Jesus is seeing the Father (14:8), and Jesus responds to Peter’s confidence with a prophetic word about Peter’s denials (13:38). The last words of their interaction with him seem to brim with confidence, as the disciples say:

“Ah, now [νῦν] you are speaking plainly and not using figurative speech! Now [νῦν] we know that you know all things and do not need anyone to question you; this is why we believe that you came from God” (16:29–30).

This seems to comport well with Jesus’s description in 17:7–8, “Now [νῦν] they know that everything that you have given me is from you.” But the context of 16:29–30 indicates we should understand these words as ignorantly uttered, probably along the lines of Peter’s foolhardy declaration (13:38).<sup>35</sup> John shows the disciples as misunderstanding what Jesus is speaking to them about.<sup>36</sup> It is not that the disciples do

---

<sup>34</sup> Many scholars have recognized the disparity between Jesus’ description of his disciples in the prayer versus how the disciples are portrayed leading up to the prayer. Lincoln writes that Jesus’ words here are from a “post-resurrection perspective,” Lincoln, “God’s Name, Jesus’ Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel,” 165.

<sup>35</sup> The disciples utter these words in response to Jesus promising them that *later* they will understand the things he is saying to them. The fact that they think they fully understand *now* simply ignores what Jesus just said, and Jesus’ response to them is also telling, “Do you now believe? Behold, the hour is coming, indeed it has come, when you will be scattered, each to his own home, and will leave me alone” (16:31–32).

<sup>36</sup> *Contra* Chennattu, who interprets John 16:29–30 as a “climactic moment in the narrative” that urges both Jesus’ disciples and subsequent readers of the Gospel to decide “definitively for or against Jesus.” She interprets 16:29–30 (she emphasizes “now” [νῦν], “we know” [οἶδαμεν], and “we believe” [πιστεύομεν]) as a public acknowledgement, an oath that generally precedes covenant renewals, and she also views the prayer of Jesus as the sealing of the renewal of a covenant. Rekha M. Chennattu, *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 86. Chennattu’s positive evaluation of the disciples’ statements is in tension with Jesus’ negative evaluation of the disciples’

not believe, but clearly at this point they don't fully understand what it is that Jesus is saying to them. Also, one of the descriptions that Jesus gives in the prayer, "they have kept your word" (17:6) is not as fitting for the disciples' current state as they are about to either deny him or scatter and leave him alone (13:38; 16:32).<sup>37</sup> As John already has hinted in his explanatory asides, it is after the resurrection that the disciples fully understand the word of Jesus (e.g. 2:22).<sup>38</sup> Additionally, Jesus here states that the words which the Father has given to him, he has given to them, and that everything which the Father has given to him he has given to them (17:7, 8), whereas back in 16:12 Jesus indicated that he has many more things to speak to them but they are unable to bear them. Only later when the Spirit comes will they receive in full what Jesus has for them (16:12–15). Therefore, what John portrays is not simply an idealized picture of the disciples, but a projection of how Jesus knows they will respond to his ministry as a whole. It describes them not as they are now, but as they will be post-resurrection, after Jesus has given them certainty and has led them into all truth by his Spirit (16:12–15). Therefore, it is reasonable as well to understand "I revealed your name" (17:6) with reference not just to the ministry of Jesus up to chapter seventeen but encompassing his whole ministry of revealing the Father's name to the disciples, including the passion that is to occur.

---

profession immediately after, where he says, "Do you now believe? Behold, the hour is coming, indeed it has come, when you will be scattered, each to his own home, and leave me alone" (16:31–32). Schnackenburg rightly observes about the disciples here, "Their words, addressed to Jesus in affirmation of their faith, are meant well (see v. 30b), but they also reveal that they do not yet have a full understanding of faith – if they had, Jesus would not have wanted to 'correct' them (with typically Johannine irony)," Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 3:164. Carson is more scathing in his assessment of the disciples, "No misunderstanding is more pathetic than that which thinks it no longer exists . . . [their statement of belief in 16:30] though formally embracing a true conclusion, betrays just how feeble a foundation supports the immature faith they have so far attained . . . even their over-confident *Now we can see* (*oidamen*, lit. 'we know') echoes other false claims to knowledge in the Gospel (e.g. 3:2; 6:42; 7:27. . .)," emphasis original, Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 548.

<sup>37</sup> This is not to deny that the disciples have indeed believed in Jesus and have followed him all this time, even after many others had left him (cf. 6:67–68).

<sup>38</sup> John 2:22, "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this, and they believed the Scripture and the word that Jesus had spoken."

Discerning the relationship between 17:6–8 and 17:9–11 helps us understand what “I am glorified in them” (17:10) means. While 17:6–8 establishes the identity of the disciples as those who belong to Yahweh and have responded positively to his name as revealed by Jesus, 17:9–11a re-iterates their identity as established in 17:6–8 and adds the fact of Jesus’s departure as the reason for his requests to God.

In 17:9 Jesus asks concerning them (ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ), and not concerning the world but concerning those whom the Father has given him. Those he has extensively described in 17:6–8 are the referent of αὐτῶν. The ὅτι at the end of 17:9 provides the reason for his asking, and this begins a string of phrases separated by καὶ until his actual request in the second half of verse 11.

Table 14. Breakdown of John 17:9–11a

Initiation of Request	Ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ, οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι,
Reasons for his request	ὅτι σοί εἰσιν, καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστίν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσὶν καὶ γὰρ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι
First Request	Πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς . . .

As signaled by the explanatory ὅτι, Jesus provides six explanations for his coming request. The first three explanations give cause for why God should heed Jesus’s requests for *these* particular people, and are, I would argue, largely recapturing what Jesus has just stated in 17:6–8. The last three reasons indicate that the need for the Father’s action arises due to the Son’s impending absence. The first three reasons, then, take up the material in 17:6–8 and reaffirm them as compelling reasons for the Father to act. The first, that “they

are yours” (σοί εἰσιν)<sup>39</sup> is essentially a restatement of “yours they were” (17:6, σοὶ ἦσαν).<sup>40</sup> The second reason, “All mine are yours and yours are mine” (τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ) also takes up what has been stated before (17:6, 7, 8). It is likely that “all” (τὰ πάντα) refers specifically to people in this context, and along with the first reason, is an affirmation that although the Father has given them to the Son, they belong both to Father and Son.<sup>41</sup> The mutual possession by both Father and Son of these whom Jesus prays for adds weight to Jesus’s coming plea for their protection. Jesus’s third reason, “and I am glorified in them” (καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς) should be understood as another reason why the Father should answer Jesus’s coming request, and it too can be traced back to 17:6–8.

This third reason, καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς (“I am glorified in them”), like the first two, calls attention to who the disciples are by virtue of their response to Jesus. They are those who have received the revelation of God and thus have honored God in recognizing the glory of Yahweh in Jesus. They know that Jesus came from God and believe that the Father sent him (17:8). Glorification here bears a meaning under the category of status. The disciples have glorified Jesus, that is, they recognized his status and have accordingly honored him in his ministry. They have responded by honoring the

---

<sup>39</sup> Whether as those “given” to the Son (17:2, 6 [2x]) or those who belong to the Father (17:6).

<sup>40</sup> Or, rather, it may be that Jesus is affirming that though the Father has given them to the Son, they still belong to the Father as well.

<sup>41</sup> The reference to Jesus’ disciples is expressed through the masculine plural τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (in 17:6). Why the switch in 17:9 to neuter plurals (τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ, “All mine are yours and yours are mine”)? Michaels points out that in 10:14 when Jesus refers to himself as the good shepherd, he refers to his sheep (neuter, τὰ πρόβατα), ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσιν με τὰ ἐμὰ. Michaels finds that Jesus is “tacitly” reintroducing the metaphor of himself as Shepherd and his disciples as sheep. J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 865–66. Although Michaels provides an explanation for the neuter plural use, it is so subtle that it is questionable whether John desires to elicit Jesus as good shepherd through it. Barrett detects in the use of the neuter “a definite intention of broadening the thought” to show a “complete mutuality of interest and possession between the Father and the Son,” Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 506–7. However, the sentence which immediately follows, “I am glorified in them” (17:10) and the referents in 17:7–8 makes clear Jesus is focusing on *persons*, and providing reasons for why he is praying for *these* persons and not others (17:19). We also observe a switch from neuter plural to masculine plural in John 1:11 (εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον, “He came to his own [τὰ ἴδια] and his own [οἱ ἴδιοι] did not receive him”), where the difference between τὰ ἴδια and οἱ ἴδιοι, if there is one, is quite subtle.

Son, and thus honor the Father (5:22–23).<sup>42</sup> In their reception of Jesus’s words and recognition that he is sent from God, they recognized that the Son bears the name and δόξα of the Father. It is in this way that Jesus has been glorified (δεδοξασμαι) “in” them (better: “by” them).<sup>43</sup> The perfect tense of δεδοξασμαι indicates that Jesus is honored by them not only in how they had received him in the past but in how they continue to honor him as sent from the Father.<sup>44</sup> This state of things provides additional basis for why Jesus

---

<sup>42</sup> Carson also detects a link to 5:23. He suggests that the “all” language, pointing to reciprocity of ownership, may have recalled 5:23 and the Father’s intention that all should honor the Son, Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 561.

<sup>43</sup> The ESV translates ἐν as “in,” indicating a locative sense. If the focus in the context is on how the disciples have actively responded to Jesus (17:6, τὸν λόγον σου τετήρησαν, “they have kept your word”; 17:8 ἔλαβον καὶ ἔγνωσαν, “they have received and come to know”; ἐπίστευσαν, “they have believed”), then it makes sense that they have honored or glorified Jesus, and thus ἐν should be understood instrumentally, “I am glorified by them.” In agreement with this interpretation, Carson affirms the NIV84 translation, “And glory has come to me through them,” Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 561. So also Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 436; Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 492–93. Alternatively, Klink prefers ἐν as locative, “describing the place in which Christ receives glory.” He writes, “Jesus receives glory as the disciples manifest the glory of God as they bear his name and participate in his mission,” Edward W. Klink, *John*, ZECNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 717. It is difficult to discern a material difference in these interpretations of ἐν. In either case, Jesus is glorified through the actions of his disciples. Moloney, similar to Klink, detects an ongoing glorifying of Jesus as the disciples demonstrate the same quality of love that Jesus had given them (13:34–35; 15:12), and thus Moloney and Klink seem to assign glorification both meanings, the disciples honor Jesus as they reveal Jesus, Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 466. The difference in interpretation is not in the function of the preposition but is in what time period is encompassed by Jesus’ use of δεδοξασμαι. If the perfect tense also refers to the post-ascension, ongoing ministry given to the disciples, their interpretation makes good sense. If the perfect tense refers both to the past response of these particular disciples and to their post-resurrection response of belief (20:28), then it may simply be referring to how they honored Jesus in their positive reception of him. I prefer the latter. If we take the former view, the perspective of the perfect tense is no longer in Jesus’ speaking before he ascends, but in the time of John and his writing. In 17:6–11 Jesus provides reasons for praying for these disciples and has in view their response to his ministry during the days of his earthly life (and includes their projected response to his completed mission). His being glorified in them (17:10) does not have in view their future mission where they will, in love and witness glorify the Father, which in the perspective of the prayer still lies in the future (17:18).

<sup>44</sup> The perfect, according to the traditional view, would indicate a completed past action with results into the present time of speaking. If that is the case, then John is presenting Jesus as saying that the disciples responded to Jesus’ ministry with faith and glorified him, continuing to do so into the present. For the traditional view of the perfect see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 573–74. Alternatively, Porter views the Greek perfect as indicating a stative aspect and that it marks key information in the discourse as opposed to the unmarked, default aorist form. Even with this view, the context of 17:10 pushes us to understand δεδοξασμαι in reference to the past response of the disciples (and explains their current state at the time of Jesus’ speaking), and the use of the more marked perfect tense would make even more prominent the theme of glorification. For a brief discussion on the debate around the Greek perfect, see Constantine R Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 117–19. For a grammar advocating Porter’s view of the perfect, see Rodney A. Decker, *Reading Koine Greek: An Introduction and Integrated Workbook* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 329–30.

prays for them and not others. They have an abiding faith, one that continues to honor Jesus for who he is. Therefore the phrase “I am glorified in them,” captures the essence of 17:6–8, where Jesus indicated he has revealed the Father’s name and the disciples have responded positively.

After Jesus recaptures 17:6–8 with his first three reasons (17:9–10), he now adduces three more reasons for praying for these disciples (17:11a): (4) Jesus is no longer be in the world; (5) the disciples remain in the world; (6) Jesus is going to the Father. These six reasons together provide the basis for Jesus’s petitions to the Father regarding the disciples. Jesus has completed his mission among them, they are among those who belong to God and Jesus, who have glorified him, and now he is leaving them.

### **The Purpose of His Prayer: The Disciples’ Future Mission**

The way that Jesus describes his ministry, as one of revealing the Father’s name, is consistent with the characterization of Jesus’s public ministry as one that reveals the glory of Yahweh in signs for belief. Jesus was sent into the world to reveal the Father and grant eternal life through knowledge of him (1:14–18; 3:16; 17:3; 20:31). The climactic sign that reveals the glory of the Father is in the glorification of the Son on the cross, which Jesus prays for (17:1–3) and assumes the completion of (17:4, 6ff). In light of Jesus’s completed mission, he returns to the Father (17:11a), and prays to the Father in relation to the disciples’ mission. The disciples are to remain in the world, yet as sent ones to continue the work of Jesus (17:18). The mission of Jesus has given way to the mission of the disciples. Just as Jesus was sent by the Father, so he sends the disciples (17:18). As we saw in 14:13, Jesus will continue to glorify the Father in his disciples as they depend on him in prayer and do greater works. The disciples will glorify the Father as they abide in Jesus and bear fruit (15:8). Just as Jesus’s mission was to glorify the Father, so the disciples will continue this glorification as they obey Jesus and keep his commands. Jesus’s greatest act of glorification was the cross, which was an act of love



that reveals God's glory, and the disciples are to follow in this pattern of glorifying God with their sacrificial love for one another.

It is in view of their remaining in the world and being sent into the world that Jesus prays for them to be kept in the Father's name (17:11), kept from the evil one (17:15), and sanctified (17:17). As Jesus implies the success of their mission, since there will be those who believe in Jesus through his disciples' word (17:20), he continues to pray for his disciples through the generations in the context of their remaining in and being sent into the world.

### **Glory and Glorification in John 17:20–26**

The focus in this section will be on 17:20–23. Although 17:24–26 will also be lightly discussed, it will be primarily in reference to interpreting  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in 17:22. We will first compare the requests made in 17:21 with 17:22–23, clarify its clausal relationships, and provide an overview to its logical structure. Then we will clarify the nature of unity, and finally examine the use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , what it precisely means, and how it contributes to unity and, subsequently, to mission.

### **John 17:20–21**

Jesus now fixes his Father's attention on all future believers. His request is twofold, as indicated by the first two  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  clauses. First, Jesus prays "that they may all be one" ( $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  πάντες ἐν ᾧσιν). Second, he prays "that they also may be in us" ( $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν

ἡμῖν ὧσιν).<sup>45</sup> The purpose for these requests is given by the third ἵνα clause,<sup>46</sup> “so that the world may believe that you have sent me” (ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, 17:21). Jesus is praying that future believers be unified, together with one another and also with the Father and the Son, in such a way to lead even those in the world to believe that Jesus is sent from God. The positive response of faith from the world is like the disciples themselves who “have believed that you sent me” (17:8). The unities that Jesus prays for lead to a form of witness such that others also come to believe and thus will partake of the unity. Those whom Jesus prays for, then, are in a sense ever expanding. There is also an implicit commentary on how people are to believe after Jesus leaves the disciples. Earlier, Jesus indicated that the Holy Spirit will come and bear witness to Jesus, and the disciples themselves will bear witness (15:26–27; cf. also 16:7–11). John 17:20 assumes the success of that witness, since Jesus prays for those who believe through “their word” (διὰ τοῦ λογοῦ αὐτῶν). It is not the only way that others would come to believe, however, since Jesus here prays for a unity that compels belief. How exactly this

---

<sup>45</sup> Some interpreters think this request is a re-iteration of the first request and view “one” (ἓν) as elided, thus they read the request as “that they also may be [one] in us.” So Theron sees this second request as a re-iteration of the first, see S. W. Theron, “INA OSIN EN. A Multifaceted Approach to an Important Thrust in the Prayer of Jesus in John 17,” *Neotestamentica* 21, no. 1 (1987): 89–90. Brown also thinks the “one” (ἓν) should be supplied in thought, as well as Murray Harris. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 770; Murray J. Harris, *John*, EGGNT (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 292. Carson acknowledges it as a separate request, “they may be in us,” Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 568. Textually, the inferior reading includes “one” (ἓν). Metzger comments that the “pedantic addition of ἓν before ὧσιν, which comes from ἓν ὧσιν earlier in the verse, clouds the thought more than illumines it,” Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1994), 250. Apart from the text-critical question, the question is whether “one” (ἓν), even if included, truly is a re-iteration of the first request or a more specific request for one-ness with Father and Son. The addition of “in us” (ἐν ἡμῖν) marks the request as different from the first, such that even if the “one” (ἓν) is present, the request is not simply for the disciples to be “one,” but that they, together, would be in the Father and Son.

<sup>46</sup> *Contra* Hudgins, who identifies the third ἵνα as a request, in Hudgins, “An Application of Discourse Analysis Methodology in the Exegesis of John 17,” 40, 42. It is best to take this third ἵνα clause, “ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας” (17:21), as signaling the purpose for the requests and not as another request. If it was a request, then Jesus would then be interceding for the world (ὁ κόσμος), who do not believe, asking that they would believe. This wouldn’t make sense since 17:20 sets up the prayer as requests on behalf of those who *do* believe. This doesn’t exclude the world-wide scope of the prayer, but affirms the intent of Jesus to pray specifically for his own, even if it entails an ever-widening circle of who are his own.

unity leads others to believe is not as clear, but the re-iteration of these requests in 17:22–23 and the giving of δόξα may provide an explanation.

### John 17:22–23

Jesus does not make a new request in these verses but elaborates on the requests just offered and indicates that he has provided for the requests. It may seem strange that Jesus would ask for something then indicate he has done what is needed for the request to take place, yet this is exactly what he did in the previous request. He just prayed for the Father to “sanctify them in the truth” (17:17, *ἀγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*) then followed that request with, “for their sake I consecrate myself [*ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἐμαυτόν*], that they also may be sanctified in truth [*ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*]” (17:19). He asks but also provides the means for the answer. Jesus does the same in 17:22–23 for 17:21 but there are a few differences:

Table 15. Clausal comparison between 17:21 and 17:22–23

17:21	17:22–23
<p>ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὧσιν, (first req.) καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν σοί,</p> <p>ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὧσιν, (second req.)</p> <p>ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ (purpose) ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας</p>	<p>καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, (provision for requests)</p> <p>ἵνα ὧσιν ἐν (first req.) καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν·</p> <p>ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἐν,</p> <p>ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος (purpose) ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας</p>

We can make a few observations before further analysis. The verbiage in 17:22–23 is not identical to 17:21. There is the added provision of glory, but there are other differences as well. Instead of re-iterating the previous two requests, Jesus only re-iterates the first, ἵνα ὥσιν ἐν. Both requests have the one-ness between Father and Son as the comparison, although with different expressions (καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν σοὶ versus καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν). Moreover, the second request in 17:21 is not expressed as a second request in 17:22–23 but is enfolded into the first (ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὥσιν versus ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί) and followed with a repetition and elaboration on believer’s unity, ἵνα ὥσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν. This raises the question of how the phrase ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί relates to its neighboring clauses. The unity (or unities) that Jesus prays for, in both cases, have an intended effect on the world, that the world would also, like the disciples, believe that Jesus was sent from the Father.<sup>47</sup> Both verbs (πιστεύω and γινώσκω) describe a positive response by the world to Jesus, and it is likely γινώσκω is used in 17:23 because it also entails knowing that the Father loves the disciples just as he loves Jesus. It seems 17:22–23 not only provides a means for the requests to be fulfilled in the granting of glory, but with the enfolding of the second request into the first, and the different expressions used, provides a fuller understanding of what Jesus is praying for.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Most interpret the world’s “believing” (πιστεύω, 17:21) and “knowing” (γινώσκω, 17:23) as a positive response of faith in Jesus. Brown, however, interprets these clauses as the believers’ unity challenging the world to believe in Jesus, and that this will be occasion for the world’s self-condemnation, Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:770, 778. He sees the negative characterization of the world in the Gospel (16:33) combined with the contrast in prayer between Jesus praying for these disciples and not the world (17:9) as evidence that “the world” (ὁ κόσμος) in 17:21, 23 are those who will reject Jesus. However, “the world” (ὁ κόσμος) in John does not always refer to those opposed to God and Jesus (cf. 3:16, 17), and John 16:8–11 refers to the evangelistic ministry of the Spirit to “the world” (see D. A. Carson, “The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7–11,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, no. 4 (1979): 547–66). It is not necessary to read each instance of “the world” as those opposed to Jesus, for the context usually makes it quite clear. For instance, in 17:25 Jesus speaks of “the world” which does not know God. If we do not allow for those who belong to the world to believe in Jesus, then where will future believers be drawn from? Jesus speaks of the disciples themselves as chosen out of the world (ἐξελεξάμεν ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, 15:19). See also J. Gerald Janzen’s response to Brown in “The Scope of Jesus’s High Priest Prayer in John 17,” *Encounter* 67, no. 1 (2006): 6–9.

<sup>48</sup> *Contra* Chibici-Revneanu, who sees a progression from 17:21 to 17:23 because of the granting of glory, Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 293–94. She holds that the granting of δόξα in 17:22 marks the difference between the world believing (17:21) and the world understanding (17:23), with the content of their understanding expanded in 17:23 as opposed to the content of the believing in 17:21. She points to how 12:16 (and 7:39) describes glorification as a hermeneutically

How does “I in them and you in me” (ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί) fit into 17:22–23? The language seems to be another expression of the second request, “that they also may be in us” (ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, 17:21), but why is it not re-iterated as a second request? It will not do to understand “I in them and you in me” as further defining believers’ unity (“that they may be one”). Nor would it make sense to understand it in apposition to, and thus an explanation of, “even as we are one.” If it was, the Father being in Jesus (“you in me”) makes sense, but Jesus being in the disciples (“I in them”), not so much. It is best to understand “I in them and you in me” as that which leads to believers achieving unity.<sup>49</sup> Jesus points to another means for believers’ unity, not only through the provision of glory but also through the Father and Son in the believers. In this way, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί is parallel to τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς as a second means for the unity of believers:

First means: καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,  
 For believers’ unity: ἵνα ὡσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν (17:22)  
 Second means: ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί,  
 For believers’ unity: ἵνα ὡσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἐν (17:23a)

If we compare 17:21 and 17:22–23 once again, we find that the second request of 17:20–21 has now been enfolded into the first request as one of its means. The effect is that the unity of the disciples is further emphasized, and clarification is provided as to how it comes about. The unity of the Father and the Son, together with the unity that the Father

---

significant event. Therefore, she finds it plausible that the granting of glory is what leads to the difference between “believing” in 17:21 and “knowing” in 17:23. First, although it is true that the glorification of Jesus (and the resultant sending of the Spirit, 7:39) is hermeneutically significant for the disciples, the granting of glory *to the disciples* in 17:22 is in view, not a granting of glory to the world. Second, the granting of glory does not transform the believing of 17:21 into the knowing of 17:23, rather the granting is what enables the world to both believe (17:21) and know (17:23). Third, the change from πιστεύῃ to γινώσκῃ may not be very significant, e.g., see their use for the disciples in 17:8, “For I have given them the words that you gave me, and they have received them and have come to know [ἐγνώσαν] in truth that I came from you; and they have believed [ἐπίστευσαν] that you sent me.”

<sup>49</sup> Keener also reconciles these phrases by indicating that they are the means by which believers’ unity can be achieved, “by Jesus dwelling in them and with the Father dwelling in him (cf. also 14:23), Jesus’ followers would experience God’s presence in such a way that unity would be the necessary result (17:23).” Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 2:1062.

and the Son have with believers, enable a third unity, the unity of believers with one another. The language matters, for it is the Father being in the Son (σὺ ἐν ἐμοί), and thus the Son being in the believers (ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς), which enables believers' unity. In parallel, it is the Father's glory given to the Son (τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι), and the Son giving that glory to the believers (δέδωκα αὐτοῖς), which enables believers' unity. In both cases, it is Jesus who provides the presence or the glory of the Father, for without him, as John has repeatedly affirmed, one cannot know the Father.

Both 17:21 and 17:22–23 specify why Jesus emphasizes unity. It is for the sake of effective mission:

ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας (17:21b)  
 ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας  
 (17:23b)

To believe that the Father has sent Jesus is synonymous with believing Jesus or believing the Father.<sup>50</sup> To know or believe in Jesus is to see that he bears the glory of the Father.<sup>51</sup> Knowing (10:38) or believing that the Father sent Jesus are closely related as positive responses to Jesus. Perhaps the verb is changed because it is not simply about believing that the Father has sent Jesus (17:21), but Jesus adds that it is also knowing that the Father loved them just as he has loved Jesus (17:23).

---

<sup>50</sup> E.g., see the exchange between Jesus and the Jews in John 5:30ff. Jesus says that his works bear witness that “the Father has sent me” (ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν, 5:36). Jesus has performed a miraculous work and they fail to believe that he has been sent from the Father, and Jesus equates this with not believing in “the one whom he has sent” (5:38) and with “refusing to come to me that you may have life” (5:40). Additionally, in 17:25, Jesus indicates that in contrast to the world that does not know the Father, Jesus knows the Father, and he also adds, “and these know that you have sent me” (17:25). One would expect “and these know you.” The substitution of knowing the Father sent Jesus for knowing the Father illustrates how in the Gospel of John, they are the same.

<sup>51</sup> For a survey of the verbs knowing and believing and their respective objects in the Gospel of John, see James Gaffney, “Believing and Knowing in the Fourth Gospel,” *Theological Studies* 26, no. 2 (June 1965): 215–41. For an example of knowing and believing as positive, parallel responses to Jesus, see John 6:69, “and we have believed [πεπιστεύκαμεν], and have come to know [ἐγνώκαμεν], that you are the Holy One of God.”; 17:8, “For I have given them the words that you gave me, and they have received them and have come to know [ἐγνώσαν] in truth that I came from you; and they have believed [ἐπίστευσαν] that you sent me.” Cf. also 8:24, 28.

In 17:22–23 Jesus emphasizes the unity of the believers that he just prayed for in 17:21, in addition he identifies two provisions that will make this unity possible. First, he has granted them glory, and second, he will be in them (and thus the Father, through him, in them as well). Their possession of glory and unity with Jesus will enable them to be unified with one another. This unity will lead to effective witness, such that the world will come to know and believe that the Father sent Jesus and loved them just as he has loved Jesus. We turn now to clarify the nature of this unity, then examine how each provision leads to unity.

### **The Nature of Unity**

The importance of believers' unity is apparent through its three-fold repetition within the span of two verses:

*ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὧσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὼ ἐν σοί (17:21)*

*ἵνα ὧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν (17:22)*

*ἵνα ὧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν (17:22)*

Additionally, the first request given to the Father for the disciples also had unity in view: *τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς (17:11b)*. As Black notes, it is not simply the repetition of the request for unity that makes unity essential, but “where it occurs and how it is used,” thus he identifies unity as the underlying theme of the entire prayer.<sup>52</sup> The importance of unity is further underscored when 17:20–23 shows unity as an effective witness such that the world would come to believe Jesus was sent by the Father.

What kind of unity is envisioned? It is a unity that is functional and ontological, and it is a unity that is enfolded into and enabled by the unity of Father and Son. By functional I mean a unity of action; just as the Father works, Jesus works. The

---

<sup>52</sup> Black, “On the Style and Significance of John 17,” 154–55.

believers are to be unified as one in their commitment to obey the commands of Jesus. By ontological I mean there is a nature that is shared between those unified.

### **The Basis and Example: Father and Son**

The unity of believers is based first and foremost in the unity of Father and Son, and secondly on the unity of the Father and Son in the disciples.<sup>53</sup> We must consider the comparative clauses which accompany all three requests. In 17:11, the shortest form to the expression is given, *καθὼς ἡμεῖς*,<sup>54</sup> while 17:22 does not elide the predicate, *καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἓν*. The believers' ought to be "one" (ἓν) just as the Father and Son are "one" (ἓν). In 17:21 the expression is given in terms of mutual indwelling, "just as you, Father, are in me and I in you" (*καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὼ ἐν σοί*). We can make two observations from these comparative phrases. First, their parallel expressions lead to the assumption that language of mutual indwelling (for example, that of "X" in "Y") is closely related to the "one"-ness of X and Y. Instead of flattening them out to mean the same thing, we can assume that together they give a fuller expression to what we call "unity." Second, as Pollard rightly indicates, in order to understand believers' unity in 17:11, 21, and 22, we must first understand the unity of Father and Son, and so we turn to John 10:30.<sup>55</sup>

### **The Unity of Father and Son**

Discourse about Father and Son unity is clearest in 10:30, *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν*.<sup>56</sup> As the Jews respond by picking up stones, Jesus indicates that by doing the

---

<sup>53</sup> Appold highlights the importance of unity in the Gospel of John, "The line leads from Christology to soteriology to ecclesiology, and oneness serves as the theological abbreviation for the constitutive aspects of all three," in Mark L. Appold, *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John*, WUNT II 1 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1976), 285.

<sup>54</sup> A few manuscripts include an adverbial *καί* ("also") (P<sup>107</sup>, B, Θ, 579, 700, / 844 aur f vg sy<sup>h</sup>), "just as we (also) are one." Curiously, P<sup>66</sup>, Old Latin, and a Coptic version (Lycopolitanic) exclude the entire telic clause regarding unity.

<sup>55</sup> T. Evan Pollard, "That They All May Be One: John 17:21 and the Unity of the Church," *The Expository Times* 70, no. 5 (February 1959): 149–50.

<sup>56</sup> Although the scene changes in 10:22 marking the time of a feast and the movement of Jesus,



works of the Father, Jesus has given them proof that “the Father is in me and I am in the Father” (ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, 10:38). Here too, as in 17:11, 21, and 22, the expression of “unity” is given both in terms of mutual indwelling (10:38) and of being “one” (ἐν, 10:30). This account shows us that the unity between Father and Son can be characterized in at least two ways. First, this unity is one of function. It is a unity of action. This unity in function cannot be a strict unity, a uniformity of action, as if what one does the other is doing exactly. This unity of function has to be differentiated at some level, for the Father himself did not go to the cross. Only the Son did.<sup>57</sup> The Father was not sent, but the Son was sent. It is best to indicate that this unity means that what the Father desires, the Son too desires and so does.<sup>58</sup> This unity of function between the Son and the Father also maintains the priority of the Father, for it is the Father who shows the Son what he is doing, and the Son who does not do his own will but the will of the one who sent him (5:19, 30). The Son agrees with the Father and does his will at all times, so the works that he does bear witness that he is in the Father and the Father in him (10:37–39). This is a functional unity where there is agreement in desire and action.<sup>59</sup>

Second, there is an ontological unity. The Jews respond with picking up stones because they accuse Jesus of blasphemy (10:31). They perceive Jesus to be merely a man, yet one who makes himself God (σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὧν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν, 10:33). In making a

---

there are connections between 10:1–39, showing that we should read it as a unit. The image of Jesus as shepherd and his people as the “flock” and his “sheep” continue (10:2, 3, 11, 14, 16, 26, 27). Jesus reiterates how his sheep hear his voice and follow him (10:3, 4, 14, 16, 27). He also uses the same vocabulary about “snatching” (ἁρπάζω) sheep (10:12, 28, 29) and whereas in 10:11 Jesus says he will lay down his life for the sheep, in 10:28 he indicates he grants his sheep eternal life and they will never perish.

<sup>57</sup> It is best to interpret “Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing. For whatever the Father does, that the Son does likewise” (5:19), in this manner. It is not that Jesus sees the Father going to the cross, but that he, in agreement with the Father’s plan of salvation, goes to the cross.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. John 5:19, “The Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing,” and 5:30, “I seek not my own will but the will of him who sent me.” Also 4:34; 6:38.

<sup>59</sup> Thompson describes this unity, applied to the disciples, as being united in the mission entrusted to the disciples, Thompson, *John*, 356.

claim to unity with God, Jesus is not merely stating that he does things in agreement with God, but that he is to be regarded as God. This is a claim about his nature and identity. In stating that he and the Father are “one,” perhaps he evoked the Jewish Shema, and thus they perceived Jesus as including himself in the divine identity. The reader of the gospel may link Jesus’s claim in 10:30 to the statements in the prologue about his pre-existence, about his role in creating the world as λόγος, and also to the statements where he assigns himself the divine name (8:28; 8:58). Jesus’s claim and the Jews response in 10:30 is similar to 5:18, where Jesus was “making himself equal with God” (ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ) in calling God his Father, and thus the Jews were seeking to kill him (5:18). For the reader, it is evident that Jesus is putting himself on the divine side of the equation between creator and creation. Claiming unity with his Father is a claim for who Jesus is, that is, his nature and identity. He is one with God, and thus to be regarded as God and honored as God (5:23).

### **The Unity of Believers**

How does the example of Father and Son unity inform the nature of believers’ unity? First, ontologically, just as the Father and Son share in divinity expressed through familial terms, believers are given the right to become children of God (1:12–13). They share a new nature and identity. Each believer, individually, is part of the collective identity given by the designation “children of God” (τέκνα θεοῦ, 1:12). Some have identified this as use of “fictive kinship,”<sup>60</sup> and argue that the use of fictive kinship strengthens the bond between believers amongst the audience of the Gospel, perhaps in

---

<sup>60</sup> Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 32, 245. Piper points out that John doesn’t emphasize kinship as much as ethnicity (e.g. Jesus as true vine, John 10 and shepherd/flock imagery, John 11:51 and Jesus dying for the nation), so Piper suggests it is not fictive kinship, but rather fictive ethnicity, an extension of fictive-kinship. See Ronald A. Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage in the Fourth Gospel: Understanding the Doxa Given to Disciples in John 17,” in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, Biblical Interpretation Series 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 306–7.

the face of persecution like that described in 9:22; 16:1–3. As helpful as this sociological concept is, to call it “fictive” is a misnomer because there is no indication that John saw this as some literary device used to rhetorical effect. Rather, the language of re-birth in 3:3, 5 (γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος) is of new life that constitutes inner-renewal and cleansing by the Spirit of God (John 3:3–8), and is thus linked with Ezekiel 36–37 and speaks to the eschatological promises of God in gathering Israel together. In Ezekiel 36–37 God will grant them a new heart and new spirit (Ezek 36:26), will cleanse them with water (36:25) and place his Spirit within them so that they would obey his commands (36:27). Ezekiel 36–37 foresees a time when God will act to save his people but also transform them from within. He will breathe new life into dead bones (37:5), will open up their graves and raise them up (37:12–13), and the way Yahweh will do this is by causing “breath” (τὸ πνεῦμα) to “breathe” (ἐμφυσᾶω) into the dead (37:9; cf. John 20:22).<sup>61</sup> Thus, for John, to be born again as the children of God (1:12–13) is an act of new creation in fulfillment of God’s promises. The disciples are *actually* born again and are made part of God’s family. Thus the ontological unity believers have with one another is that they, through the death of the one good shepherd, have been gathered together “into one” (εἰς ἓν) as the “children of God” (τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, John 11:51–52). They are united for they are the one flock (μία ποίμνη) who have been granted eternal life by the self-giving of their one shepherd (εἷς ποιμὴν; 10:11, 14, 16; cf. Ezek 37:22, 24). There are sociological implications to this ontological reality wrought by the Spirit. They

---

<sup>61</sup> Yahweh instructs Ezekiel to prophesy to the “breath” (τὸ πνεῦμα), and call to the breath to “breathe” (ἐμφύσῃσιν) upon the dead that they may live (LXX Ezek 37:9). See John 20:22 where Jesus “breathes” (ἐνεφύσησεν) on the disciples and tells them to receive “the Holy Spirit” (πνεῦμα ἅγιον). The verb ἐμφυσᾶω is used 7x in the LXX (Gen 2:7; Ezek 21:36; 37:9; Wis 15:11; Nah 2:2; Job 4:21; 3 Kgdms 17:21). Genesis 2:7 is about God creating man, and Wisdom of Solomon 15:11 recounts Genesis 2:7. 3 Kgdms 17:21 is about Elijah breathing upon the child three times to raise him from the dead. Ezek 21:36 speaks about blowing wrath; Nah 2:2 is also a wrath context; and Job 4:21 speaks about the Lord breathing upon man and them withering, because they did not possess wisdom. So the term ἐμφυσᾶω is used four times of giving life (Gen 2:7, Ezek 37:9; Wisd 15:11; 3 Kgdms 17:21). The use of ἐμφυσᾶω in Ezekiel 37:9, which has connections to John 20:22 also through the use of πνεῦμα, may allude back to Gen 2:7, painting the raising of the dead in Ezekiel 37:9 and the granting of the Spirit in John 20:22 as acts of new creation. Thus the re-constituting of Israel, gathered together in the land with a renewed, obedient heart, is an act of new creation.

can have confidence in the face of a world that may hate them (15:18) for Jesus's Father is their Father, Jesus's God is their God (20:17). If believers are facing persecution from Jews, then the Gospel of John encourages them through their identification with the "children of God." They, being the true children of God, are the recipients of God's promises in the OT to gather his people together in the latter days (John 11:51–52; cf. Deut 30:3–4; Isa 56:8).

Second, the functional unity between Father and Son is also to be present in believers. As the Son always sought to do the Father's will and accomplish his work (4:34; 6:38), so believers are given the commandments of Jesus to keep them (14:15, 21, 23). This means that they, collectively, are committed to the words of Jesus and to keeping his commandments. Believers abide in Jesus (15:4), in his word (8:31), have his words abiding in them (8:31), and abide in his love (15:9). Believers' unity does not center on their commitment to one another, but from their commitment to Jesus.<sup>62</sup> As they obey Jesus's commands, the chief of which (and not to the exclusion of other commands) is to love one another as Christ has loved them (13:34–35; 15:12), this constitutes their functional unity. Therefore their mutual commitment to following Jesus constitutes their functional unity.

The unity of Father and Son is not only an *example* of the unity the believers ought to have with one another, but it is the basis of disciples' unity and enables it. It is not that believers are to look upon an external example, the unity of Father and Son, and then copy it in turn. Rather, the second request of 17:21, "that they may also be in us," and its corresponding phrase in 17:23, "I in them and you in me," opens the divine unity

---

<sup>62</sup> Van der Merwe helpfully observes how believers are to be "one," but they are not "in" one another, Dirk G. van der Merwe, "The Character of Unity Expected among the Disciples of Jesus, According to John 17:20–23," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 13 (2002): 241–42. Their unity consists not through their being in one another, but through their being "in" the Father and the Son.

to include the participation of believers. This participation of believers in the divine unity is the very basis and enablement of their own unity. As Watson observes,

The unity of those who believe is not only *like* the unity of the Father and the Son, it *participates* in that unity. In the divine oneness, the Christian community finds its foundation and dwelling-place.<sup>63</sup>

We have thus defined believers' unity under two general categories. Their unity, through comparison with the unity that the Father and Son have with one another, consists in their shared identity and nature as the children of God (ontological) and in their commitment to following Jesus (functional). We will now examine the two means identified in John 17:22–23, Jesus in them, and the granting of glory.

### **Means for Unity: Jesus in Them**

In the Gospel there are other causes identified for the unity of believers, such as the death of Jesus to gather εἰς ἓν (“into one”) the children of God (11:51–52), but we will focus here on the two causes identified in 17:22–23. First, we will examine ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ᾧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν (“I in them and you in me, that they may become perfectly one,” 17:23) and then we will turn our attention to the giving of δόξα.

As we consider ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, the first observation is that there are two unities spoken of here. The unity of Father and Son, σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, and then the unity of the Son (and by implication the Father) in the disciples, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς. The reality of these two unities is what enables the third unity, that of the believers εἰς ἓν (“into one”).

We also consider two prior passages that ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς recalls, 14:20 and 15:4. This language of Jesus being “in” the disciples recalls 14:20 and recalls that it is through the sending of the Holy Spirit that this indwelling will take place. In 14:20 Jesus similarly says “and I in you [pl.]” (καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν, 14:20). This passage is in substance the same with

---

<sup>63</sup> Emphasis original. Francis Watson, “Trinity and Community: A Reading of John 17,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 1, no. 2 (July 1999): 170.

Jesus's words in 17:23 because the "you" (ὁμῖν) is in reference to his disciples, thus in both 17:23 and in 14:20 Jesus is speaking of being "in" his disciples. Jesus also speaks of him being in the Father, and Jesus being in the disciples, "In that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you [pl.]" (ὁμεῖς ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὁμῖν, 14:20). This passage, in context, points to how the Father and Son will both dwell in the believer through the promised Holy Spirit.<sup>64</sup> Therefore when Jesus says ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοὶ in 17:23, he has already indicated beforehand that the way in which he (and the Father) will be in them is through the Holy Spirit and presupposes their love for Jesus and obedience to his commandments (14:15, 20, 21, 23–24).

The phrase ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς also calls to mind John 15:4, where the abiding relationship between Jesus and his disciples is commanded (μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὁμῖν, 15:4). Jesus then indicates that it is through keeping his commandments that the disciples abide in his love (15:10). If abiding in his love is further explaining "Abide in me" (15:4) then the disciples being "in" Jesus, and they "in" him, entails responsibility by them to obey his commands to sustain this abiding relationship.<sup>65</sup> In tandem with 14:20, where ὁμεῖς ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὁμῖν is through the sending of the Holy Spirit, 15:4 indicates that Jesus being in them (ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, 17:23) is maintained through the obedience of the disciples. The reality of Jesus's unity with the disciples involves the Holy Spirit and their keeping of the commandments, chief of which is to love one another.

---

<sup>64</sup> I interpret Jesus' coming in 14:18 and the subsequent indwelling described in 14:20, 23 as made possible through the sending of the Holy Spirit. See chapter 5, footnote 37.

<sup>65</sup> Is the second part of Jesus' command a condition ("If you abide in me, I will abide in you"), [so Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 516], a comparison ("Abide in me as I abide in you") [so Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 489], or a mutual imperative ("Abide in me, and see that I abide in you") [so Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 595; also Whitacre, *John*, 376]? Carson admits all of them make sense and detects a "slight edge" to the conditional reading. If it is a conditional, it cannot mean that the believers' obedience is the ultimate cause of mutual indwelling, rather it must be the occasional cause. As Michaels observes, "it is part and parcel to the imperative itself," in Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 803. The believer abides in Christ, and Christ abides in him. It is a mutual relationship where both parties are engaged, the two "abidings" cannot be separated, "the divine must take initiative and provide the means and ability for that union to take place, but it cannot happen without the response of the disciple" (Whitacre, *John*, 376). Therefore abiding in Christ is commanded to the believer as a means by which he continues and perseveres as a disciple.

In light of these observations, how does “I in them and you in me” enable believers’ unity, that they can be perfected into one (ἵνα ὧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν)? The answer is that “I in them and you in me” points to the new situation the disciples will find themselves in after Jesus departs. This new situation consists of the Son (in whom is the Father) “in” the disciples, which is made possible through the sending of the Spirit and their abiding in Jesus. The close, Spirit-enabled abiding relationship that Jesus will have with his disciples, characterized by obedience to commands, is one which is strikingly similar in concept to the promises of God of Israel’s eschatological restoration. God will put his Spirit within them, grant them an obedient heart, and they will be his people and he will be their God, and his dwelling place shall be with them (Jer 31:33; 32:38–40; Ezek 36:26, 28; 37:27). Jesus-in-them points to the new moment in salvation history where the Spirit will be poured out and their hearts will be turned to the Father.<sup>66</sup> Jesus, through his hour of glorification, will have secured both their eternal life and perseverance in the faith, and encourages his disciples by pointing to this new reality in which their unity is made possible. In John 14:20 and 15:4 the *mutually* abiding relationship is explicitly mentioned (ὁμοῖς ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν, 14:20; μέναιτε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν, 15:4), while in 17:23 only one side is highlighted, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς. Perhaps this is so in order to emphasize what Jesus has done and will do in order to enable their unity. The disciples’ abiding in Jesus, after all, is made possible ultimately because no one snatches the sheep out of the shepherd’s hand after he has gathered them (10:27–29).

---

<sup>66</sup> Malatesta detects New Covenant fulfillment referred to in the prayer of John 17, “The prayer of Jesus is therefore the prayer of the Mediator of the New Covenant that eternal life be shared by the disciples, by future believers and by the world. The New Covenant consists in an interior deepening of the knowledge and love of the one God which results in the honouring of the Lord’s Name among the nations (Jer 31,31 – 34; Ez 36,23–28; see Dt 6,4–9),” in Malatesta, “Literary Structure of John 17 (Two Folding Charts),” 214.

## Means for Unity: Granting of Glory

What is this glory given to the disciples, and how does it enable unity? Does it relate to the second means of unity, the Father in the Son and the Son in the believers? Furthermore, how does believer's unity, enabled by these two means, lead to witness? There were already close to twenty-five pages dedicated to overviewing different interpretations of δόξα in 17:22 along with my critique,<sup>67</sup> so this section will largely be a positive argument for what it is, along with some contrasts along the way. We must take into account several considerations:

1. What is the possible range of meaning for δόξα?
2. How can it be that this δόξα is given to Jesus, and thus given to the disciples?
3. How does this δόξα relate to the δόξα of 17:24?
4. How does this granting of δόξα contribute to unity and witness?

### Lexical Considerations

We will begin with some preliminary comments about the semantic range of the lexeme δόξα. We previously overviewed the semantic range of δόξα and concluded that the range of meaning for δόξα in the NT can indicate these general categories of meaning: (1) appearance (some sort of visible splendor, majesty), or (2) status (honor, reputation, praise).<sup>68</sup> In chapter 2 I analyzed the uses of δόξα in John 1–12 and identified its occurrences in 1:14, 2:11, 11:4, 40, 12:41 under the category of appearance, and the occurrences in 5:41–44, 7:18, 8:54, 9:24, 12:43 under the category of status. The two other occurrences of δόξα in chapter 17 (17:5, 24) correspond to divine heavenly glory

---

<sup>67</sup> In chapter 1 under the section entitled “History of Research.”

<sup>68</sup> For discussion on the lexeme, its use in the LXX and Classical Greek, and for discussion in the secondary literature see chapter 2. For examples of others who also analyze δόξα along similar lines, see Nielsen who breaks down the meanings under either a “social-hierarchical understanding of δόξα/δοξαζειν as a relational status and recognition,” or “the aesthetic idea of δόξα as divine appearance,” Jesper Tang Nielsen, “The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 3 (July 2010): 347. Bauckham concludes, “*Doxa* in the New Testament has the two different categories of meaning: “honor, reputation” and “visible splendor,” Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 44. Chibici-Revneanu recognizes a multidimensionality to the term and identifies a “profane-anthropological” (honor/praise) glory, and a theological (revelatory) glory, Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 329.



and thus indicates δόξα as appearance, the eternal splendor or radiance of Jesus. Perhaps John 17:22 follows suit. If so, it may also indicate the divine glory, the radiance of God's character, in connection with the δόξα of Jesus in John 1:14 and thus the כבוד יהוה of the OT. If status, then in connection with passages like 5:44 or 12:43, this would be δόξα ("honor") given from God in contrast to the δόξα one might seek from other people for themselves (5:41, 44; 7:18; 8:50–54; 12:43).<sup>69</sup> This would be δόξα as honor or praise, perhaps in reference to an elevation of status or approbation from God. Perhaps δόξα in 17:22 entails both notions of status and appearance, since Jesus's δόξα in John 1:14 also involved the identity and position of Jesus, "glory as of the only begotten from the Father" (1:14). Whatever the proposal for δόξα, we must relate it back to the semantic possibilities of the lexeme. Ferreira, in his analysis of glory in the Gospel of John, states that the "concept of glory has a very concrete meaning in John."<sup>70</sup> So he writes off any notions of "splendor," or "majesty," thinking them too abstract. Indeed, the glory of Jesus is revealed in concrete activity—the signs of Jesus (1:14; 2:11). Signs in which Nicodemus should have recognized the promised kingdom of God in Jesus (3:3). The error Ferreira makes, however, is that he reduced glory to the associated acts that demonstrated it rather than account for how glory was *revealed* in those acts. Thus he interprets δόξα in 17:22 as referring to the mission of Jesus. In doing so, Ferreira effectively emptied the term of semantic content.<sup>71</sup> The following discussion will try to avoid such a misstep by keeping the semantic range of δόξα in mind.

---

<sup>69</sup> Piper rightly points out how the use of δόξα in such passages do not seem to fit with δόξα as splendor, or radiance, or brilliance, Piper, "Glory, Honor and Patronage," 282–83, 287. His analysis of the text in John 17:22–23, however, leads him to miss the possible revelatory significance of glory in 17:22.

<sup>70</sup> Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 161.

<sup>71</sup> For Ferreira, δόξα neither means honor, reputation, or splendor. His analysis of glory is problematic. He empties δόξα of semantic content, save the OT background that he reduced to the "presence of God with his people for salvation." Then by the end of his analysis the presence of God is dropped, and it is anything that falls under the umbrella of the "saving ministry of Jesus" Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 149–65, esp. 161. See further critique in my chapter 2 where I overview his work.

τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς

This δόξα is that which the Father has given to Jesus, and Jesus has given to the disciples. We must understand δόξα within this constraint of that which has been given by God to Jesus and then given by Jesus to the disciples. We need to also correlate δόξα in 17:22 to its occurrence in 17:24, where the same language is used: τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι.

We can first consider it is possible that Jesus's δόξα is not actually *given* to the disciples but *revealed* to them. This view understands δόξα under the category of appearance, as some sort of divine revelation. In this way the “giving” of glory would connote the disciples’ witness and positive reception of it. This seems to be how Keener understands the phrase, when he remarks, “this statement directly fulfills 1:14, for the glory that Moses could see only in part the disciples now witness in full.”<sup>72</sup> Two things can be said against this view. First, there is a meaningful distinction between manifesting glory (2:11) and giving glory (17:22). One speaks of revealing and perceiving, the other speaks of granting and receiving. Although the whole ministry of Jesus may be described as revealing glory, or the Father’s name (17:6), there may be something more narrow in mind when Jesus speaks of granting glory as opposed to manifesting glory (2:11). Second, the language of “giving” δόξα is re-iterated in 17:24, where Jesus repeats how the Father has given Jesus glory, but there in 17:24 (and also in 17:22), it wouldn’t make sense to mean the Son has merely seen the Father’s glory. In 17:24, the glory given to Jesus by the Father is possessed by Jesus such that he desires his disciples to see *his* glory. In the same way, the parallel in 17:22 indicates that the glory the Father has given Jesus, he has given to the disciples. If 17:22 refers to a revealing and perceiving, then does this mean the Father revealed his glory to his Son, and that the Son perceived it? But

---

<sup>72</sup> Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 2:1062. Similarly, Hamerton-Kelly writes, “The revelation of the name of God is now described as the giving to the community by Jesus of the ‘glory’ which he received from the Father,” Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 223.

how then does the Son reveal glory for the disciples to perceive? It still implies some sort of possession of glory, and thus granting, by the Father to the Son. Thus it is not a revealing of glory that is described in 17:22 but a granting of it.<sup>73</sup>

The use of δόξα in 17:24 must factor into understanding the meaning of δόξα in 17:22. Some interpreters treat the δόξα in 17:24 and the δόξα in 17:22 separately, since 17:24 speaks of a heavenly vision of Jesus which would link it to the δόξα in 17:5 (the pre-existent δόξα the Son shares with the Father).<sup>74</sup> However, the almost verbatim phrasing in such close context mitigates against a clear distinction (17:22: τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι; 17:24: τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι). It is also not necessary to think that if 17:24 refers to the same glory in 17:5, which I think it does, that it means it cannot be the glory referred to in 17:22. The close wording between 17:22 and 17:24 at the very least suggests that we should first consider that the two δόξαι spoken of are the one and the same δόξα. Clearly, there is a visual aspect of this δόξα, for it is what Jesus desires his disciples to see (θεωρέω, 17:24). Yet, in what sense has Jesus received this δόξα from the Father, which can be said as given to the disciples on one hand (17:22), and yet eternally possessed by the Son and seen by the disciples in heaven on the other (17:24)?

The definition of δόξα given by John himself in 1:14 fits best. A definition of δόξα that includes both notions of status and appearance makes the most sense of the δόξα

---

<sup>73</sup> This rules out interpretations of glory along the revealed/perceived dynamic, such as Carson's suggestion that glory is the completion of Jesus' revelatory task. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 569. For other examples of those who interpret δόξα given in 17:22 along a revealed/perceived dynamic, see van der Merwe, "The Interpretation of the Revelatory Events in John 17:24-26: An Exegetical Exercise," 317; Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*, 233, 237, 239.

<sup>74</sup> D. G. van der Merwe is an example of this, when he states that the δόξα in 17:24 is the same as 17:5, but different from 1:14, in van der Merwe, "The Interpretation of the Revelatory Events in John 17:24-26: An Exegetical Exercise," 317. As a result, the revelation of glory in Jesus throughout the narrative of John (the glory of 1:14, 2:11, etc.) is differentiated from and treated as a separate δόξα from the δόξα of Jesus in 17:5 and 17:24. Chibici-Revneanu rightly posits that the Gospel of John only knows of one δόξα, but she differentiates Jesus' δόξα in 17:5, 24 from 17:22 as δόξα with God (παρὰ πατρί) and δόξα from God (παρὰ πατρός). Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 326–27. She still, functionally, ends up making a glory distinction, by calling 17:22 the mission-glory of Jesus and 17:24 the glory Jesus has properly in himself. See also my critique in the next footnote.

in 17:22 and 17:24. Additionally, since glory in 17:22 is Jesus's glory, it makes the most sense to start with John's own definition of Jesus's glory in 1:14. John bears witness, "we have seen his glory," and further defines this visual phenomenon both in terms of status (glory as of the only begotten) and of appearance (glory that is *seen*, glory as full of grace and truth).<sup>75</sup> This kind of δόξα can be given to the disciples in that they receive the status of being the children of God, bearing the radiance of God's glory, on the one hand (17:22), even while they are promised to see Jesus's δόξα in heaven on the other (17:24).<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> For a discussion of Jesus' δόξα in the Gospel of John in the context of an honor and shame culture, see David A. DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 74–80. Jesus' status as the only begotten would be understood as ascribed glory. DeSilva's analysis is helpful so far as he highlights the value of honor and shame in the Gospel, especially as it pertains to Jesus and the disciples. But he often overlooks the other end of the semantic range of δόξα, that of appearance and thus the radiance of God.

<sup>76</sup> *Contra* Chibici-Revneanu, who points out the tension between δόξα in 17:22 and 17:24, and she asks, "Does it make sense to promise the believers that they will see glory in the future (17:24) after stating that they have been given glory already *in the present* just two verses earlier (17:22)?," emphasis original, in Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, "Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine Δόξα-Language," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Gilbert Van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 223 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 515. She reconciles the two verses by pointing to the *one* glory of God in Jesus as differentiated by the Gospel of John through two different glory-relations, as δόξα with God (παρὰ πατρί) and δόξα from God (παρὰ πατρός). She rightly posits that there is only one glory of God, in connection with the כבוד יהוה of the OT. She critiques other interpreters who try to propose distinctions of glory in the Gospel, as if there is a heavenly glory and an earthly glory. For she argues, and I agree, that the Gospel of John only presents one glory of God. She then proposes, based on the grammar of John 1:14 and 17:5, that there are two glory *relations* between Jesus and the one glory of God. Therefore, glory in 17:22 is glory *from* God (like glory in John 1:14), and is related to Jesus' earthly mission, while glory in 17:24 (and 17:5) is glory *with* God. See both her article and her monograph, Chibici-Revneanu, "Variations on Glorification," 515–17; Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 326–27. She also asserts that her glory-relations proposal solves another issue, which is how Jesus can be revealing glory while on earth, and yet still ask for a future glorification in the events of the hour. She finds that because Jesus exhibited glory on earth in John 1:14 terms, glory *from* the Father, that his request for glorification is related to glory *with* the Father (17:5). Thus, she argues, that δόξα (she restricts glorification as referring to the events of the hour, see chapter 4, footnote 8) marks the transition from δόξα παρὰ πατρός to δόξα παρὰ πατρί. I am not persuaded that these proposed glory-relations are the key to solving either of these issues, which Chibici-Revneanu confidently asserts that it is. First, although John 1:14 does speak of glory, John further defines glory as, "glory as the only begotten from the Father" (my trans., δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός), not "glory from the Father" (δόξα παρὰ πατρός). Therefore, the kind of glory John sees is related to who Jesus is as the μονογενής, and it is questionable that Jesus is the μονογενής only in relation to his earthly mission. Second, it is unlikely that John intended such a distinction based on the genitive used in 1:14 and the dative used in 17:5, such that we could construct a schema for glory and glorification the way Chibici-Revneanu has proposed. Third, a tension is only present between 17:24 and 17:22 if we view the "giving" of 17:22 in terms of revealing/perceiving, which I argued against above. Thus, what is given in 17:22, can still be spoken of as being perceived in 17:24. Fourth, her proposed glory-relations still make a distinction that functionally posits a two-glory interpretation of John, which she argued strongly against. My proposal, fully explained below, is that Jesus' glory in 17:22 and 17:24 is one and the same eternal glory he possesses as the μονογενής. In 17:22 Jesus grants the disciples this same kind of glory, but when applied to them it elevates them to be children of God (for they cannot be the μονογενής) who also bear the radiance of God's character. Thus in 17:22 there is an actual granting of glory, not a display of glory. There is no contradiction then to 17:24, which speaks of the disciples seeing Jesus' glory in the heavenly setting.

We will first discuss how the δόξα of John 1:14 can be “given” to Jesus by God, then follow that with how it can be then given by Jesus to the disciples.

The Father has granted δόξα to the Son (17:24), and if this is the δόξα which he has had with the Father before the world was (cf. 17:5), then we can conclude that it is δόξα he has *always* had with the Father.<sup>77</sup> God giving δόξα to the Son therefore is an eternal grant in the sense that Jesus has always been, and has never not-been the *μονογενής*, possessing the radiance of divine character. It would be difficult to identify δόξα with Jesus’s mission or his revelatory task in 17:22, given its use in 17:24.<sup>78</sup> Although δόξα involves his position and identity as the *μονογενής*, this δόξα is something that can be *seen* in the heavenly setting (17:24). That should not be surprising since Jesus has been revealing his δόξα to some degree already on the earth (1:14; 2:11; 11:4).<sup>79</sup> For Jesus, visual δόξα emanates from the possession of δόξα as status, which explains why the signs, and the cross and resurrection in particular, reveal Jesus to be who he is. The radiance of his character, when seen, demonstrates his identity. The heavenly vision needs no such acts of glory to reveal it but can be beheld as it is (17:24).<sup>80</sup> Δόξα, as given

---

<sup>77</sup> The description of δόξα in 17:5 specifically defines it as δόξα Jesus has always had with the Father, “before the world existed” (πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι). This pre-existent δόξα is related to Jesus’ post-ascension δόξα in 17:24 in at least two ways. First, assuming that Jesus’ prayer of 17:5 is answered, the request of 17:24 is for his disciples to see this pre-existent δόξα since Jesus will have returned to the Father’s side. Second, the δόξα given to Jesus by the Father in 17:24 is motivated by the Father’s love for Jesus “before the foundation of the world” (πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου). It is this eternal, pre-existent love that the Father has had for the Son, which motivates this giving of δόξα. We can then reasonably conclude that the δόξα given to Jesus is an eternal, pre-existent δόξα that Jesus has always had with the Father.

<sup>78</sup> *Contra* Köstenberger, who writes of δόξα in 17:22, that it is “glory that Jesus was awarded in order to carry out his earthly mission” in Köstenberger, *John*, 498. Also *contra* Chibici-Revneanu, see my critique of her view that glory in 17:22 is related to Jesus’ mission glory in the note above.

<sup>79</sup> Interpreters have commonly referred to the glory seen on earth (1:14) as some sort of “veiled” glory, in light of the glory seen in 17:24 in heaven. It is on this basis that some posit a distinction between the glory in 17:24 and 1:14. For example, van der Merwe affirms that Jesus possessed the glory in 1:14 prior to the foundation of the earth, yet still indicates it is a *different* glory from 17:24, see van der Merwe, “The Interpretation of the Revelatory Events in John 17:24-26: An Exegetical Exercise,” 317–18, esp 317n7. It is better to indicate that 17:24 and 1:14 refer to the same glory, but the experience of it on earth (1:14) is going to be limited compared to the heavenly sight (17:24).

<sup>80</sup> Even then, the seeing of Jesus in a heavenly scene can be linked to his acts in history. The heavenly vision in Revelation 5:6–14 is of a Lamb who was slain, who is worthy to receive such honor and glory (5:12).

to and possessed by Jesus, carries both meanings of status and appearance, involving both the Sonship of Jesus, as the only begotten, and the radiance of God's character, full of grace and truth. This explains how δόξα in 17:24 can both be given and seen.

How can this kind of δόξα be granted to the disciples (17:22)? By stating that this δόξα is divine δόξα, as we have, it does not necessitate a one-to-one correlation between the δόξα Jesus has and the δόξα passed onto the disciples. John's Gospel allows us to distinguish between the two. Two examples undergird this point. First, the language of mutual indwelling shared by Father and Son ("the Father is in me and I am in the Father," 10:38) is also used of believers and the Son ("In that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you," 14:20) and even of believers in the Father and Son ("that they also may be in us," 17:20; "I in them and you in me," 17:21). But the statements about believers being in the Son and he in them is clearly of a different nature than the Son and Father being in one another, and so must be qualified. Second, the mission of Jesus is given to the disciples, yet it is not the same exact mission. Just a few verses prior, Jesus indicated *καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ γὰρ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον* (17:18). The correlation between the two "sendings" are clear, and the same language is used, yet there are distinctions that must be made. Jesus has come from above, from the Father, and is the only begotten Son from the Father (16:27–28). The disciples can be given the right to be born of God (1:13), or born *ἄνωθεν* (3:3), yet they are not sent into the world like the Son was, who came from the Father's side (17:5). The disciples will eventually be with the Father and Son (17:24), yet they began as part of the world (3:16). The Son, who is the *λόγος* enfleshed, was sent into the world to grant eternal life and to reveal God, while the disciples, like John the Baptist, are not the light themselves but bear witness to the light (1:6–8; 15:27). Thus in the Gospel of John, a distinction can be made between Jesus and the disciples even as the same verbiage may be used to describe them or their mission.

If Jesus grants to the disciples the divine δόξα, then what is shared between the disciples and Jesus and what is distinct? We will explore this first regarding δόξα as status and then δόξα as appearance.

**Δόξα given: Status.** The δόξα that Jesus possesses involves his being the μονογενής παρὰ πατρός; his status as the only begotten Son. If Jesus gives this glory to the disciples, glory in terms of status correlates to the disciples being “children of God,” as in John 1:12, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι.<sup>81</sup> There, Jesus is the one who grants those who believe in him a new identity and status, they are “children of God” (τέκνα θεοῦ), who also are “from God” in the sense that they have been ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν (“born of God,” 1:13). The granting of glory as status points to the inclusion of the disciples into the family of God: they belong to God and call him Father (20:17).<sup>82</sup> They are part of Jesus’s flock, those he gathers into one as his children (11:52), and are thus

---

<sup>81</sup> For examples of the use of δόξα with reference to the elevation of one’s status or the status / position one has, see Luke 14:10; Hebrews 3:3; 2 Maccabees 14:7; Sirach 7:4; 8:14; Josephus *Antiquities* 4.14. In Luke 14:10, δόξα is used to describe the glory one will have due to being elevated to a place of honor. In Hebrews 3:3 Jesus is described as one who is worthy of more δόξα than Moses due to his being faithful over God’s house as the Son. In Luke 14:10 and Hebrews 3:3 the δόξα one possesses is directly linked to the position one holds. 2 Maccabees 14:7 uses “the ancestral glory” (τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν) to refer to the position of the high priesthood that Alcimus lost (cf. Heb 4:4 and Josephus *Ant.* 12.42 for τιμὴ, a close synonym to δόξα, used as a direct reference to the position of high priest). “A seat of glory” (καθέδραν δόξης) is used in parallel to “high office” (ἡγεμονίαν) in Sirach 7:4, and a judge’s status or standing is called his δόξα in Sirach 8:14 (“Do not go to law against a judge, for the decision will favor him because of his standing [τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ],” NRSV). Josephus uses both τιμὴ and δόξα to describe Moses’ honorable position he had over the Israelites as their leader (*Ant.* 4.14, cf. also 4.15–16 for τιμὴ as reference to the position of the priesthood).

<sup>82</sup> So also Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 295. She recognizes both notions of status and appearance in the granting of glory. The difference between my proposal and hers is that she views the glory of Jesus in 17:22 as a sent-one glory related to Jesus’ mission, rather than his eternal glory as related in 17:24, although she claims that she still views both 17:22 and 17:24 as one in the same glory. Godet rightly interprets the glory in 17:22 as the glory of adoption and links it to the eternal love of the Father for the Son, and thus the believers also being objects of divine love, Frédéric Louis Godet, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Timothy Dwight, Classic Commentary Library (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1955), 342. See also Kerr, who also identifies the granting of glory with John 1:12 but gets there through a somewhat convoluted path, via Numbers 27:20, see Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 363–65. For the granting of glory from a social scientific perspective see Piper, “Glory, Honor and Patronage.” For an overview of his article see my chapter 2, and for a critique on how he applies the social scientific model see below. Chibici-Revneanu is more judicious in her application of social scientific models, considering how each occurrence of δόξα in the Gospel of John may have notions of both appearance and status.

part of the realization of the people of God whom he promises to gather in the latter days (Deut 30:3; Isa 56:8; Jer 32:37; Ezek 34:11–16). Like Jesus who is of God, so are the disciples, yet Jesus only is the *μονογενής* while the disciples are *τέκνα*. Elsewhere in John, Jesus describes this birthing as Spirit-wrought and from above (John 3:3–8). It is in the lifting up of the *μονογενής*, his self-giving in the world, that others can have eternal life (3:14–16), and thus become *τέκνα θεοῦ*. Therefore, the disciples can be like Jesus in being of God, yet their status as *τέκνα θεοῦ* depends on the work of Jesus as the *μονογενής*. Both Jesus and the disciples share in God’s glory, yet John maintains a clear distinction between Jesus and his disciples. Jesus is the pre-existent eternal Son, who has authority to judge and grant life, and his sharing of God’s glory necessarily results in honor due to him as one would honor the Father (5:22–23). On the other hand, the disciples were slaves to sin, set free by the Son (8:31–32, 36). Even if the disciples were Jews, children of Abraham, they are not truly children of God until the Son sets them free. Jesus’s giving of *δόξα* to the disciples is to give them the glory of being the children of God.

If *δόξα* relates to one’s status before God, then this giving of *δόξα* in John 17:22, which is no less than the *δόξα* which comes from God, stands in contrast to the *δόξα* seeking of the Jews from one another. As Jesus did not seek his own *δόξα* but the Father is the one who glorifies him (8:54), so the disciples should be those who do not seek their own *δόξα*. For those who follow Jesus in his glorification, the Father will honor them (*ἐάν τις ἐμοὶ διακονῇ τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ*, 12:26). The fact that the disciples receive *δόξα* from God through Jesus contrasts strikingly with the Jews who seek *δόξα* from one another. These Jews are those who did not believe in Jesus nor confess him because they were concerned for their standing among their peers, loving the *δόξα* that comes from man (12:43). The problem, as Jesus explained in John 5:44, is that these Jews *cannot* believe due to their fundamental orientation to seek *δόξα* horizontally, from one another (*παρὰ ἀλλήλων*, 5:44), rather than vertically, “from the only God” (*τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ*, 5:44). Here in John 17:22, the disciples need not fear man, for the only



standing that matters is one's standing before God, and Jesus provides it. In social scientific terms, for the disciples, the court of reputation needs to shift from seeking status or approbation from "one another" to seeking δόξα from God.<sup>83</sup> The negative seeking of glory Jesus describes could involve seeking recognition from others (praise from others) or a status of honor amongst their community (cf. 12:42).<sup>84</sup> Jesus himself indicated that he does not seek glory from men (5:41)<sup>85</sup> in contrast to his interlocutors. Passages such as 5:41–44 and 12:42 challenge the would-be disciple of Jesus and indicate that their court of reputation must shift from the horizontal to the vertical. Regard for God is what matters, not regard for man. In John 17:22 Jesus indicates his disciples will indeed receive δόξα from the only God, through Jesus's granting it to them. In God's reckoning, those who follow Jesus are those who possess the glory of being the children of God, despite what the Jews may think, and despite the consequence of being put out of the synagogue (9:22, 12:42).<sup>86</sup> This granting of δόξα from God must have been

---

<sup>83</sup> For a brief explanation of honor and shame in Mediterranean society see DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*, 1–28. See pp. 4–7 on the concept of the "court of reputation."

<sup>84</sup> Thus there were some who believed in Jesus yet did not confess him because they feared the Pharisees and had regard for their fellow man more than God. They cared more about their standing as given by the Pharisees ("they did not confess it, so that they would not be put out of the synagogue," 12:42), rather than their standing as given by God.

<sup>85</sup> "I do not receive glory [δόξαν] from people" (John 5:41).

<sup>86</sup> Ronald A. Piper rightly explores the honor and shame context of 17:22 yet he applies the social scientific model too rigidly, in "Glory, Honor and Patronage," 293, 299–300. Piper interprets "the world may know" with the public recognition of δόξα. He identifies the world as the source of recognition, by them envying the believers. This interpretation of 17:22 is based on understanding honor as a "limited good" in Mediterranean culture. One gains honor *in competition* with his peers, and the client acquires honor "according to the envy which he can draw from his fellows." There are at least three problems with this interpretation. First, it goes against the grain of the text of John 17:22–23 itself. John 17:21 states in parallel, that the believers be one, that (ἑνα) the world may believe. The world knowing is not about envy or hatred, rather it is a positive response of belief. Second, in John 5:41ff Jesus indicts the Jews precisely because they seek recognition from one another. Why would Jesus now be giving his disciples δόξα, to incur recognition from men? Third, the understanding that honor is a limited good in the Mediterranean world is based upon a study by George M. Foster, which was a study in the 1960's of peasants in Tzintzuntzan, Michoacán, Mexico. Foster is concerned with the nature of the cognitive orientation of peasants, to make a case for what he believes to be the dominant theme in the cognitive orientation of classic peasant societies. I doubt that the methodology of building a model on a single study of peasants in the 1960's in Mexico, then applying it rigidly to the biblical text is methodologically sound. George M. Foster, "Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good," *American Anthropologist* 67, no. 2 (1965): 293–315. See especially pages 296–297. Piper quotes Foster's work which was republished in a reader on Peasant Society in 1967. I think this is an example of the model taking precedence over the exegesis of the text. For another study that argues for honor as a limited good, see J. H. Neyrey and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "'He Must Increase, I Must Decrease' (John 3:30): A Cultural and Social Interpretation," in *The Social*

tremendously encouraging for any readers facing similar consequences from their own communities.<sup>87</sup>

Therefore the status given to the disciples is expressed in terms of familial identity, inclusion in the family of God as the children of God, granted by the only begotten of God. Δόξα as it relates to Jesus is the glory of being the only begotten from the Father. Δόξα as it relates to the disciples is the glory of being the children of God.

**Δόξα given: Appearance.** John prefaces his Gospel by claiming a new revelation of God has dawned in Jesus Christ, the enfleshed λόγος. This new vision of δόξα, the radiance of God’s character, John boldly asserts, is the new definitive point of reference for knowing God, surpassing even prior revelation given to Moses through the law (1:14–18).<sup>88</sup> Because Jesus is the μονογενής, the μονογενής θεός who is at the Father’s side, he has made the Father known in a new and unprecedented way (1:18).<sup>89</sup> Because of who Jesus is as the μονογενής, to look upon Jesus is to look upon the Father (14:9). This means that Jesus’s status as μονογενής refers not merely to his exalted position but his divine nature. Therefore, if a similar status is granted to believers, that of being τέκνα θεοῦ, it follows that they too possess the character of their Father. They are not simply

---

*World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric Clark Stewart (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008). For the rationale of using peasant studies, see Bruce J. Malina, “Rhetorical Criticism and Social-Scientific Criticism: Why Won’t Romanticism Leave Us Alone?,” in *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric Clark Stewart (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008), 7.

<sup>87</sup> Perhaps the passages of synagogue expulsion reflect to some degree the situation for John’s readers as far as their standing within non-Christian Jewish communities, see DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*, 72–73.

<sup>88</sup> As explained in chapter 2, the visual witness of Jesus’ δόξα—that in Jesus one sees the radiance of God’s character—is entirely grounded in his being the μονογενής παρὰ πατρός (1:14). Grace and truth came through Jesus, transcending the law that was given through Moses (1:16–17), both “grace and truth” and “the law” are references to the revelation of God (1:18). See my unpacking of the phrase χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος (1:16) in chapter 2. One “grace” (in reference to the revelation of God through Jesus) replaces another “grace” (in reference to the revelation of God through Moses). I also argue that “replace” need not be understood as negation but can be understood as transcending and fulfilling.

<sup>89</sup> Jesus’ will continue to make known the Father’s name even after he returns to the Father (17:26). His very designation as the λόγος (1:1–3, 14), in context of his role as revealer (1:14–18), grounds the later Trinitarian understanding that the Son is the eternal expression of the Father.

elevated in office or position, but their becoming children of God demands the inward change necessary to make them so.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, believers who are given the right to become children of God also exhibit something of the character of God, and thus others ought to be able to perceive something of God's glory in God's children.

The Father and Son are "full of grace and truth" (1:14; Exod 34:6) so the children of God are also to be "full of grace and truth." The *δόξα* of the disciples, as appearance, should be defined in the same way as the *δόξα* of Jesus, as the radiance of God's character. Just as Jesus did not exude visible glory but manifested it through his actions, most notably in the climactic act of glorification, so the disciples are to manifest the radiance of God's character in their acts of love for one another (13:31–35). This means no less than the expectation that children are to act as their Father, in contrast to the unbelieving Jews who act like *their* father (8:44). The disciples are to be doing what their Father desires, and to act as Jesus has called them to in accordance with his commands. They are to love as Jesus loved (13:34–35), following Jesus in his glorification, and thus are to lay down their lives for one another (12:23–24; 15:12–13). They are to bear witness verbally but also through their self-sacrificing loving actions (21:19, 24). The revelatory aspect of the disciples' mission was pointed out in the last chapter, and this granting of glory is necessary for them to carry out their mission.

### **Glory as Mission?**

At this point it sounds like I am proposing what Ferreira argues, that the grant of "glory" refers to "mission."<sup>91</sup> Or, what Bultmann indicated, that in the granting of *δόξα*

---

<sup>90</sup> Thus it is not like Luke 14:10 where the elevation of one's position at a banquet results in glory before others, or like 2 Maccabees 14:7 or *Ant.* 4.14 where the high priesthood is granted. The granting of status in those situations are related to the elevation of their position, and are thus an external granting, but not necessarily inclusive of any inward change. The granting of glory in 17:22 involves both an elevation of status but also the inward change God has wrought in the believer through his Spirit.

<sup>91</sup> Ferreira writes, "*δόξα* is understood as the mission Jesus received from the father. The *δόξα* that Jesus gives to his disciples is the sharing in his mission.... The disciples' *δόξα* then is to continue the divine mission of Jesus," in Ferreira, *Johannine Ecclesiology*, 159.

the community of believers “receives a share in [Jesus’s] work of revelation.”<sup>92</sup> The context of the disciples’ mission is indeed highly relevant. The giving of δόξα in 17:22 comes after Jesus indicates that he is sending his disciples into the world (17:18), and in this section of John 17 Jesus prays for his disciples because the disciples need to remain in the world while Jesus departs from it (17:6–26).

Admittedly, glory and mission are closely related but it is important to maintain that they are not the same. The granting of glory itself is not the granting of mission. Two clarifications must be made. First, the granting of glory enables mission. We need not look further than 17:22–23 and its logic to prove this point, the granting of glory is for unity, which is for witness. Therefore Jesus himself identifies the granting of glory as an element which enables the success of the disciples’ mission. The mission of the disciples, like the mission of Jesus, involves the demonstration of glory but this is different than the granting of glory. If we collapse mission and glory together, then it becomes difficult to explain how the granting of glory enables mission.

Second, the granting of, and thus their possession of glory, entails their mission. Their glory of being children of God and possessing the radiance of God’s character is part and parcel with the *revealing* of this character. Who the disciples are cannot be understood apart from the actions they take, such that they are identified by obedience to Jesus’s commandment to love one another (13:34–35). The term δόξα itself indicates that something is *perceptible* by others—it is a communication of worth. Thus the Gospel of John makes clear that others will know that they are disciples through their Christ-like love for one another (13:34–35). Moreover, when a passage such as Exodus 33–34 speaks of the δόξα of God, the δόξα of God cannot be neatly extricated from the actions of God as if we can contemplate his character apart from his acts in salvation

---

<sup>92</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 515.

history.<sup>93</sup> For the *δόξα* of God is in reference to his very character, the radiance or communication of his character, a revelation of who he is. And it is quite impossible to know who someone is apart from what they do.<sup>94</sup>

Furthermore, the character of God has an outward orientation that desires others to see it, perceive it, partake in it, and rejoice in it. For Jesus, having been given glory due to the Father's love, desires that his disciples may see his glory (17:24). If Jesus reveals the glory of God through his actions and desires, then this desire of Jesus in 17:24 reveals something of the Father. God desires to be known by his own, thus he sends his Son in order to grant them eternal life, which is to know the Father and the Son (17:3). In other words, if we can see the Father in Jesus, then we can observe that part and parcel of possessing God's *δόξα* is the desire to have others share in it—the character of God is fundamentally glorious in the *radiant* sort of way. Thus if to be given his *δόξα* is to share in who he is (be of his family, receive the radiance of his character), the disciples' possession of it will necessarily result in the communication of this *δόξα* to others in acts that reveal *δόξα*. But the mission of revealing God and honoring him is not to be equated with the possession of his glory, although it is entailed. Therefore, the granting of glory enables and entails mission, but is not the same as mission.

### **Sharing in God's Glory: Glory as Status and Appearance**

Therefore, in 17:22, the giving of *δόξα* refers to both the disciples being the children of God and possessing the radiance of God's character. The disciples share in God's own glory given to Jesus. They not only have a new status as the children of God,

---

<sup>93</sup> As I argued in chapter 2, the proclamation of God's name and character in Exodus 34:5–7 are in the context of historical concrete actions towards Israel.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Prov 20:11, "Even a child makes himself known by his acts, by whether his conduct is pure and upright." Even if we learn of someone's character through verbal report, it is a report that inevitably must point to actions taken by the person. See also Psalm 96:3, where declaring God's glory among the nations is parallel to declaring his marvelous works among all peoples.

but it necessarily involves their new birth and nature. They are a new creation who bear the image of their Father, and thus resemble him, possessing the radiance of his character. The granting of glory underscores who the disciples are, born again with new life and a new way of life. This is their true *δόξα*, which they need not seek from man, for Jesus has provided it from the only God.<sup>95</sup>

Why does John present Jesus using *δόξα* terminology here? In the context of their mission (17:18), it is to highlight John's theme of revelation once again. The granting of status with *δόξα* terminology entails them being sent out into the world to demonstrate the radiance of God's character in acts of love. They are to glorify the Father, that is, to radiate the character of the Father, just as the Son did, and in so doing honor the Father. Just as the Father sent the Son, so the Son sends the disciples. The Son reveals the Father, and the disciples will reveal the Son, and thus continue the work of the Son in revealing the Father. The granting of glory, therefore, enables and further

---

<sup>95</sup> My proposal overlaps with much of what Chibici-Revneanu has proposed. Chibici-Revneanu provides a great deal of discussion and reasoned argumentation on 17:22. She affirms that both meanings of *δόξα* are present in 17:22: a divine revelatory meaning (appearance) and also a profane-anthropological meaning (status). The granting of *δόξα* includes the disciples into the divine family as the children of God, while also including them in Jesus' mission to reveal God's glory in acts of love. Therefore our views of *δόξα* in 17:22 do not differ significantly, even as we may differ in other details as I have noted through the chapter. My view is not so novel as to contradict with other proposals of glory, such as glory as the divine presence or life (Witherington; Whitacre), as adoption (Godet), as divine nature (Bernard), or as the radiance of God's character (Bauckham). These interpretations, however, do not take into account the possibility of glory as status. Alternatively, those who identify *δόξα* as status, and thus some sort of divine honor (Lincoln; Morris; Thompson; Piper), may not take into account glory as appearance, nor link it directly with the honor of being the children of God. As a result they miss the connection with the larger theme of glory and glorification. The advantage of my proposal lies in: (1) identifying the glory of Jesus in 17:22 with how John himself explains the glory of Jesus in John 1:14; (2) factoring in both meanings of status and of appearance, taking into account the wider theme of the revelation of the Father in the Son through glory language, while also taking into account how one should seek glory from the only God (5:44); (3) consistently interpreting glory in 17:22 with glory in 17:24; (4) explaining how this provision of glory enables unity. For the varying views I outline above, see Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 286–99; Ben Witherington, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 271; Rodney A. Whitacre, *John*, IVP New Testament Commentary Series (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 416; Godet, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 2:342; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ed. A. H. McNeile, ICC 29 (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929), 2:578; Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 62; Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, 438–39; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, Revised edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 650; Thompson, *John*, 356–57; Piper, "Glory, Honor and Patronage," 287.

underscores the task of discipleship in the Gospel of John—the glorification of the Father through bearing witness and loving one another.

### **Glory, Unity, and Mission**

How, precisely, does this glory enable unity? How does it relate to the other means for unity, Jesus-in-them? This is rarely given exposition.<sup>96</sup> First, the granting of glory establishes their ontological unity as well as solidifies their identity as a group vis-à-vis the world. Second, the granting of glory, in tandem with Jesus-in-them, enables their functional unity.

The granting of glory to the disciples establishes their ontological unity. The unity they are to share implies more than doing the same things, but also sharing in the same nature. If Jesus grants them the glory of being children of God, then they all share in this renewed humanity. Their being made children of God (1:12; 3:5), gathered “into one” by the one shepherd (10:16; 11:51–52), is a reminder of their shared identity and simultaneously how securely they share that identity. Those who believe in Jesus, together, renewed in heart and given a new spirit (John 3:3; Ezek 36:26), are born again as children of God (John 1:12; 17:22). Jesus has indeed made them all one through his death (11:51–52), and none can snatch them out of the Father’s hand (10:28). It is an objective reality for all who have believed in Jesus.

The granting of glory also solidifies their identity as a group vis-à-vis the world. The possession of status given by Jesus functions as an encouragement to readers of John who have already placed their faith in Jesus. It is true that they face hostility from

---

<sup>96</sup> Some studies on unity may acknowledge the logic but do not go farther than stating simply that glory is important, or is a basis for unity. For example, Robert A. Peterson, “Union with Christ in the Gospel of John,” *Presbyterion* 39, no. 1 (2013): 26–27; Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 2:774–79; Pollard, “That They All May Be One: John 17:21 and the Unity of the Church”; John F. Randall, “The Theme of Unity in John 17:20–23,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 41, no. 3 (July 1965): 373–94; van der Merwe, “The Character of Unity Expected among the Disciples of Jesus, According to John 17”; Theron, “INA OSIN EN. A Multifaceted Approach to an Important Thrust in the Prayer of Jesus in John 17.”

the world (15:18), but via John 17:22 they are reminded that they need not seek δόξα among men since they have been given true δόξα from God. They have a new status given from God, such that any threat of a loss of status among their fellow man can be endured.<sup>97</sup> This honor given to the disciples is neither achieved nor earned but a gift to those who believe (cf. 1:12; 6:29).<sup>98</sup> Possession of this honor leads to a re-orientation of how they ought to view their social identity. They are reminded that they now belong to a new family, that of God and his son Jesus. They need not fear to confess Jesus like some (12:42–43), for they are part of the people of God whom God has promised to gather together in the latter days. Therefore the granting of glory would solidify their sense of corporate identity and embolden them in the face of hatred from the world, for they have true honor before God, while those who oppose them are actually blind in their seeking of δόξα from one another (5:41–44; 12:42–43).<sup>99</sup>

How does the granting of glory relate to the means of Jesus-in-them, such that these two means lead to unity and effective witness? Broadly speaking, the granting of glory enables believers' ontological unity, while Jesus-in-them enables their functional unity. These two means for unity interconnect and together enable a unity that leads to effective witness. To draw an analogy from systematic theology, the granting of glory relates more to justification, their initial conversion, while Jesus-in-them relates more to

---

<sup>97</sup> Such a loss of status is feared in John 12:42, cf. 9:22; 16:2.

<sup>98</sup> Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*, 295.

<sup>99</sup> Social-scientific studies that have tried to reconstruct the precise social setting of the text are far too speculative. For example, Malan interprets the prayer for unity in John 17 as a plea for ecumenical diversity rather than structural, theological, or confessional unity. He comes to this conclusion by first rejecting the “face value” reading of the text (a reading of the text that takes at face value that the Gospel is written by an eyewitness and provides a historical account), and then reconstructing its *Sitz im Leben*. Following Brown's hypothesis of the Johannine community that stands in opposition to even other Christian communities, Malan contends that we should understand the prayer of John 17 as a prayer “for unity and solidarity within the Johannine antisociety in opposition to other communities of faith,” in Gert Malan, “Does John 17:11b, 21-23 Refer to Church Unity?,” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 67, no. 1 (2011): 9. So far as Jesus' prayer should bolster the identity of an “antisociety,” this is true in terms of those who follow Jesus as opposed to those of the world. But it would be going too far to then pit even different groups of Christians against one another, as if Peter represents the apostolic churches and the Beloved Disciple the Johannine community.



sanctification, their ongoing obedience. Together, these two means enable the disciples to be unified and bear witness.

The granting of glory enables the disciples, replete with new nature, to obey the Lord and demonstrate his character. The disciples, through Jesus in them, as they abide in Jesus's love, are simultaneously keeping the commands of Jesus. Their functional unity is increasing, for they are, in commitment to their one shepherd, obeying his commands and loving one another. Therefore as they are abiding in Jesus, and he in them, they are becoming perfectly one. The ontological aspect of this unity does not change, for they are "children of God," through the giving of glory. But the perception of their status, thus their identity before others, becomes more apparent. As they love one another the world sees that they are disciples of Jesus (13:34–35) and believe that Jesus was sent from the Father (17:21, 23). For as they grow in obedience to Jesus's commands (chiefly consisting in greater love for one another) it will lead to a more accurate representation of Jesus's love for them, and hence a growth in functional unity results while there is also a growing recognition of their ontological unity by others.

The granting of glory, in tandem with Jesus abiding in them, leads to the fulfillment of their mission to reveal God and honor God, and thus draw the world in to believe. As others perceive that they are disciples of Jesus, through their obedience to Jesus's commandments, chiefly to love one another (13:34–35; 15:8), the world comes to believe that the Father has sent Jesus (17:21). Glory leads to unity which leads to witness. As a result, the Father is honored because his love through Jesus is revealed, thus God is glorified. The world comes to know not only that Jesus is sent from the Father, but as the disciples love one another and grow in unity, it becomes apparent to the world also that the disciples are loved by the Father just as the Father has loved Jesus (17:23)

### **Glory as God's People**

In the final section of this chapter I will make an argument for how the granting of δόξα in John 17:22 may allude to Isaiah 60:1–3 with a few comments on how the granting of glory may fit into the wider canonical context. Space does not permit a full exploration of Isaiah 60:1–3 and its context, so a few connections between John 17:22 and Isaiah 60:1–3 will be pointed out along with some implications.

The two means that Jesus identifies for unity: (1) the granting of glory, and (2) the abiding relationship (17:21–23), together point to the new moment in salvation history in which the disciples find themselves, and thus also identifies them with the eschatologically renewed people of God. It is a time where they, as those who abide in Jesus, the true Israel, are enabled by the Holy Spirit to obey Jesus's commands and thus abide in him and he in them. They, through Jesus, will faithfully do what Israel failed to do. It is a new eschatological age in which they have been granted the honor to be born again of water and spirit and thus with new hearts bear the radiance of the Father who loves them. Additionally, the Gospel presents the disciples as those: who are taught by God (John 6:45; Isa 54:13); who have been made clean through Jesus's word (15:3), and thus would indeed be fruitful branches rather than those thrown into the fire (15:4–6; as opposed to faithless Israel); who are gathered by the good shepherd and would never be snatched out of the Father's hand (John 10:29; Ezek 36:24; 37:24–28); who would abide in Jesus and bear much fruit (John 15:5; Isa 27:2–6); who would have the Holy Spirit (John 14:16; 16:7; Ezek 36:27; Isa 32:15; 44:3), who are born of water and spirit (John 3:5; Ezek 36:25–26); and are those whom Jesus intercedes for and to whom he will continually reveal the Father (17:6–26). It is as if God has entered into a New Covenant with these disciples, not like the old covenant made with Israel, the covenant they broke (Jer 31:31–34).

At the very least, the above examples in John identify the disciples, and by extension all future believers, as participants of the promises given to Israel as a people

and locate the inauguration of their fulfillment through Jesus. The granting of glory to the disciples, especially in lieu of Isaiah’s influence on John, furthermore, may allude to the restoration of the kingdom in Israel and the renewal of his people in Isaiah 60:1–3:<sup>100</sup>

Arise, shine, for your light has come,  
and the glory of the LORD has risen upon you. (60:1)  
For behold, darkness shall cover the earth,  
and thick darkness the peoples;  
but the LORD will arise upon you,  
and his glory will be seen upon you. (60:2)  
And nations shall come to your light,  
and kings to the brightness of your rising. (60:3)

In Isaiah 60:1, “your light” (σου τὸ φῶς) parallels with “the glory of the LORD” (ἡ δόξα κυρίου), which is then identified as Yahweh himself coming upon Israel (60:2).<sup>101</sup>

Darkness (σκότος) covers the land and peoples but God himself will come, shine upon his people and his glory will be seen upon them. Then in Isaiah 60:3 there is a referent change, for Israel is now identified as light, and the nations will come to them. The imperative that begins the whole sequence, “Arise, shine” also demonstrates that Israel themselves are to shine. Therefore, God dawns upon his people who dwell in darkness, and transforms them such that they themselves become light and attract the nations.<sup>102</sup> In John 1:9 and 1:14 Jesus is identified with both “light” (τὸ φῶς) and “glory” (ἡ δόξα), shining in the darkness (ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, 1:4). This glory is then given to the disciples in

---

<sup>100</sup> The LXX differs slightly from the MT, but not significantly. LXX: Φωτίζου φωτίζου, Ιερουσαλημ, ἡκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν. ἰδοὺ σκότος καὶ γνόφος καλύψει γῆν ἐπ’ ἔθνη· ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται κύριος, καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ ὀφθήσεται. καὶ πορεύσονται βασιλεῖς τῷ φωτί σου καὶ ἔθνη τῇ λαμπρότητί σου. MT: קוּמִי אֲוִרִי כִּי בָּא אֹרֶךְ וּבְבוֹד יְהוָה עָלֶיךָ יִרְחַח כִּי־יִהְיֶה הַחֹשֶׁךְ יִכְסֶּה־אֶרֶץ וְעָרָפֶל לְאֻמִּים וְעַל־יְדֵי יִרְחַח יְהוָה וּבְבוֹדוֹ עָלֶיךָ יִרְאָה וְהָלְכוּ גוֹיִם לְאֹרֶךְ וּמַלְכִּים לְנֹגַהּ יִרְחֹץ:

<sup>101</sup> The LXX identifies Jerusalem in particular in 60:1, “Shine, Shine, Jerusalem,” although the MT does not. The nearby previous verse of 59:20 identifies a Redeemer coming to “Zion”, and the parallel line is “to those in Jacob who turn from transgression.” The focus on Jerusalem and its people is also clear in 65:19, “I will rejoice in Jerusalem and be glad in my people.” The emphasis on the renewal of Jerusalem is clear in Isaiah (Isa 1:1, 21, 27; 2:1; 4:3; 29:1; 40:2; 65:19), but notice how the focus is on its people (65:19)

<sup>102</sup> Light and darkness take on moral overtones, for in the slightly wider context, 59:9 says, “Therefore justice is far from us, and righteousness does not overtake us; we hope for light, and behold, darkness, and for brightness, but we walk in gloom.” Thus for Israel to shine and to have light implies they now practice righteousness and justice.

17:22, who themselves are now transformed, given new birth, to exhibit the radiance of God's character in loving one another, the fruit which may correspond to the righteousness and justice that Israel lacked in Isaiah (Isa 5:7; 27:6). The light in Isaiah 60:1–3 that Israel is to “shine” is also related to the righteousness and justice they lacked in Isaiah 59:9, implying that their restoration through Yahweh's dawning upon them includes their renewal such that they now practice righteousness and justice. The disciples, like the picture of renewed Israel, in John 17:22 possess the glory of God. As they abide in Jesus, they will bear fruit and be one, such that the world will see the glory of God in them, like the nations who come to Israel's light (Isa 60:3).<sup>103</sup>

If the granting of glory to the disciples alludes to the transformation of Israel in the dawning of the Lord upon them as light and glory, then the allusion serves to reinforce the image of the disciples (in their connection to Jesus) as fulfilling the role of eschatological Israel by filling the world with fruit (John 15:1–17; Isa 27:2–6).

Additionally, the glory of God rising upon the people also means the return of God himself to dwell with his people (Ezek 37:27; 43:2, 5; Zech 2:10; Joel 3:17). His presence and glory, associated with the tabernacle and temple (Exod 40:34; 1 Kgs 8:11; Ps 27:4), are now to be located in Jesus Christ his Son (John 1:14; 2:21), and through Jesus, in the disciples who bear his glory (17:22). God has come to dwell with man in Jesus, and through both means of unity in John 17:21–22 we see how God has come to dwell *in* the disciples through Jesus and the Spirit. God is now to be known, seen, and experienced only through his glorified crucified Son (1:18; 14:6), who has placed his glory in his disciples and sent them out into the world. As 1 John 4:12 says, “No one has ever seen God, but if we love one another, God abides in us and his love is perfected in

---

<sup>103</sup> Another connection is how in Isa 59:15–16, the Lord saw that there was no justice and then “his own arm brought him salvation” which can be, in light of Isaiah 53:1, a reference to the redemption of Israel through the servant. If that is so, then the transformation of Israel into “light” that attracts the nations is a result of the servant's work. In the same way, the glory given to the disciples and their new status as children of God is a result of Jesus who is lifted up and glorified as the servant of Isaiah (John 12:23, 32; Isa 52:13).

us.” The world will see the radiance of God’s character and experience his presence as the disciples love one another and manifest his glory.

In terms of kingdom, Jesus’s glory was one that revealed the radiance of God’s character in the fulfillment of God’s kingdom promises (John 1:14; 2:11; cf. 3:3).<sup>104</sup> To be given the glory of Jesus implies participation in his kingdom and in what he comes to restore and renew. Just as Jesus’s kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36), so his disciples are not of the world (17:16), for they belong to the King and are participants in his kingdom. As the disciples serve their king and bear his image in glorifying God (12:23–26), they go and bear fruit (15:16), filling the world with the glory of God.<sup>105</sup> Israel was to be a beacon of light to the world, bearing the glory of their maker and redeemer (Isa 42:6), the fulfillment of God’s intention to bless the world through Abram (Gen 12:3).<sup>106</sup> They failed, but in Jesus and through his disciples, God continues his program of renewing the world, filling the world with his glory as the waters cover the sea (Isa 11:9; Ps 72:18–19).

### Conclusion

In this chapter I examined glory and glorification in the prayer of Jesus and proposed a specific definition of δόξα for John 17:22. The δόξα that God gives to Jesus in both 17:22 and 17:24 is the divine δόξα which John bears witness to in John 1:14, “glory as of the only begotten, full of grace and truth.” This δόξα encompasses both notions of appearance and status. Jesus, in his status as the only begotten, bears the radiance of God’s character. When given to the disciples in John 17:22, this δόξα involves the

---

<sup>104</sup> As discussed in my chapter 2, the revealing of glory in 2:11, shows Jesus as the Messiah who brings about the new age and is informed by both 1:14 (glory as the radiance of God’s character) and 3:3 (glory in relation to the kingdom).

<sup>105</sup> And thus the drawing of all people to himself (12:32) is probably through the continued work of the disciples as they are sent into the world (17:18).

<sup>106</sup> Which goes further back to God’s creation purposes of making Adam and Eve in his image, in order that they might take dominion and fill the world (Gen 1:26–28).

disciples' status as the children of God and also their possession of the radiance of God's character. This granting of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  enables unity and has in view the demonstration of God's character in acts of love. In my analysis of John 17:20–23, I identified the granting of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  along with Jesus abiding in them as two means for believers' unity. This unity then functions as an effective witness in causing the world to believe that the Father sent Jesus.

As it relates to the Gospel of John as a whole, we can see how  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  in John 17:22 fits into the larger framework of Jesus revealing the Father. The public ministry of Jesus (chs. 1–12) was bookended with eyewitness testimony of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , first by John and then by Isaiah (1:14–18; 12:42). They testified that the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of Jesus is the  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  of Yahweh himself. A new and fuller revelation of Yahweh has taken place in Jesus. John's narrative showed us that it was revealed through Jesus's signs (2:11; 11:4; 12:37). Jesus's public ministry of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  gave way to his hour of  $\delta\omicron\chi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , where John uniquely presents the death and resurrection of Jesus as glorification, a climactic sign that reveals the love of God (12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 17:1–5). Through the glorification of Jesus eternal life will be granted (17:1–3) and Jesus will return to the Father (17:5). He then sends out his disciples to continue his work of glorification (17:18; 14:13). They are to follow not his signs of glory, but his sign of glory: his self-giving on the cross, and in doing so they too will honor God and reveal God (12:23–26; 13:31–35; 21:19).

As we round out the farewell discourse and prayer of Jesus, which functions as both encouragement and instruction for his disciples, we see that those who have beheld Jesus's  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and believed that he was sent from the Father also receive possession of this  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ . In receiving this  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  they have the honor of being the children of God and possess the radiance of God's character, so that they can, through abiding in Jesus, fulfill their mission of glorifying God through bearing witness and loving one another. The Son will continue to glorify the Father through those whom he has given  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ .

## CHAPTER 7

### CONCLUSION

I will close out the current study in four steps. First, I will summarize my chapters. Second, I will provide a brief synthesis of glory and glorification with special attention to John 17:22. Third, I will note a few areas for further study. Fourth, and finally, I will suggest how my study contributes to academia and the church.

#### Chapter Summaries

In the opening chapter I surveyed various interpretations on John 17:22 and explained the method of this current study as biblical-theological, building off G. K. Beale's approach of "biblical-theological-oriented exegesis." Given the prominence of glory in the Gospel of John, it is surprising how there has not been, in English, a full-length study published on glory or glorification. Most significant is how little attention has been given to δόξα in John 17:22, and therefore also a lack of explanation for how the granting of δόξα in 17:22 leads to unity and witness. Therefore, there is a need not only for careful analysis of δόξα in 17:22, but how it may cohere with the wider narrative of John and with the theme of glory in the Gospel of John as a whole. The trajectory was set for a study of glory and glorification in John with the goal of interpreting δόξα in John 17:22.

Chapter 2 was dedicated to the exposition of δόξα in the prologue of John (1:1–18), for it is here that John introduces and defines the δόξα of Jesus (1:14). I provided a brief explanation of the lexeme δόξα, related it to the OT כבוד יהוה, and argued for Exodus 33–34 as the primary background for John 1:14–18. In my exegesis on John 1:14 I renewed the argument for understanding μονογενής as "only begotten," being helped by

Lee Irons' work on *μονογενής*. And building off Alexander Tsutserov's work on John 1:14 and Exodus 34:6–7, I argued that John alludes to the revelation of God's character to Moses at Sinai. John predicates about Jesus what Moses predicates about Yahweh, Jesus's glory is Yahweh's glory. Additionally, I maintained that John claims, through his use of the phrase *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος* (John 1:16), that there is now a new defining point of revelation by which to know God, and it is no longer through Moses but through Jesus. The *δόξα* of Jesus should be defined as the radiance of God's character, for it does not only denote the divine presence but conveys something about who God is. Jesus's *δόξα* also includes his status as the *μονογενής*. For Jesus, the *μονογενής*, provides a new revelation of God that now transcends the previous revelation of God given through Moses. Study of Exodus and how God revealed his glory showed how John may have intended, through his allusion to Exodus 33–34, to prepare his readers for new events to follow in his narrative which would reveal the glory of God in new acts of deliverance and forgiveness.

Chapter 3 surveyed the use of *δόξα* in John's presentation of the public ministry of Jesus (1:19–12:43). In each occurrence of *δόξα*, I sought to establish whether its meaning fell under the semantic category of appearance or status, and then to understand its use within the developing narrative of John. The meaning of *δόξα* as the radiance of God's character was fitting for the instances where glory was seen or revealed (2:11; 11:4, 40; 12:41).

I observed that John uses *δόξα* very intentionally to frame Jesus's public ministry. There is an "outer frame" to the ministry, where John and Isaiah attest to seeing Jesus's *δόξα* and identify this *δόξα* as Yahweh's glory (1:14, 12:41). There is also an "inner frame" which demonstrates that this *δόξα* was revealed in signs (2:11; 11:4, 40). In the intervening chapters (chs. 5–9), occurrences of *δόξα* belonged the semantic category of status and were always in contexts of the Jews' rejection of Jesus or confusion about him (5:41, 44; 7:18; 8:50, 54; 9:24). I argued that John frames Jesus's ministry in this



particular way to emphasize for the reader how Jesus's ministry is one of revealing Yahweh's glory through signs.

Those who saw Jesus's signs should have perceived the glory of Yahweh in Jesus, and those who responded with persevering belief honor the Son as they honor the Father (5:23). Those who failed to see δόξα ("radiance of God's character") in Jesus did so because they were blinded in their seeking of δόξα ("honor" or "praise") from one another, rather than from God (5:44; 12:43). But this rejection of Jesus was part of God's plan to glorify and lift up his servant (John 12:38–41; Isa 52:13–53:12). In Jesus, Yahweh has returned to deliver his people and show forth his glory once more. The δόξα of Jesus must be understood within this larger framework of revelation and its demonstration in the fulfillment of OT patterns and promises.

In Chapter 4 I examined the glorification (δοξάζω) of Jesus in John. Whereas John used δόξα to describe the public ministry of Jesus in chapters 1–12, he largely reserves the verb δοξάζω (with some exceptions, cf. 11:4; 12:28; 17:4) to refer to "the hour" of glorification, that is, Jesus's death, resurrection, and return to the Father (7:39; 12:16; 12:23, 28 [2x]; 13:31–32 [5x]; 17:1 [2x], 5). Using G. B. Caird's work on glorification in 13:31 as a point of departure, I argued that δοξάζω as it refers to "the hour" should be understood to have a dual meaning, such that when God is glorified (e.g., 13:31–32), God is both honored and his glory is revealed.

I then turned to counter the unhelpful line of interpretation that identifies Jesus's glorification particularly with the return to the Father. This interpretation downplays the cross, making it the entry point of glorification (and thus emphasizes glorification as returning to the Father) rather than its focal point. I asserted that glorification is rightly located *in* the death of Jesus by arguing that John presents the death and resurrection of Jesus as the climactic sign of glory (2:18–21). But what is revealed through this climactic sign? I argued that Jesus's heavenly origin in John underscores his divine status, such that it demonstrates the depth of God's love in sending

his only begotten Son to die on the cross for his people. Additionally, John presents Jesus as the King, the servant of Isaiah, and the Passover lamb. God's love is displayed in that his only begotten Son is the one who comes to fulfill the kingdom promises to redeem his people, remove their sin, and enact a new exodus. Jesus does this by way of a shameful death on a cross, which John designates as the lifting up and glorification of Jesus (12:23, 32). Therefore, John testifies that in the death and resurrection of Jesus, a new revelation of God's glory, the radiance of his character, has occurred.

Chapter 5 turned our attention to glorification and discipleship. For although Jesus departs to the Father, he continues his glorification of the Father through the disciples. I examined passages that relate discipleship with glorification (14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 21:19) and also two passages where Jesus's own glorification is juxtaposed with implications for discipleship (12:23–28; 13:31–38). I argued that the task of discipleship in John is glorifying the Father through loving one another and bearing witness. The “greater works” the disciples are to do (14:12) include both bearing witness and loving one another. Thus their works, like Jesus's, are to reveal the Father in the Son. Similarly, I argued that the disciples glorifying the Father in 15:8 by bearing fruit also had the love commandment primarily in mind. Just as Jesus exhibited a self-giving love for others and thus honored God in revealing God, so the disciples are called to love one another with the same love, and in doing so glorify the Father, honoring him by revealing him (12:23–28; 13:31–38).

The task of discipleship primarily consists in bearing witness and loving one another, for loving one another *is* a form of witness and reveals God. In their love for one another, the love of God will be made known to the watching world (13:34–35). The disciples will only be able to do this after Jesus himself is glorified (14:13). They will glorify God in dependence upon Jesus (14:13; 15:4) and through the Holy Spirit glorifying Jesus (16:14). Peter and the Beloved Disciple illustrate this dual task of sacrificial love and bearing witness (21:19, 24). I also connected John 15:1–17 to Isaiah

27:2–6 and argued that the disciples, in Jesus, through their fruit-bearing are fulfilling the role of Israel in blessing the world and filling it with fruit. Therefore, the task of discipleship is construed as one of glorifying the Father through bearing witness and acts of love, in dependence upon Jesus and made possible by the Holy Spirit.

Finally, in chapter 6 we were in a better position to consider δόξα in John 17:22. After considering the purpose and structure of Jesus's prayer in John 17, I examined glory and glorification in the sections leading up to 17:22. In my analysis of 17:21 and 17:22–23, I identified two means for the unity Jesus desires. First, Jesus has granted them glory (17:22), and second, Jesus is in them (17:23). I argued that Jesus's δόξα in John 17:22 must be the same δόξα that John had introduced and defined in 1:14. For the δόξα given to Jesus in 17:22 should be viewed as the same as that given to Jesus in 17:24. How it can be seen on one hand (17:24) and given on the other (17:22) can be explained by δόξα as an actual granting of Jesus's δόξα to the disciples in terms of both status and appearance. Jesus's δόξα consists of Jesus's status as only begotten Son, and the radiance of God's character that John sees in him (1:14). When given to the disciples, this means that they are given the status, the honor, of being the children of God (1:12). This granting of status is a direct contrast to John 5:44 and 12:43, where those who fail to see Jesus's glory seek and love δόξα from one another rather than from the only God. Jesus provides the δόξα that comes from the only God, and those who possess it need not fear. For they have honor before God even if they lose honor in the sight of others. They are also given the radiance of divine character, for they are born again and made new, sons and daughters of their Father. Just as Jesus, the μονογενής, exhibits the glory of his Father, so the τέκνα are to demonstrate the character of their Father. Thus the granting of δόξα in 17:22, along with Jesus abiding in them (17:23), enables believers' unity. For the granting of δόξα enables their ontological unity, while Jesus abiding in them contributes to their functional unity. Together, these two realities (δόξα given and Jesus abiding in them) point to the new moment in salvation history that results from Jesus's glorification.

The disciples are the eschatological people of God’s renewed kingdom that the one shepherd will bring together into one. Thus, I proposed that John presents the disciples as eschatological Israel, where light and glory has dawned upon them, and subsequently they themselves become glory and light to the world (Isa 60:1–3). Glory given enables them to exhibit the character of God and love one another as Christ loved them. This unity leads to the world believing and knowing that the Father has sent Jesus and that the Father loved the disciples just as he has loved Jesus (17:21, 23).

### Synthesis of Glory and Glorification in John

Here we can provide a brief synthesis of glory and glorification in John with a view towards understanding John 17:22 in its wider narrative context. Over the course of two chapters (chs. 3, 4) I argued that John utilizes δόξα to frame Jesus’s public ministry while δόξαζω is largely reserved for Jesus “hour” of glorification. Both terms relate to the larger theme of the Father’s revelation in the Son. Rather than a strict distinction between the terms, their different uses signify how John sees the glorification of Jesus as the climactic act of glory. Jesus’s ministry of δόξα gives way to his hour of δόξαζω, a climactic act of deliverance whereby God decisively reveals his glory. John presents Jesus’s whole life on earth as a ministry of revealing God (17:6). This differs from the portrait of Jesus’s glory in the Synoptics, where the terms δόξα and δόξαζω are much less utilized and Jesus’s glory refers to his future glory after his suffering.

Table 16. Use of Δόξα and Δόξαζω in the Gospels

Gospel	Δόξαζω	Δόξα
Matthew	4	7
Mark	1	3
Luke	9	13
Total:	14	23
John	23	19

John uses *δοξάζω* far more than the other three gospels combined, and his use of *δόξα* is markedly increased compared to the other gospels. The manner of their use is significantly different as well. The use of *δοξάζω* in the other gospels are all in reference to the ascription of glory, whether to God, Jesus, or man.<sup>1</sup> Aside from a few instances in Luke,<sup>2</sup> and the references to Jesus's *future* glory,<sup>3</sup> the occurrences of *δόξα* in the Synoptics do not refer to Jesus possessing any sort of glory while on earth, and certainly not in his death. Therefore, John is unique in emphasizing the glory of Jesus in his life and death, and the contrast is all the more striking when he assigns glory to the ignominy of crucifixion.

This emphasis on glory is explained by John 1:14–18 and 12:37–43. John presents Jesus as bearing in his flesh (*σάρξ*, 1:14) a revelation of God that fulfills and transcends prior revelation to Moses, but he also understands Isaiah as fore-seeing this glory in a rejected, glorified servant. Therefore, John locates the glory of God not as something Jesus enters into through death (Luke 24:26), but as supremely revealed in his death and resurrection. Only in the Gospel of John is the cross itself glory and glorification, for in John Jesus honors God on the cross by revealing him on the cross. Therefore, it is in the death and resurrection of Jesus that John 1:14 finds its primary reference, for in a decisive new act of God, God has delivered his people through the blood of a new Passover lamb, opening up the fountain of eternal life for all who would believe. The revelation of God's glory in Jesus takes place in concrete action which fulfill the prophecy and pattern of Scripture, bringing about the promised kingdom, which explains why Nicodemus ought to have detected in the signs of Jesus the kingdom of God

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt 5:16; 6:2; 9:8; 15:31; Mark 2:12; Luke 2:20; 4:15; 5:25, 26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43; 23:47. Only Matt 6:2 is in reference to the ascription of glory to man, all the other occurrences are in context of giving praise to God.

<sup>2</sup> Luke 2:32; 9:31, 32.

<sup>3</sup> Matt 16:27; 19:28; 24:30; 25:31; Mark 8:38; 10:37; 13:26; Luke 9:26; 21:27; 24:26.

(3:3). Led by the Spirit of truth, John understood that the signs of Jesus signify both the fulfillment of the kingdom and a new definitive revelation of God's character. For the manner in which the fulfillment came about, that the only begotten Son would lay down his life in love, signaled to him that this new act also constituted the anticipated revelation of God to Israel in the eschatological age (John 8:24, 28; cf. Isa 43:10, 11, 25).

As Jesus was sent into the world in order to glorify the Father, so too the disciples are sent into the world to glorify the Father (17:18; 14:13; 15:8; 21:19). We can propose a schema to John's use of  $\delta\delta\xi\alpha$  as it relates to Jesus and the disciples as follows:

Table 17. Glory and Mission in John

"As you sent me into the world. . ." (17:18a)			
Glory given to Jesus	Glory manifest in climactic act of love	Ascription of glory to Jesus by disciples	Reception of glory by disciples
<p>"The glory you have given to me . . ." (17:22, 24)</p> <p>"glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (1:14)</p>	<p>"Now is the Son of Man glorified . . ." (12:23; 13:31–32)</p>	<p>"They have believed that you sent me . . . I am glorified in them" (17:8, 10; cf. 1:14; 5:23)</p>	<p>". . . I have given to them" (17:22)</p> <p>Glory as the children of God, full of grace and truth</p>
". . . so I have sent them into the world" (17:18b).			
Glory given to disciples	Glory manifest in acts of Christlike love	Ascription of glory to Jesus by others	Reception of glory by others
<p>". . . I have given to them" (17:22)</p> <p>Glory as the children of God, full of grace and truth</p>	<p>"If anyone serves me, he must follow me. . ." (12:26)</p> <p>". . . just as I have loved you, you also are to love one another." (13:34; cf. 14:12; 15:8; 21:19)</p> <p>"that they may all be one . . ." (17:21)</p>	<p>"By this all people will know that you are my disciples. . ." (13:35)</p> <p>". . . that the world may know that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me." (17:23)</p>	<p>More come to believe and are included among the disciples.</p>

The table is broken into two major parts, the mission of Jesus is on the top half and the mission of the disciples is shown on the bottom half. We will walk through the top half first, column by column. First, Jesus possesses glory, and as defined by 1:14, it is glory as of the only begotten, full of grace and truth, encompassing both aspects of status and appearance. Second, Jesus's signs reveal his glory (2:11; 11:4, 40), but it is his climactic sign that is called glorification, which the disciples are to imitate, so that is the one sign I chose to include on the table. Jesus's climactic sign of glory reveals the love of God. Third, the disciples have seen this glory and in response believed that Jesus was sent from the Father (17:6–8). In other words, they perceived Jesus's glory in his signs, have rightly recognized who Jesus is as the only begotten, have confessed it (cf. 1:14), and ascribed to Jesus the glory due his name (cf. 5:23); thus they have glorified Jesus (17:10). Fourth, Jesus, in turn, has granted them the glory of being children of God, resplendent with God's own character. He then sends them out, as he was sent by the Father (17:18).

We now turn to the second part of the table, the bottom half. First, the disciples are granted the glory of Jesus (17:22). Second, they are called to glorify God as well by following in Jesus's way of glorification, thus they reveal God and honor God by obeying Jesus's commandments, chief of which is to love one another (12:23–26; 13:31–35; 14:12; 15:8; 21:19). As they do this their unity grows (17:21). Third, their love for one another and apparent unity reveals God to the world such that some in the world come to believe that the Father sent Jesus, and even know that the Father loves the disciples just as he has loved Jesus (13:35; 17:21, 23).<sup>4</sup> Fourth, as more come to believe, more are added to the number of the disciples who are also given the glory of Jesus. Thus the granting of glory from the Father to Jesus, and Jesus to the disciples, which enable the

---

<sup>4</sup> The disciples' possession of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  will lead to a manifestation God's love, in that their actions will demonstrate *them* to be greatly loved by Jesus, and thus their  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  is one that demonstrates Jesus'  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ . For when the disciples love one another, it is not evidence that they in themselves are greatly loving, but it is evidence that Jesus greatly loves them.

disciples to carry out their mission, contributes to how God will fill the earth with image-bearing creatures who bear his glory (Hab 2:14; Isa 11:9; Ps 72:19; Isa 27:6).

### Areas for Further Study

Glory and glorification merit further study in the Gospel of John. Perhaps the reason why no other full length study has been published in English is due to how pervasive glory and glorification is through the entire Gospel. If the entire ministry of Jesus is of revealing the Father's name (17:6), and Jesus's glory is introduced as a revelation of the Father (1:14–18), then arguably one must tackle every issue in the Gospel to comprehensively cover what glory and glorification encompass. I will simply point out a few areas of further study.

In my study I barely touched on glory as it relates to the temple and Jesus's fulfillment of the temple in his death and resurrection (2:18–21). Neither did I explore any further what the possession of glory by believers may entail for this theme.<sup>5</sup>

My study did not interact substantially with Andrew Byers' recent work *Ecclesiology and Theosis in the Gospel of John*, where he argues that the term "one" in John is a theological expression of Jewish Christian social identity. More specifically, Byers interprets one-ness in connection with the Shema (Deut 6:4) and holds that Jesus's prayer for oneness in John 17 is a prayer for theosis.<sup>6</sup> He touches on John 17:22, and asserts that the glory of divinity "is bestowed on the deified believers who are one with the one God of Israel."<sup>7</sup> He does not explain how this glory given *enables* or relates to the

---

<sup>5</sup> While Kerr considers the granting of glory in John 17:22 in his study, both Coloe and Hoskins do not. Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 363–65; Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001); Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006).

<sup>6</sup> He draws from the patristic idea of theosis, but seeks to establish a Johannine understanding of theosis, see his part III of his work, Andrew J. Byers, *Ecclesiology and Theosis in the Gospel of John*, SNTS Monograph Series 166 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 153–235.

<sup>7</sup> Byers, *Ecclesiology and Theosis in the Gospel of John*, 198.



conception of oneness that he argues for. His substantial arguments for John as a “deification narrative” and for John 17 as a “deification text” merit a level of engagement that I did not have opportunity to provide.

In chapter 2, I presented an exegetically based argument, primarily from John 1:14–18, and also my wider exploration in Exodus, that John claims in Jesus a new defining point of revelation for who God is in contrast to Exodus 33–34 and the revelation of God to Moses. Although I did some work in attempting to show that Exodus 33–34 was indeed a defining point of reference for Jews, I did this mainly by recourse to later allusions to Exodus 33–34 in the OT, heavily leaning on Barclay for references in Second Temple Literature. More work can be done to confirm whether Jews in the Second Temple period actively alluded to Exodus 33–34 as a primary defining text for identifying God.<sup>8</sup>

If it is true that Jesus’s public ministry ought to be understood entirely as a ministry of glory and revealing the Father’s name, then any pericope within chs. 1–12 can be further studied to examine its portrayal of Jesus and how it may contribute to the revelation of God’s glory in him, and how it relates as well to the fulfillment of OT pattern and prophecy. In my survey of glory, I only covered the first and last signs of Jesus. It would be helpful to examine the other signs with an eye to how they may also show forth the glory of Jesus as defined in John 1:14, and the glory of the kingdom of God in 3:3.

---

<sup>8</sup> I think the OT references I provide establish a strong case for the influence of Exodus 34:6–7 as a reference point for who God is, but I did not get the opportunity to explore further to confirm this in STL beyond my examination provided in chapter 2. If there is more evidence for it, that would strengthen my case that Exodus 33–34 is indeed primarily in mind for John in John 1:14–18. It is also possible that 1:16–18 refers to the Torah as a whole but Exodus 33–34 would still hold prominence.

### Contribution of Current Study

I will outline the possible contribution of my study on two fronts. First, in the area of academia and Johannine studies, and second in terms of my wider ecclesial context, the evangelical protestant church in North America.

The contribution of the current study to Johannine studies is primarily in my focused exegesis on 17:21–23, extended exposition on δόξα in John 17:22, and a proposal for how δόξα fits into the conceptual structure of John 17:20–23. Aside from Chibici-Revneanu’s monograph on glory and glorification (2007), and Thüsing’s work on glorification and exaltation (1960, updated in 1970), very few works give any attention to δόξα in 17:22. Even in the commentaries that give a little more space to discussing glory in John 17:22, or in specific studies on unity in John 17:20–23, little to no explanation is given as to how the granting of glory relates to unity and witness. In that regard, my study already stands apart as unique by giving δόξα in 17:22 focused attention. My particular proposal for δόξα’s meaning in 17:22 and its possible allusion to Isaiah 60:1–3 is the first that I have seen. Additionally, my overall study on glory and glorification in preparation for John 17:22 is surprisingly unique in light of Bauckham’s comment that glory is “rarely given extended exposition.”<sup>9</sup>

The work that I performed in preparation leading up to chapter six also contains considerable interaction with scholarship, whether arguing against certain views or proposing new ones. I recount some here: (1) I renewed the argument for μονογενής as meaning “only begotten,” going against the tide of current scholarship that interprets it as “only” or “unique.” (2) In taking seriously the force of the preposition ἅντι in John 1:16 and noting how 1:14–18 functions as a unit to compare one revelation to another, I made an exegetical argument for why the revelation of God in Jesus alludes to and also

---

<sup>9</sup> Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 43. There is still no full-length study in English on glory or glorification that has been published.

fulfills/transcends the revelation of God to Moses at Mt. Sinai. (3) My argument that John's allusion to Exodus 33–34 may demonstrate his intention to prepare the reader to anticipate new acts of God that would demonstrate his forgiving character in the following narrative of John is a new proposal as well. (4) I tried to provide a full and coherent account of the glory of Jesus and his hour of glorification, relating the two concepts under the unifying thread of revealing the Father. (5) I made an attempt to overturn Köstenberger's criteria for excluding the death and resurrection of Jesus as a "sign" in the Gospel and sought to demonstrate more precisely how it was that Jesus's death and resurrection revealed the love of God. (6) I examined all the glorification passages that related to the disciples but also made the observation that other passages important for discipleship in John are juxtaposed with the glorification of Jesus (12:23–26; 13:31–38). Thus, I tried to provide a coherent account of discipleship as it relates to glorification, finding a common thread in many of the passages: that the disciples are to continue the glorification of God through their love for one another. (7) I explored how fruit in John 15 may allude to the fulfillment of Israel taking root and bearing fruit in Isaiah 27:2–6, adding to the work of Kirsten Neilsen who also noted this connection. (8) At several points throughout my chapters I engaged critically but appreciatively with several of Chibici-Revneanu's views on glory and glorification. As it relates to glory and glorification in John, her work is unrivaled thus far in its detail and breadth. I disagreed with her at various points, but she makes a concerted effort to provide a coherent account of glory and glorification. I hope my interactions with her work are helpful for others. Several more arguments I made along the way towards John 17:22 could be noted, but these will have to suffice, and whether they will make any real contribution to Johannine studies will have to be determined by others.

Finally, we turn to how my study contributes to my ecclesial context, the evangelical church in North America. Like a good sermon, I will outline three points. I

think that my study, at the very least, should shape our view of God, our view of church unity, and our view of ourselves.

Our view of God. John asserts that the only way to know God is through Jesus his Son. He bears witness that the fullest revelation of God is found in Jesus and in his glorification on the cross. As Jesus's disciples, our mission is to glorify God by pointing continually back to the cross of Jesus, whether in bearing verbal witness or through our acts of love. If we focus on the cross of Jesus, and imitate Paul's settled desire to "know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor 2:2), we find that God is more gracious, compassionate, and forgiving than ever has been revealed before (fulfilling and surpassing Exod 34:6–7). The more we know this God through what he has done through his Son, the more we will center our lives upon him, honor him, and reflect him in our words and actions. Sin will be taken seriously, and grace to forgive even more so. The ministries of the word, from preaching to individual discipleship, must ultimately center on God through Jesus Christ. We must understand his word in relation to the sending of the Word. Preaching must be Christ-centered if we endeavor to be God-centered. Individually, one is tempted often to define God by his or her circumstances. If your child is dying, it may seem cruel of God or uncaring. But we are reminded through John that God is defined by what he has already done with his Son on the cross. It is the glory of Jesus that shows forth the Father, not the circumstances of my life. And that is a freeing and comforting reality. Jesus has shown us who God is, and he is love. We need not grope about by interpreting God through our circumstances.

Our view of church unity. The granting of glory to enable believers' unity informs our understanding of church unity and how it can be attained. First, it must be through the work of Jesus, and cannot be manufactured by clever programs or centered on a charismatic leader. Second, unity can only be had amongst regenerate membership. Unity comes through those who have believed in Jesus and have become the children of God not in name only, but also in nature. They share with one another not only a

commitment to follow Jesus, but the Spirit has given them rebirth such that they are given the radiance of God's character. When the church body consists of regenerate members, then even if immature at first, the buds of brotherly and sisterly love inevitably sprout because they have been greatly loved by Jesus through his glorification on the cross, and will eventually blossom, because they will abide in him and he in them. This is the kind of unity which beckons the watching world to believe that Jesus was sent by the Father.

Our view of ourselves. Our social-media saturated world can be understood as an expression of our need to be "seen" and recognized by others. We easily derive our identity from our social identity, the status which others confer upon us and how our peers may perceive us. John warns us that we ought to seek glory from the only God, not from one another (5:44; 12:43). We must be aware that an orientation towards horizontal status renders us like the Jews who failed to see Jesus's glory. In a culture becoming more antagonistic towards Christian values, it is easy to feel the need to conform to societal norms rather than to confess Jesus Christ. John 17:22 reminds us that Jesus himself grants us glory, and that our identity as Christians is found in Jesus, not in our standing amongst our communities. This strengthens us not only individually, but as a church collectively. Our identity is collectively given, we are children of God. We are beloved by the Father, kept in his name, sanctified in his truth. We belong to the family of God, and this is tremendously encouraging and strengthening amidst possible opposition and hatred from the world. Our Lord's glory is a crucified glory, one that was shameful in the world's eyes but wonderful in the sight of those who have eyes of faith. If we share in that kind of glory then we have simultaneously the blessings of being part of his family yet should also expect the opposition of the world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Edwin. *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three*. London: A. and C. Black, 1905.
- Akagi, Kai. "The Light from Galilee: The Narrative Function of Isaiah 8:23–9:6 in John 8:12." *Novum Testamentum* 58, no. 4 (2016): 380–93.
- Appold, Mark L. *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1976.
- Argyle, A. W. "Philo and the Fourth Gospel." *The Expository Times* 63, no. 12 (September 1952): 385–86.
- Ashton, John. *The Gospel of John and Christian Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Aubrey, Rachel. "Motivated Categories, Middle Voice, and Passive Morphology." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Christopher J. Fresch and Steven E. Runge, 563–625. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Augustine of Hippo. "Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to St. John." In *St. Augustin: Homilies on the Gospel of John, Homilies on the First Epistle of John, Soliloquies*, edited by Philip Schaff, translated by John Gibb and James Enns, vol. 7. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, First Series. New York: Christian Literature, 1888.
- Ball, David Mark. "I Am" in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 124. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Barclay, J. M. G. "'I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy': The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism." *Early Christianity* 1, no. 1 (2010): 82–106.
- Barnes, Timothy D. *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History*. Tria Corda 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Prologue of St. John's Gospel*. London: Athlone Press, 1971.

- Barton, Stephen C. "Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives in New Testament Study." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, edited by Joel B. Green, 34–64. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Bauckham, Richard. "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" In *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham, 9–48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "God Crucified." In *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*, 1–59. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 93–112. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jewish Messianism According to the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 207–38. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 239–52. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 33–72. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 153 Fish and the Unity of the Fourth Gospel." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 271–84. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, 43–69. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Beale, G. K. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Belle, Gilbert van. *Johannine Bibliography 1966–1985: A Cumulative Bibliography on the Fourth Gospel*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 82. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1988.

- Bennema, Cornelis. *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Giving of the Spirit in John 19–20: Another Round." In *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology: Essays in Honor of Max Turner*, edited by I. Howard Marshall, Volker Rabens, and Cornelis Bennema, 86–104. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Giving of the Spirit in John's Gospel - A New Proposal?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 74, no. 3 (2002): 195–213.
- Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Edited by A. H. McNeile. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary 29. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Bernier, Jonathan. *Aposynagōgos and the Historical Jesus in John: Rethinking the Historicity of the Johannine Expulsion Passages*. Biblical Interpretation Series 122. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Berry, Donald L. *Glory in Romans and the Unified Purpose of God in Redemptive History*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016.
- Beutler, Johannes. "Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12:20f)." *Biblica* 71, no. 3 (1990): 333–47.
- Bieringer, Reimund. "The Spirit's Guidance into All the Truth: The Text-Critical Problems of John 16,13." In *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, edited by A. Denaux, 183–207. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 161. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Black, David Alan. "On the Style and Significance of John 17." *Criswell Theological Review* 3, no. 1 (1988): 141–59.
- Blackburn, W. Ross. *The God Who Makes Himself Known: The Missionary Heart of the Book of Exodus*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 28. Downers Grove, IL: Apollos, 2012.
- Blaine, Bradford B., Jr. *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple*. Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 27. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Blomberg, Craig L. "John and Jesus." In *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne, 209–28. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Boda, Mark J. *The Heartbeat of Old Testament Theology: Three Creedal Expressions*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017.
- Boer, Harry R. "The Glory of Christ and the Unity of the Church." *The Ecumenical Review* 12, no. 1 (October 1959): 11–22.



- Boer, Martinus C. de. "Expulsion from the Synagogue: J. L. Martyn's History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel Revisited." *New Testament Studies* 66 (2020): 367–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 17. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Boismard, M. E. *St. John's Prologue*. Translated by Carisbrooke Dominicans. London: Blackfriars, 1957.
- Borgen, Peder. "Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue of John." *New Testament Studies* 16, no. 3 (April 1970): 288–95.
- Bosman, J. P. "The Paradoxical Presence of Exodus 34:6–7 in the Book of the Twelve." *Scriptura* 87 (2004): 233–43.
- Boyarín, Daniel. "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John." *Harvard Theological Review* 94, no. 3 (July 2001): 243–84.
- Boyle, John L. "The Last Discourse (Jn 13,31–16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on Their Unity and Development." *Biblica* 56, no. 2 (1975): 210–22.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A. *John*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Brendsel, Daniel J. "Isaiah Saw His Glory": *The Use of Isaiah 52–53 in John 12*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 208. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. "'Charis' and 'Eleos' in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *The Letter to the Romans*, edited by Udo Schnelle, 247–77. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 226. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Brockington, L. H. "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of ΔΟΞΑ." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, edited by D. E. Nineham, 1–8. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Appendix III: Signs and Works." In *The Gospel According to John*, 1:525–32. Anchor Bible Commentary 29–29A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Commentary 29–29A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "The Crisis and Promise of Presence in Israel." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 1, no. 1 (1979): 47–86.
- Bruner, Frederick D. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

- Brunson, Andrew C. *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament II 158. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Büchsel, F. “Μοϋσενής.” In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols., 4:737-41. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Bulman, James M. “The Only Begotten Son.” *Calvin Theological Journal* 16, no. 1 (April 1981): 56–79.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- . “The History of Religions Background of the Prologue to the Gospel of John.” In *The Interpretation of John*, edited and translated by John Ashton, 27–46. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Scribner, 1951.
- Burchard, Christoph, Carsten Burfeind, and Uta Barbara Fink, eds. *Joseph und Aseneth. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece* 5. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Byers, Andrew J. *Ecclesiology and Theosis in the Gospel of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 166. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Bynum, William R. *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 144. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Caird, George B. “Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics.” *New Testament Studies* 15, no. 3 (April 1969): 265–77.
- . “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint, I.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19, no. 2 (1968): 453–75.
- Campbell, Constantine R. *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.
- Caneday, Ardel B. “Glory Veiled in the Tabernacle of Flesh: Exodus 33-34 in the Gospel of John.” *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 20, no. 1 (2016): 55–72.
- Carson, D. A. “Adumbrations of Atonement Theology in the Fourth Gospel.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57, no. 3 (September 2014): 513–22.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exegetical Fallacies*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus: An Exposition of John 14-17*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, no. 4 (1979): 547-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel: After Dodd, What?" In *Gospel Perspectives: A Study of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, edited by David Wenham and R. T. France, 2:83-145. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is Faith in Christ Without Evidence Superior Faith? A Re-Examination of John 20:29." In *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology: Essays in Honor of Max Turner*, edited by I. Howard Marshall, Volker Rabens, and Cornelis Bennema, 105-18. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 4 (December 1987): 639-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30-31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no. 4 (2005): 693-714.
- Carter, Warren. "The Prologue and John's Gospel: Function, Symbol and the Definitive Word." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39 (June 1990): 35-58.
- Chance, John K. "The Anthropology of Honor and Shame: Culture, Values, and Practice." Edited by Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin. *Semeia* 68 (1995): 138-51.
- Chapman, David W. *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Chennattu, Rekha M. *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Chester, A. "High Christology -- Whence, Where and Why?" *Early Christianity* 2, no. 1 (2011): 22-50.
- Chibici-Revneanu, Nicole. *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: das Verständnis der [doxa] im Johannesevangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 231. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gottes Herrlichkeit. Impulse aus dem Johannesevangelium." *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 50, no. 1 (2008): 75-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. and Johannine Δόξα-Language." In *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, edited by Gilbert Van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, 511-22. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 223. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

- Collins, C. John. “כנבד.” In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols., edited by W. A. VanGemeren, 2:581–87. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Collins, M. S. “The Question of Doxa: A Socioliterary Reading of the Wedding at Cana.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 25, no. 3 (1995): 100–109.
- Coloe, M. “The Structure of the Johannine Prologue and Genesis 1.” *Australian Biblical Review* 45 (1997): 40–55.
- Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Comfort, Philip Wesley. *A Commentary on the Manuscripts and Text of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2015.
- Conrad, Carl W. “New Observations on Voice in the Ancient Greek Verb.” Unpublished paper, 2002.  
<https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/cwconrad/newobsancgrkvc.pdf>.
- Cook, John Granger. *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*. WISSENSCHAFTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT 327. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- . “John 19:17 and the Man on the Patibulum in the Arieti Tomb.” *Early Christianity* 4, no. 4 (2013): 427–53.
- Cook, W. Robert. “The ‘Glory’ Motif in the Johannine Corpus.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27, no. 3 (September 1984): 291–97.
- Cotterell, Peter, and Max Turner. *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989.
- Coutts, Joshua J. F. *The Divine Name in the Gospel of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 447. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Coxon, Paul S. *Exploring the New Exodus in John: A Biblical Theological Investigation of John Chapters 5–10*. Eugene, OR: Resource, 2015.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. “Exodus in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, 305–21. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 164. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Crowe, Brandon D. “The Chiastic Structure of Seven Signs in the Gospel of John: Revisiting a Neglected Proposal.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28, no. 1 (2018): 65–81.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- . “The Pivot of John’s Prologue.” *New Testament Studies* 27, no. 1 (October 1980): 1–31.

- Culy, Martin M. *Echoes of Friendship in the Gospel of John*. New Testament Monographs 30. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.
- Dahms, John V. "The Johannine Use of Monogenēs Reconsidered." *New Testament Studies* 29, no. 2 (April 1983): 222–32.
- Davis, Dale Ralph. "Rebellion, Presence, and Covenant: A Study in Exodus 32–34." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 44, no. 1 (1982): 71–87.
- Day, Adam. "Lifted up and Glorified: Isaiah's Servant Language in the Gospel of John." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016.
- Decker, Rodney A. *Reading Koine Greek: An Introduction and Integrated Workbook*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Dempster, Stephen G. "From Slight Peg to Cornerstone to Capstone: The Resurrection of Christ on 'the Third Day' According to the Scriptures." *Westminster Theological Journal* 76 (2014): 371–409.
- Dennis, John A. *Jesus's Death and the Gathering of True Israel: The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology in the Light of John 11:47–52*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 217. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus's Death in John's Gospel: A Survey of Research from Bultmann to the Present with Special Reference to the Johannine Hyper-Texts." *Currents in Biblical Research* 4, no. 3 (June 2006): 331–63.
- Dentan, Robert C. "Literary Affinities of Exodus 34:6f." *Vetus Testamentum* 13, no. 1 (January 1963): 34–51.
- DeSilva, David A. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SBL Dissertation Series 152. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Embodying the Word: Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament." In *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne, 118–29. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Diehl, Judith A. "The Puzzle of the Prayer: A Study of John 17." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2007.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship." In *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, edited by F. L. Cross, 9–22. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1957.

- Dozeman, Thomas B. "Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh's Gracious and Compassionate Character." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 2 (1989): 207–23.
- Dumbrell, William J. "Grace and Truth: The Progress of the Argument of the Prologue of John's Gospel." In *Doing Theology for the People of God: Studies in Honor of J. I. Packer*, edited by Donald M. Lewis and Alister E. McGrath, 105–21. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1989.
- Durham, John I. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Edwards, Ruth B. *Discovering John: Content, Interpretation, Reception*. Discovering Biblical Texts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- . "XAPIN ANTI XAPITOS (John 1:16): Grace and the Law in the Johannine Prologue." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 3–15.
- Elliott, John Hall. *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism? Guides to Biblical Scholarship, New Testament Series*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Ellis, Wesley G. "An Investigation into the Meaning of ΔΟΞΑ in the Fourth Gospel." PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1968.
- Emadi, Samuel. "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading." *Currents in Biblical Research* 14, no. 1 (October 2015): 8–23.
- Ensor, Peter W. "The Glorification of the Son of Man: An Analysis of John 13:31–32." *Tyndale Bulletin* 58, no. 2 (2007): 229–52.
- . *Jesus and His "Works": The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 85. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, 128–46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Esler, Philip F. *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- . "Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, 221–36. Scholars Press Homage Series 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Prologue of John and the Trimorphic Protennoia." *New Testament Studies* 27, no. 3 (April 1981): 395–401.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 89. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Fee, Gordon D. "On the Text and Meaning of John 20,30–31." In *The Four Gospels, 1992: festschrift Frans Neirynck*, edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, Gilbert Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, 3:2193–2205. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Once More – John 7:37–39." *The Expository Times* 89, no. 4 (January 1978): 116–18.
- Ferreira, Johan. *Johannine Ecclesiology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 160. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Flesher, Paul V. M., and Bruce Chilton. *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*. Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 12. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011.
- Forestell, J. Terence. *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*. Analecta Biblica 57. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.
- Foster, George M. "Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good." *American Anthropologist* 67, no. 2 (1965): 293–315.
- Freed, Edwin D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 11. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative; A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Fresch, Christopher J. "Typology, Polysemy, and Prototypes: Situating Nonpast Aorist Indicatives." In *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch, 379–415. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Frey, Jörg. "'... daß sie meine Herrlichkeit Schauen' (Joh 17,24). Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der Δόξα Jesu." *New Testament Studies* 54, no. 3 (July 2008): 375–97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'... daß sie meine Herrlichkeit Schauen' (Joh 17,24). Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der Δόξα Jesu." In *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten*, 639–62. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 307. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Between Torah and Stoa: How Could Readers Have Understood the Johannine Logos?" In *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts: Papers Read at the Colloquium Ioanneum 2013*, edited by J. G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle, 188–234. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 359. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John." In *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 171–97. Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die 'Theologia Crucifixi' des Johannesevangeliums." In *Kreuzestheologie im Neuen Testament*, edited by Andreas Dettwiler and Jean Zumstein, 169–238. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 151. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "God in the Gospel of John." In *The Glory of the Crucified One*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 313–44. Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Glory of the Crucified One." In *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 237–58. Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint." In *The Reception of Septuagint words in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Literature*, edited by Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten, 85–104. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 367. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Furlong, Dean. *The Identity of John the Evangelist: Revision and Reinterpretation in Early Christian Sources*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2020.
- Gaffney, James. "Believing and Knowing in the Fourth Gospel." *Theological Studies* 26, no. 2 (June 1965): 215–41.
- Garrett, Duane A. *A Commentary on Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2014.
- Garvie, Alfred E. "The Glory in the Fourth Gospel." *Expositor* Eighth Series 17 (1919): 36–47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and the Evangelist's Theological Reflexions." *The Expositor* Eighth Series 10 (1915): 163–72.
- Gathercole, Simon J. "The Alleged Anonymity of the Canonical Gospels." *Journal of Theological Studies* 69, no. 2 (October 2018): 447–76.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "The Archive of Excess: John 21 and the Problem of Narrative Closure." In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, 240–52. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Gentry, Peter J. "'The Glory of God': The Character of God's Being and Way in the World: Some Reflections on a Key Biblical Theology Theme." *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 20, no. 1 (2016): 149–61.
- Gentry, Peter J., and Stephen J. Wellum. *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012.



- Geyser, A. "The Semeion at Cana of the Galilee." In *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr. J. N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 12–21. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 24. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Giblin, C. H. "Two Complementary Literary Structures in John 1:1-18." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104, no. 1 (1985): 87–103.
- Glasson, T. F. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1963.
- Godet, Frédéric Louis. *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated by Timothy Dwight. 2 vols. Classic Commentary Library. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1955.
- Grant, Frederick C. "'Only-Begotten': A Footnote to the New Revision." *Anglican Theological Review* 36, no. 4 (October 1954): 284–87.
- Greene, Joseph R. "Integrating Interpretations of John 7:37-39 into the Temple Theme: The Spirit as Efflux from the New Temple." *Neotestamentica* 47, no. 2 (2013): 333–53.
- Grigsby, Bruce H. "'If Any Man Thirsts': Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7:37-39." *Biblica* 67, no. 1 (1986): 101–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5, no. 15 (1982): 51–80.
- Gupta, Nijay. "A Man of No Reputation: Jesus and Ascribed Honor in the Gospel of John." *Ashland Theological Journal* 40 (2008): 43–59.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Hamilton, James M. *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*. NAC Studies in Bible & Theology. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. In *ESV Expository Commentary*, vol. 9, *John–Acts*, edited by Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton, and Jay Sklar. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What Is Biblical Theology?: A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014.
- Hanson, A. T. "John 1:14–18 and Exodus 34." *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 1 (October 1976): 90–101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

- Harris, Elizabeth. *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 107. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Harris, Murray J. *John*. Exegetical Greek Guide to the Greek New Testament. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament: An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.
- Harrison, Everett F. "A Study of John 1:14." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd*, edited by Robert A. Guelich, 23–36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Harstine, Stan. *A History of the Two-Hundred-Year Scholarly Debate about the Purpose of the Prologue to the Gospel of John: How Does Our Understanding of the Prologue Affect Our Interpretation of the Subsequent Text?* Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2015.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Johannine Question*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989.
- Hera, Marianus Pale. *Christology and Discipleship in John 17*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hodges, Zane. "Rivers of Living Water: John 7:37–39." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136, no. 543 (September 1979): 239–48.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret." *New Testament Studies* 21, no. 1 (October 1974): 40–58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John the Baptist and the Johannine Prologue." *New Testament Studies* 16, no. 4 (July 1970): 354–58.
- Hoskins, Paul M. "Freedom from Slavery to Sin and the Devil: John 8:31–47 and the Passover Theme of the Gospel of John." *Trinity Journal* 31, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 47–63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement, and Francis Noel Davey. *The Fourth Gospel*. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.

- House, Paul R. "God's Character and the Wholeness of Scripture." *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 4–17.
- Howard, Wilbert Francis. *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. Edited by C. K Barrett. 4th ed. rev. London: Epworth Press, 1955.
- Hudgins, Thomas W. "An Application of Discourse Analysis Methodology in the Exegesis of John 17." *Eleutheria* 2, no. 1 (2013): 24–57.
- Humble, Susan Elizabeth. *A Divine Round Trip: The Literary and Christological Function of the Descent/Ascent Leitmotif in the Gospel of John*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 79. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- Humphrey, Edith M. *Joseph and Aseneth*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Fashions, Fallacies and Future Prospects in New Testament Studies." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36, no. 4 (June 2014): 299–324.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Approaches to Jesus-Devotion in Earliest Christianity." In *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*, 13–30. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Manuscripts and the Sociology of Early Christian Reading." In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 49–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Oral Fixation and New Testament Studies? 'Orality,' 'Performance' and Reading Texts in Early Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 60, no. 3 (2014): 321–40.
- Irons, Charles Lee. "A Lexical Defense of Johannine 'Only Begotten.'" In *Retrieving Eternal Generation*, edited by Fred Sanders and Scott R. Swain, 98–116. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Righteousness of God: A Lexical Examination of the Covenant-Faithfulness Interpretation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 386. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. "The Scope of Jesus's High Priest Prayer in John 17." *Encounter* 67, no. 1 (2006): 1–26.
- Johnson, Benjamin J. M. "'Whoever Gives Me Thorns and Thistles': Rhetorical Ambiguity and the Use of מִי יִתֶּן in Isaiah 27.2–6." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 36, no. 1 (2011): 105–26.
- Jones, Larry Paul. *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 145. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

- Jonge, M. de. "Signs and Works in the Fourth Gospel." In *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, edited by Tjitze Baarda, Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, and W. C. van Unnik, vol. 2. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 48. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*. Translated by Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Kellum, L. Scott. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 256. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- Kelly, Joseph R. "Joel, Jonah, and the YHWH Creed: Determining the Trajectory of the Literary Influence." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132, no. 4 (2013): 805–26.
- Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus's Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 220. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Kittel, G. "Δόξα." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols., 2:233–54. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Klink, Edward W. *John*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 4. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
- . *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Klink, Edward W., and Darian R. Lockett. *Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.
- Knapp, Henry M. "The Messianic Water Which Gives Life to the World." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 19, no. 2 (December 1997): 109–21.
- Knibb, Michael A. "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." *Heythrop Journal* 17, no. 3 (1976): 253–72.
- Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 22. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.
- . "Jesus's Resurrection, the Signs, and the Dynamics of Faith in the Gospel of John." In *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, edited by Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer, 47–74. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- Köstenberger, Andreas J. "The Glory of God in John's Gospel and Revelation." In *The Glory of God*, edited by Christopher W. Morgan and Robert A. Peterson, 107–26. Theology in Community. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12, no. 1 (2002): 67–96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 415–512. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Kressel, Gideon M. "An Anthropologist's Response to the Use of Social Science Models in Biblical Studies." Edited by Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin. *Semeia* 68 (1995): 152–61.
- Kruger, P. "אִיִּשׁ." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols., edited by W. A. VanGemeren, 1:331–33. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Kruijf, T. C. de. "The Glory of the Only Son (John I 14)." In *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr. J. N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 111–23. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 24. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Kuyper, Lester J. "Grace and Truth: An Old Testament Description of God, and Its Use in the Johannine Gospel." *Interpretation* 18, no. 1 (January 1964): 3–19.
- Kysar, Robert D. "Background of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Critique of Historical Methods." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16, no. 3–4 (1970): 250–55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel of John in Current Research." *Religious Studies Review* 9, no. 4 (October 1983): 314–23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Whence and Whither of the Johannine Community." In *Life in Abundance: Studies of John's Gospel in Tribute to Raymond E. Brown, S.S.*, edited by John R. Donahue, 65–81. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005.

- Labahn, Michael. "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career." In *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*, edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. F. Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmerman, 151–67. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 314. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Lane, Nathan C. *The Compassionate, but Punishing God: A Canonical Analysis of Exodus 34:6-7*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010.
- Lange, Armin, and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Lightfoot, R. H. *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Lillas, Rosmari. "Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible: An Investigation of the Applications of the Term." PhD diss., University of Gothenburg, 2012.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. "God's Name, Jesus's Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel." In *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker, 155–80. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Ling, Timothy J. M. *The Judaeen Poor and the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Lloyd, R. B. "The Word 'Glory' in the Fourth Gospel." *The Expository Times* 43, no. 12 (August 1932): 546–48.
- Loader, William. *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
- Loader, William R. G. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues*. New York: Verlag P. Lang, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John 5,19-47: A Deviation from Envoy Christology." In *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology: Festschrift Gilbert van Belle*, edited by Joseph Verheyden, Geert van Oyen, Michael Labahn, and Reimund Bieringer, 149–64. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 265. Leuven; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Law in John." In *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the Society for New Testament Studies Johannine Writings Seminar*, edited by Gilbert Van Belle, P. Maritz, and J. G. van der Watt, 135–54. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Longenecker, Richard N. "The One and Only Son." In *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, 119–26. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.

- Louw, J. P. *Semantics of New Testament Greek*. Semeia Studies. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Louw, J. P., and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Macgregor, G. H. C. *The Gospel of John*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1928.
- Malan, Gert. “Does John 17:11b, 21-23 Refer to Church Unity?” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 67, no. 1 (2011): 1–10.
- Malatesta, Edward. *Interiority and Covenant*. Analecta Biblica 69. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- . “Literary Structure of John 17 (Two Folding Charts).” *Biblica* 52, no. 2 (1971): 190–214.
- . *St. John’s Gospel, 1920-1965: A Cumulative and Classified Bibliography of Books and Periodical Literature on the Fourth Gospel*. Analecta Biblica 32. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.
- Malina, Bruce J. “Rhetorical Criticism and Social-Scientific Criticism: Why Won’t Romanticism Leave Us Alone?” In *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric Clark Stewart. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008.
- . *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. 3rd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey. “Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World.” In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 25–65. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Manning, Gary T., Jr. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 270. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- Maronde, Christopher A. “Moses in the Gospel of John.” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 77 (2013): 23–44.
- Matzerath, Roger. *The Prayer of Christ for Unity: St. John 17:20-23*. Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1950.
- Maynard, Arthur H. “The Role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel.” *New Testament Studies* 30, no. 4 (October 1984): 531–48.
- McNamara, Martin. “Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Exod 12:42).” In *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays*, 439–43. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 279. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Meeks, Wayne A. "Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91, no. 1 (March 1972): 44–72.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, edited by Martinus C. de Boer, 292–320. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 84. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Merwe, Dirk G. van der. "The Character of Unity Expected among the Disciples of Jesus, According to John 17:20-23." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 13 (2002): 224–54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John 17: Jesus Assigns His Mission to His Disciples." *Skirf En Kerk* 19, no. 1 (1998): 115–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Interpretation of the Revelatory Events in John 17:24-26: An Exegetical Exercise." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 25, no. 1 (2004): 311–29.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Metzner, Rainer. *Das Verständnis der Sünde im Johannesevangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 122. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *The Gospel of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Miller, Ed L. "The Johannine Origins of the Johannine Logos." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112, no. 3 (September 1993): 445–57.
- Mirtow, Paula von. "The Glory of Christ in the Fourth Gospel." *Theology* 49, no. 317 (November 1946): 336–40, 359–65.
- Mlakuzhyil, George. *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987.
- Moberly, R. W. L. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How May We Speak of God? A Reconsideration of the Nature of Biblical Theology." *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2002): 177–202.
- Moloney, Francis J. "The Fulness of a Gift Which Is Truth." *Catholic Theological Review* 1 (1978): 30–33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Glory Not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1998.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina 4. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Love in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical, Theological, and Literary Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Moody, Dale. "God's Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72, no. 4 (December 1953): 213–19.
- Morgan, Richard L. "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations." *Interpretation* 11, no. 2 (April 1957): 155–65.
- Morris, Leon. "Additional Note G: Miracles." In *The Gospel According to John*, 607–13. Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to John*. Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Motyer, J. Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1993.
- Mounce, Robert. "John." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, 10:357–661. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007.
- Mowvley, Henry. "John 1:14-18 in the Light of Exodus 33:7-34:35." *The Expository Times* 95, no. 5 (February 1984): 135–37.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 69. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Neyrey, J. H. "The Trials (Forensic) and Tribulations (Honor Challenges) of Jesus: John 7 in Social Science Perspective." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 26, no. 3 (1996): 107–24.
- Neyrey, J. H., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. "'He Must Increase, I Must Decrease' (John 3:30): A Cultural and Social Interpretation." In *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey and Eric Clark Stewart. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "'Despising the Shame of the Cross': Honor and Shame in the Johannine Passion Narrative." Edited by Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin. *Semeia*, no. 68 (1994): 113–38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of John*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Nicholson, Godfrey C. *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*. SBL Dissertation Series 63. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Nicol, W. *The Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 32. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

- Nida, Eugene A., and J. P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. Resources for Biblical Study 25. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Nielsen, Jesper Tang. "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 3 (July 2010): 343–66.
- Nielsen, Kirsten. "Old Testament Imagery in John." In *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel Århus 1997*, edited by Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen, 66–82. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *There Is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah*. JSOTSup 65. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Nongbri, B. "The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel." *Harvard Theological Review* 98, no. 1 (2005): 23–48.
- Ogden, C. K., I. A. Richards, Bronislaw Malinowski, and F. G. Crookshank. *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1946.
- Olsson, Birger. *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42*. Translated by Jean Gray. ConBNT 6. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974.
- Orsini, Pasquale, and Willy Clarysse. "Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 88, no. 4 (December 2012): 443–74.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Righteousness in Isaiah: A Study of the Function of Chapters 56-66 in the Present Structure of the Book." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 1:177–91. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 70. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Painter, John. "The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b-32." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by Craig A. Evans and William R. Stegner, 429–58. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Pamment, Margaret. "The Meaning of Doxa in the Fourth Gospel." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 74, no. 1–2 (1983): 12–16.
- Pancaro, Severino. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity According to John*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 42. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 130. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

- Pendrick, Gerard. "Monogenes." *New Testament Studies* 41, no. 4 (1995): 587–600.
- Pennington, Jonathan T. *Reading the Gospels Wisely: A Narrative and Theological Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Setting Aside 'Deponency': Rediscovering the Greek Middle Voice in New Testament Studies." In *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Matthew B. O'Donnell, 181–203. New Testament Monographs 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.
- Perkins, Larry. "'Glory' in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations." In *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, 87–106. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 56. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.
- Peterson, Robert A. "Union with Christ in the Gospel of John." *Presbyterion* 39, no. 1 (2013): 9–29.
- Phillips, Peter M. *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading*. Library of New Testament Studies 294. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Piper, Ronald A. "Glory, Honor and Patronage in the Fourth Gospel: Understanding the Doxa Given to Disciples in John 17." In *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, edited by John J. Pilch, 281–309. Biblical Interpretation Series 53. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "Honour and Social Status." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, edited by John G. Peristiany, 19–77. The Nature of Human Society Series. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Polan, Gregory. "Still More Signs of Unity in the Book of Isaiah: The Significance of Third Isaiah." *SBL Seminar Papers* 36 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997): 224–33.
- Pollard, T. Evan. "That They All May Be One: John 17:21 and the Unity of the Church." *The Expository Times* 70, no. 5 (February 1959): 149–50.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the 'I Am' Sayings in John's Gospel." In *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice*, 120–148. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus, the Passover Theme, and John's Gospel." In *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice*, 198–224. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John's Gospel Prologue and Jesus." In *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice*, 89–119. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Public Proclamation of Jesus in John's Gospel." In *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice*, 37–62. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Andrew K. Gabriel. *Johannine Writings and Apocalyptic: An Annotated Bibliography*. Johannine Studies Series 1. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Poston, Christine Caballero. "The Motif of Glory in the Gospel of John." 2004.
- Potterie, Ignace de la. "The Truth in Saint John." In *The Interpretation of John*, edited and translated by John Ashton, 67–82. 2nd ed. Studies in New Testament Interpretation. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.
- Poythress, Vern S. "Kinds of Biblical Theology." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 70, no. 1 (2008): 129–42.
- Pryor, John W. "The Johannine Son of Man and the Descent-Ascent Motif." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34, no. 3 (September 1991): 341–51.
- Rainbow, Paul A. *Johannine Theology: The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014.
- Randall, John F. "The Theme of Unity in John 17:20-23." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 41, no. 3 (July 1965): 373–94.
- Reynolds, Benjamin E. *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 249. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Richter, Philip. "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: An Appraisal and Extended Example." In *Approaches to New Testament Study*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs, 266–309. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- . "Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John." *Novum Testamentum* 8, no. 2 (April 1966): 180–201.
- Riga, Peter J. "Signs of Glory: The Use of 'Sēmeion' in St John's Gospel." *Interpretation* 17, no. 4 (October 1963): 402–24.
- Robertson, Paul E. "Glory in the Fourth Gospel." *The Theological Educator* 38 (September 1988): 121–31.
- Ronning, John L. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Rosner, Brian S. "Biblical Theology." In *The New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, 3–11. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Salier, Willis Hedley. *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 186. Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Sandy, D. Brent. "John the Baptist's 'Lamb of God' Affirmation in Its Canonical and Apocalyptic Milieu." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34, no. 4 (December 1991): 447–59.

- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- Scholtissek, Klaus. "The Johannine Gospel in Recent Research." In *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne, 444–72. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Johannine Studies: A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions." *Currents in Research* 6 (1998): 227–59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Johannine Studies: A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions II." *Currents in Research* 9 (2001): 277–305.
- Schuchard, Bruce G. "Form versus Function: Citation Technique and Authorial Intention in the Gospel of John." In *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, edited by Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard, 23–46. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. SBL Dissertation Series 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Schwindt, Rainer. *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*. Herders Biblische Studien 50. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- Scobie, Charles H. H. *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Scouteris, Constantine. "People of God - Its Unity and Its Glory: Discussion of John 17:17-24 in Light of Patristic Thought." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 30, no. 4 (1985): 399–420.
- Segovia, Fernando F. *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. "Δόξα." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 2nd ed. 5 vols., 1:761–767. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Smith, D. Moody. *John*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999.
- Smolar, Leivy, and Moses Aberbach. "The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 39 (1968): 91–116.
- Snyder, Graydon F. "John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition." *Biblical Research* 16 (1971): 5–15.

- Sosa Soliezar, Carlos Raúl. *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John*. Library of New Testament Studies 546. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Savior of the World: A Theology of the Universal Gospel*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019.
- Staley, Jeffrey L. "The Structure of John's Prologue: Its Implications for the Gospel's Narrative Structure." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (April 1986): 241–64.
- Streett, Andrew. *The Vine and the Son of Man: Eschatological Interpretation of Psalm 80 in Early Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Suh, Joong Suk. *The Glory in the Gospel of John: Restoration of Forfeited Prestige*. Oxford, OH: M. P. Publications, 1995.
- Suomala, Karla R. *Moses and God in Dialogue: Exodus 32-34 in Postbiblical Literature*. New York: P. Lang, 2004.
- Tabb, Brian J. "Johannine Fulfillment of Scripture: Continuity and Escalation." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 21, no. 4 (2011): 495–505.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- Tam, Josaphat C. *Apprehension of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 399. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Taylor, Grant D. "The Fruitful Vineyard of God: Jesus and His Disciples at John 15:1-17." PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014.
- Thatcher, Tom, and Stephen D. Moore, eds. *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Resources for Biblical Study 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Theron, S. W. "INA OSIN EN. A Multifaceted Approach to an Important Thrust in the Prayer of Jesus in John 17." *Neotestamentica* 21, no. 1 (1987): 77–94.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 1 (1991): 89–108.
- Thüsing, Wilhelm. *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 21. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.
- Tolmie, D. F. "Discourse Analysis of John 17:1-26." *Neotestamentica* 27, no. 2 (1993): 403–18.

- Tops, Thomas. "The Orientation of the Teaching of the Paraclete in the Gospel of John: Retrospective or Prospective?" *New Testament Studies* 66, no. 1 (January 2020): 68–86.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, 183–94. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint." In *Translation of Scripture: Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute, May 15-16, 1989*. Jewish Quarterly Review Supplement 1990. Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1990.
- Tsutserov, Alexander. *Glory, Grace, and Truth: Ratification of the Sinaitic Covenant According to the Gospel of John*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2009.
- Turner, Max. "Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John--Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (April 1990): 99–122.
- Van Belle, Gilbert. "The Meaning of Sēmeia in John 20,30-31." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 74, no. 4 (1998): 300–325.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Peter as Martyr in the Fourth Gospel." In *Martyrdom and Persecution in Late Antique Christianity: Festschrift Boudewijn Dehandschutter*, edited by J. Leemans, 281–309. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 241. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 116. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994.
- Vargas, Niceta M. "Agapaō, Hypagō, and Doxazō: Juxtaposed, yet Tightly-Knit Themes in John 13,31-35." In *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology: Festschrift Gilbert van Belle*, edited by Joseph Verheyden, Geert van Oyen, Michael Labahn, and Reimund Bieringer, 371–95. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 265. Leuven; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014.
- Viviano, B. T. "The Structure of the Prologue of John (1:1-18): A Note." *Revue Biblique* 105, no. 2 (1998): 176–84.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Vol. 2. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Idea of Biblical Theology as a Science and as a Theological Discipline." In *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, edited by Richard B. Gaffin, 3–24. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Nature and Aims of Biblical Theology." *Kerux* 14, no. 1 (May 1999): 3–8.

- Vries, Pieter de. *The Kābôd of YHWH in the Old Testament: With Particular Reference to the Book of Ezekiel*. Translated by Alexander Thomson. *Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 65. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Watson, Francis. "Trinity and Community: A Reading of John 17." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 1, no. 2 (July 1999): 168–84.
- Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II* 88. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997.
- Weinrich, William C. *John 1:1-7:1*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2015.
- Wendland, Ernst R. "Rhetoric of the Word: An Interactional Discourse Analysis of the Lord's Prayer of John 17 and Its Communicative Implications." *Neotestamentica* 26, no. 1 (1992): 59–88.
- Wenham, Gordon J. "The Golden Calf in the Psalms." In *God of Faithfulness: Essays in Honour of J. Gordon McConville on His 60th Birthday*, edited by Jamie Grant, Alison Lo, and Gordon J. Wenham, 169–81. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Westcott, Brooke F. *The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. Edited by Arthur Westcott. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Whitacre, Rodney A. *John*. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
- Wiarda, Timothy. "John 21.1-23: Narrative Unity and Its Implications." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 14, no. 46 (April 1992): 53–71.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1-12*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Isaiah 13-27*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Williams, Catrin H. *I Am He: The Interpretation of 'Ani Hu' in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II* 113. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 136, no. 11 (November 2011): 1151–53.



- \_\_\_\_\_. “(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and Body of John’s Gospel.” In *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts: Papers Read at the Colloquium Ioanneum 2013*, edited by J. G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle, 79–98. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 359. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology.” In *“As Those Who Are Taught”: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, 107–24. Symposium Series 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Williams, Peter J. “Not the Prologue of John.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33, no. 4 (June 2011): 375–86.
- Witherington, Ben. *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Woll, D. Bruce. “The Departure of ‘the Way’: The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 2 (June 1980): 225–39.
- Wong, Corinne Hong Sling. “The Δόξα of Christ and His Followers in the Fourth Gospel: An Inquiry into the Meaning and Background of Δόξα in John 17.22.” PhD diss., University of Pretoria, 2005.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Yoon, David I. “The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and Its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 12, no. 1 (October 1, 2013): 58–76.
- Young, Franklin W. “Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 46 (1955): 215–33.
- Zhakevich, Mark. “The Compensatory Benefits of Discipleship in the Gospel of John.” PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2017.
- Zumstein, Jean. “Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John.” In *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, edited by Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, translated by Mike Gray, 128–35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

## ABSTRACT

### GLORY AND GLORIFICATION IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN: THE GRANTING OF ΔΟΞΑ TO BELIEVERS IN JOHN 17:22

Johnson Pang, PhD  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2022  
Chair: Dr. James M. Hamilton, Jr.

The glory given by Jesus to the disciples in John 17:22 has received little attention in Johannine scholarship. Often interpreters gloss over glory in 17:22 and direct their attention to Jesus's prayer for unity. Others may acknowledge that glory is given as a provision for this unity but neither take the time to define glory nor to explain how its granting enables unity. This study provides an exegetical analysis of John 17:20–23 in an attempt to define glory and explain how its granting enables unity and witness. I argue that glory in John 17:22 is both the radiance of God's character and the status of being children of God. I also undertake a study on glory and glorification in John and aim to interpret glory in John 17:22 in light of John's entire gospel. Surprisingly, there is still no full length study on glory or glorification in John published in English. I devote several chapters to analysis of glory language in John and propose that John frames the entire ministry of Jesus as one of revealing the glory of Yahweh. Jesus's public ministry (John 1–12) is a revelation of Yahweh's glory in his signs. Jesus's death, and resurrection is the climactic sign, revealing Yahweh's glory in an ultimate act of love. In the hour of glorification, Jesus glorifies the Father, that is, he reveals the Father and honors the Father. The granting of glory by Jesus to his disciples enables Jesus to continue the glorification of the Father through them. Sent out by Jesus, they will go forth and glorify God—honoring God by revealing God—through loving one another and bearing witness.

## VITA

Johnson Pang

### EDUCATION

BA, University of California Los Angeles, 2006  
MDiv, The Master's Seminary, 2011  
ThM, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012

### PUBLICATIONS

Articles in *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, ed. John D. Barry et al. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015. s.v.v. "Syro-Hexapla," "Theodotion's Version," "Siloam Inscription."

Co-authored articles in *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, ed. John D. Barry et al. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015. s.v.v. "Symmachus," "Symmachus' Version."

### ORGANIZATIONS

Evangelical Theological Society

### ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Teaching Assistant, Boyce College, Louisville, Kentucky, 2013–2014  
Teaching Assistant, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2013–2014  
Hebrew Tutor, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2014  
Academic Counselor, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2015  
Adjunct Instructor, Boyce College, Louisville, Kentucky, 2015–2016

### MINISTERIAL

Intern Pastor, Community Christian Alliance Church, Northridge, California, 2007–2011  
Greenhouse Church Planting Coordinator, New Life Church, Woodland Hills, California, 2016–2018  
Associate Pastor, Jesus our Redeemer, Baltimore, California, 2019–2021  
Executive Pastor over Discipleship, Community Christian Alliance Church, Granada Hills, California, 2022–