

THE RESURRECTION IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Chris Morrison, B.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. HODGES' HERMENEUTIC..... 3

III. JOHN'S PURPOSE..... 5

IV. JOHN'S REFLECTIONS..... 20

 A. John 3:16..... 20

 B. John 20:30-31..... 26

V. CONCLUSION..... 33

VI. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 35

VII. APPENDIX A..... 37

VIII. APPENDIX B..... 40

INTRODUCTION

"Neither explicitly nor implicitly does the Gospel of John teach that a person must understand the cross to be saved. It just does not teach this."¹ With these words, Zane Hodges set off a firestorm that has been now raging in certain theological circles for eight years.² To some, the

¹ Zane Hodges, "How to lead people to Christ," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 13 (Autumn 2000), 7.

² This paper is not an attack on the Hodges' salvation or those who agree with him. Further, the author agrees with him in the free grace Gospel and assumes it throughout this paper. He simply believes Hodges arguments, though well intentioned, are unwarranted. For those who are not familiar with the debate, see the following: Hodges, "How to lead people to Christ" parts 1 and 2 in the Autumn 2000 and Spring 2001 *JGES*; Gregory P. Sapaugh's "A Response to Hodges: How to Lead a Person to Christ, Parts 1 and 2," *JGES* (Autumn 2001); Bob Wilkin's "Justification by Faith Alone is an Essential Part of the Gospel," *JGES* (Autumn 2005); John H. Niemelä's "The Cross in John's Gospel," *JGES* (Spring 2003); Jeremy Myer's "The Gospel is More than Faith Alone in Christ Alone" *JGES* (Autumn 2006); Wilkin's "A Review of Getting the Gospel Wrong," *JGES* (Spring 2008); Hodges' "The Hydra's Other Head: Theological Legalism," *Grace in Focus* (Oct/Sep 2008); Dennis Rockser's "A Critique of Zane Hodge's Article - 'The Hydra's Other Head: Theological Legalism'," *Grace Family Journal* (2008); Tom Stegall's "The Tragedy of the Crossless Gospel" parts 1-10, *Grace Family Journal* (2008); J. B. Hixon's *Getting the Gospel Wrong: The Evangelical Crisis No One is Talking About* (Xulon Press, 2008); see also these two blogs: <http://www.indefenseofthegospel.blogspot.com/>; <http://freegracefreespeech.blogspot.com/>

assertion is absurd on its face, while to others, it is the logical and necessary conclusion of the faith alone Gospel. This paper will offer a response on Hodges' own terms and hopefully show the error in his thinking.

It will be necessary to briefly outline Hodges argument. Put simply, he starts with the premise that the Gospel of John was written for the express purpose of bringing people to saving faith, and thus, it must have everything in it necessary to accomplish this goal. Next, he argues from verses such as John 3:15-16; 5:24; 6:47; 11:27; and 20:31 that the sole condition for salvation is faith in Christ. Third, he notes that the disciples exercised saving faith, even as they clearly failed to understand and even rejected the notion that Jesus would die on the cross and be resurrected. Finally, he argues that nowhere does John say that one has to do anything different than did the disciples to be saved. Therefore, he concludes that if they could trust Christ alone for eternal life and were saved apart from believing in His divinity, death, and resurrection, so too are people today.³

³ The provided representation of Hodges argument is not taken from any single source. See the bibliography in the last footnote for various places in which he and his defenders present their case.

HODGES' HERMENEUTIC

Hodges argument is logically valid. If each of the premises are true, then so is his conclusion. While his second and third premises are correct, this paper will challenge the first and fourth. But it is important to explain the problem further. One could rather easily point to Scripture outside of John's Gospel to prove the necessity of believing resurrection (many have done so), but the problem with such an approach is that it assumes Scripture contradicts itself. For if Hodges is correct, then it does not matter what Romans or Corinthians say. If Hodges is correct about John, and if one can find a passage in any other book that requires belief in the resurrection, then one has found a contradiction in Scripture. Thus, given the way Hodges has constructed his argument, it must be met by examining John only.

But further, it is not enough to show a single verse (or verses) in John that state belief in the resurrection is required for the same reason as above. Again, if Hodges is correct, then no verse may contradict the clear Gospel

presentation of, say, John 6:47, which did not require belief in the resurrection and yet was sufficient to save.

It is these constraints that have made his argument so difficult to refute. The argument here is that, contrary to Hodges, John's Gospel clearly states that believers today have to believe something different than did Jesus' contemporaries. This will be borne out by examining the purpose of John, which Hodges has misunderstood, and noting the reflective and interpretive nature of two key passages: John 3:16 and John 20:31. Because John wrote at least forty years after the death of Christ, and due to the nature of progressive revelation, his reflections—directed specifically at his post-resurrection readers—interpret and apply the events of the past and set forward a full view of the Gospel. As such, the pre-resurrection Gospel presentations are given as they provide the basis for the post-resurrection Gospel, but John views them through the lens of Jesus' completed work on the Cross.

Thus, Hodges' error is hermeneutical. He interprets certain verses without reference to their theological and historical contexts. On that basis, consideration will now be given to each of the major areas delineated above: John's purpose, John 3:16, and John 20:30-31.

JOHN'S PURPOSE

A proper investigation into the purpose of John should begin stating from the outset that John 20:30-31 does not contain "perhaps the clearest purpose statement found in any of the Gospels,"⁴ give the "purpose of his writing,"⁵ or provide "a clear conclusion to the Gospel . . . its purpose declared."⁶ Such a position is both unwarranted and unnecessary and results in several interpretive and historical problems, as will be demonstrated below. Instead, this paper will defend the position of Arthur Pink, stated in full as follows:

This and the following verse comes in parenthetically. The whole of chapter 20 is occupied with a recountal of the appearance of the risen Christ unto His own, and this is continued in chapter 21 as the very first verse shows. We take it that the "many other signs" refer not to what the Lord had done through the whole course of His public ministry, but to the proofs which the risen

⁴ Andreas J. Kostenberger, *John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 581.

⁵ Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John: the English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), 855.

⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: a commentary*. Tr. G.R. Beasley-Murray, ed. R. W. N. Hoare J.K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 697.

Christ had furnished His apostles. This is confirmed by the words "Many other signs truly did Jesus *in the presence of His disciples,*" whereas, most of His ministerial signs were performed before the general public. There were other signs which the Saviour gave to the Eleven which proved that He had risen from the dead, but the Holy Spirit did not move *John* to record them. Some of them are described in the Synoptics. For example, His appearing to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke 24:15), His eating in the presence of the Eleven (Luke 24:43), His opening their understanding to understand the Scriptures (Luke 24:45), His appearing to them in Galilee (Matt. 28:16), His declaration that all power had been given unto Him in heaven and earth (Matt. 28:18), His commissioning them to make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the triune God (Matt. 28:19, 20). Other of these "signs" are recorded in Acts 1, I Cor. 15, etc.⁷

Pink's position may seem novel, and it has not been widely embraced among commentators; indeed, few even interact with it. This could be because, as Carson noted in his widely read paper on the interpretation of this verse (though in a different context), "in recent years discussions on the purpose of John's Gospel have largely ignored John 20:30-31."⁸ So it seems that Pink's position has not gotten the hearing it deserves.

There are four reasons that John 20:30-31 is neither the conclusion nor the purpose statement of the Gospel. The

⁷ Arthur W. Pink, *Exposition of the Gospel of John*, vol.3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1945), 302.

⁸ Donald A. Carson, "The purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 reconsidered," in *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 4 (December 1987): 639-651.

first lies in John's usage of the phrase "these things have been written." Though it occurs only here in John's Gospel, it occurs four times in his epistles. They appear as follows:

And we write these things so that your joy might be made overflowing (1 John 1:4)⁹

My children, I write these things to you that you might not sin; and if anyone does sin, we have an advocate with the Father—Jesus Christ the Righteous One. (1 John 2:1)

I wrote these things concerning those misleading you. (1 John 2:26)

I wrote these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God that you might know that you have eternal life. (1 John 5:13)¹⁰

In each of these four cases, "these things" (*tauta* in all instances) refers to the immediately preceding context. Thus, "these things" in 1:4 refers to 1:1-3; in 2:1 to 1:5-10; 2:26 to 2:18-25. Like John 20:30-31, most commentators take 1 John 5:13 as the purpose statement of the entire book, but contextually, like the previous three usages, it should be taken to refer to 5:10-12. Even Robert Law, who

⁹ All translations author's unless otherwise noted.

¹⁰ Here, following the critical text. Whether or not one chooses this or TR, however, makes no difference to this paper's argument.

popularized the "Test of Life" view of 1 John, admits in a small note this fact:

["I wrote these things to you that you might know, etc."]. Those words accurately define the governing aim of the whole Epistle. Contextually, however, they refer to the contents of 5⁶⁻¹², and most directly to 5^{11, 12}. At the same time, they effect the transition to the new subject, confidence in Prayer.¹¹

That commentators insist on making 1 John 5:13 the purpose statement of the book, despite John's clear usage of the phrase to refer to only the immediately preceding context, is probably the reason that many find the book so difficult to outline.¹² In fact, the purpose of 1 John has nothing to do with testing oneself to see if one has eternal life, but rather is to combat the heresies that local church faced that would have stripped the church of its fellowship with God.¹³

Once it is observed that the "these things are written" passages in 1 John are neither conclusions nor

¹¹ Robert Law, *Tests of Life*, 2d ed. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1909), 405.

¹² I. Howard Marshall, *The Epistles of John*, NICNT, ed. F.F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 22-26.

¹³ For an excellent explanation and defense of this purpose statement, as well as a full blown analysis of the arguments surrounding the Johannine "purpose statements", see John Niemelä's "Finding True North in First John", in *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* 6 (July-September 2000): 25-48.

general purpose statements but rather statements concerning the immediate contexts, the assumption that John 20:30-31 is the purpose statement for the whole Gospel is immediately placed on unstable ground. In fact, there are signs within John 20 that John is following this same pattern in his Gospel as well.

First, there are four signs recorded in John 20. The first is the empty tomb (20:1-10), the second is the appearance to Mary (20:11-18), the third is the appearance to the disciples, less Thomas (20:19-23), and the fourth is the appearance to Thomas (20:24-29). Like the signs of the first portion of the Gospel, each of these was a supernatural event.

Second, each of these four signs resulted in belief in the ones to whom they were given. John believed as a result of the empty tomb (20:8), Mary believed as a result of Jesus' appearance to her (20:18), the disciples believed when they saw Jesus (20:25), and finally Thomas believed when He saw Jesus (20:28). That the signs in 20:30-31 were recorded for the express purpose of prompting belief ties directly into the context of chapter 20, where they produced such belief. On the contrary, the signs recorded in 1-12 produced little belief and great opposition.

Finally, as Pink observed, the phrase "in the presence of His disciples" has little meaning if it refers to the entirety of the Gospel. Bruce seems to recognize and attempt to overcome this difficulty:

Although the 'signs' recorded in chapters 2:12 were performed in the presence of more than the disciples, yet they cannot be excluded from those referred to here. They were performed in the presence of the 'world', but no resultant faith was manifested.¹⁴

While this statement acknowledges that the phrase must refer to something, Bruce's assertion that "they cannot be excluded" is merely an assertion. He offers no evidence to back his rather strong claim. On the other hand, the repeated use of the "these things" phrase, as discussed above, gives the exegete every reason to exclude them from being considered as under the purview of this verse. Further, as Bruce himself here notes, the signs from 1-12 were performed before the 'world', whereas the signs in 20:30-31 were performed in the presence of the disciples. If one is to take John's statement seriously here, he must look first for signs given to the disciples. As it stands, the signs throughout chapter 20 meet the criteria perfectly.

¹⁴ F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 395.

The second argument against adopting the view that 20:30-31 is the purpose statement of John lies in the difficulty in such a view of what one is to make of John 21. It is now almost universally held among commentators that this chapter is simply an epilogue or appendix to an otherwise complete book. Barrett's remarks are perfectly typical of current thinking:

It has already been observed that 20.30f. mark the conclusion of the gospel as at first planned. If this is so ch. 21 must be regarded as an addendum, and the question must be raised whether it was composed by the author of chs. 1 - 20 or by some other.¹⁵

The thought is natural, for if 20:30-31 do, in fact, furnish the general purpose statement for the gospel then they seem to form a fitting conclusion as well. Beverly Gaventa's essay on John 21 demonstrates that most of the "critical discussion of John 21 has concerned itself with identifying the origins of this chapter and explaining its relationship to the remainder of the Gospel."¹⁶ Reasons suggested for this addition range from correcting the idea

¹⁵ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction and Commentary with Notes on the Greek Text* (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), 479.

¹⁶ 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*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996: 240-252), 241.

that Jesus' Second Advent was soon coming¹⁷ to distinguishing between Peter and John's role in the church¹⁸ (or, similarly, between Rome's and Ephesus'¹⁹), to help harmonization with the other Gospels, to the creation of an intentional "second ending,"²⁰ etc. Despite such a wide variety of suggestions, no general consensus has been reached.

In addition to the confusion regarding the purpose of John 21, advocates of the "appendix" view also have to contend with the fact that there is only a single Syriac manuscript that omits the chapter.²¹ Further, this "appendix" is quoted by Tertullian (*Scorp.* 15) and "and is treated by Origin in his Commentary as on a par with cc. 1-20."²² This shows that even from the earliest days, the entire book has been taken as a single unit. The chapter even has deep thematic ties to chapters 1-20.

¹⁷ Barrett, 692.

¹⁸ R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 341.

¹⁹ C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1958), 431.

²⁰ Gaventa, 242.

²¹ Lightfoot, 339.

²² Bernard, 687.

[I]n addition to the definite links with ch. 20 at 21^{1, 14}, the only disciple prominent in verses 1 to 14 and 15 to 23 are St. Peter and the beloved disciple; this recalls 13²³⁻²⁶ and 20²⁻²⁰. Again, the Lord's references to lambs and sheep in 21¹⁵⁻¹⁷ recall His words in ch. 10, and his thrice repeated question to St. Peter in the same verses whether the latter loves his Lord recalls not only St. Peter's three denials but also such passages as 14^{15, 21, 23}. For small points of stylistic resemblance 21¹⁹ may be compared with 12³³, 18³², or the last five Greek words of 21² with 1³⁵.²³

If the passage is indeed an afterthought, it was certainly very well planned and tied to the rest of the book, and this afterthought must have been appended to the earliest publication of the Gospel.

All this can be better understood, though, if 20-21 are taken as a concluding unit. Chapter 20 deals with the Lord's resurrection, but nothing is said of what the resurrection means for the Church. Indeed, given John's propensity to explanation (see below), such an omission would be startling. While this is not the place to examine what the precise nature of such a meaning is in this passage, it is perhaps enough to suggest that the restoration of Peter and the implicit promise of the Second Coming provide fitting resolutions to otherwise unresolved problems (cf. John 18:15-17, 25-27; and John 14:1-3).

²³ Lightfoot, 339.

The third reason one should not accept 20:30-31 as the purpose statement is that it is simply inadequate in that role. The section commonly called the "Book of Glory"²⁴ contains no signs except the Resurrection to prompt belief. This is especially true of chapters 13-17, a section that is very didactic in nature and would have proven (and, in fact, has proven) invaluable to the Church's and individual believers' development.

The final reason for rejecting the idea that John 20:30-31 is the purpose statement of the Gospel is its relationship to 21:25, the final verse of the book. Barrett simply labels it "a second conclusion, somewhat feebly imitating the style of 20.30f."²⁵ In the standard view, Barrett must be right, and the closing verse seems altogether anticlimactic, if not superfluous. But on the view supposed here, especially in light of the material in chapters 13-17, the verse supplies a perfect conclusion.

With all of this in place, then, it seems Pink's position is a very stable one, and one is justified in looking outside of 20:30-31 for the purpose of the Gospel.

²⁴ D. A. Carson, Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), 135.

²⁵ Barrett, 480.

In that light, five lines of thought can shed light on this issue.

First is the relationship of John's material to the Synoptics' material. Differences are well noted:

John does not record the virgin birth, the baptism, temptation or transfiguration of Jesus, the cure of any demoniacs or lepers, the parables, the institution of the Lord's supper, the agony in the garden, the cry of dereliction or the ascension. This is a considerable list and demands some explanation.²⁶

Other omissions include narrative parables, the transfiguration, the Lord's Supper, and many of Jesus' pithy sayings, and themes such as Kingdom of God. Against this, John includes a great deal of material unknown to the Synoptics²⁷, including

virtually all the material in John 1-5, Jesus' frequent visits to Jerusalem and what takes place there, the resurrection of Lazarus, extended dialogues and discourses, and much more.²⁸

If John was aware of the Synoptics, the best explanation is that John knew his "readers were acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels" and saw "no reason to repeat material that was already widely known."²⁹

²⁶ Guthrie, 289.

²⁷ Carson, *Introduction*, 160.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Guthrie, 289.

This is confirmed by the fact that at several points, the text assumes that the readers are familiar with Jesus' story. To take a few examples, 1:32-34 presupposes Jesus' baptism, 1:40 presupposes Peter's leadership, 3:24 presupposes knowledge of John's imprisonment, 6:67 abruptly introduces "the Twelve," which presupposes knowledge of them, 7:39 presupposes Pentecost, 8:41 and possibly 8:48 likely presuppose knowledge of the virgin birth, and 12:16 presupposes the ascension.

This leads to the second line of thought, namely, John's heavy emphasis on the incarnation.³⁰ It could be said that the entire Gospel is the story of the Word made flesh. Many authors have noted the high Christology of John's Gospel. It cannot escape notice that it begins with the incarnation and culminates with doubting Thomas' recognition of that fact. This emphasis is so strong that some have tried to make this the central theme by

³⁰ It is the incarnation, rather than simply Jesus' divinity, that is emphasized. All four Gospels teach that Jesus is God, but none so clearly expound on those implications as this Gospel. The incarnation presupposes divinity, and in that light, the strong statements of Jesus' relationship to the Father are more clearly understood.

understanding it as a polemic against Docetism³¹. While this is not likely the entire purpose, it could well have been one of the smaller purposes, and it would be perfectly consistent with the observations above that John's readers would have been familiar with the Gospel story.

The third major issue is the extensive amount of doctrinal material in the book, especially chapters 13-17. This will not be reviewed as it has already been covered, but it is here noted that whatever the intended purpose of the book, it must take this material into account.

As the fourth line of thought, the testimony of the early church is worth considering. Irenaeus held that John wrote to oppose the Gnostic Cerinthus.³² More interestingly, Clement of Alexandria said,

Last of all John perceiving that the bodily (or external) facts had been set forth in the (other) Gospels, at the instance of his disciples and with the inspiration of the Spirit composed a spiritual Gospel.³³

"Spiritual" here is not opposed to historical. It is probably a reference to the interpretive nature of John.

³¹ Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John: the English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), 36.

³² Ibid.

³³ Guthrie, 273.

This is extremely important given the reflective nature of the book. Merrill Tenney found fifty-nine "footnotes" or "explanatory material which is not directly involved in the progress of the narrative."³⁴ John J. O'Rourke expanded that list to 109, including John 3:16-21 and 31-36.³⁵ In discussing this literary device, Alan Culpepper says the narrator

is the one who speaks in the prologue, tells the story, introduces the dialogue, provides explanations, translates terms, and tells us what various characters knew or did not know. In short, the narrator tells us what to think.³⁶

It is this aspect of the Gospel that gives it its reflective nature. It is very common for the narrator to step outside the story and explain or interpret the events for the reader. And this is precisely what Clement says John did. Further, Clement said "he received this tradition from the 'early presbyters', which shows that it represents an ancient and probably widely held viewpoint."³⁷ If this

³⁴ Merrill C. Tenney, "The Footnotes of John's Gospel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 117:468 (Oct 1960), 350.

³⁵ John J. O'Rourke, "Asides in the Gospel of John," *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979).

³⁶ Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 17.

³⁷ Guthrie, 273.

true, it means the tradition likely goes all the way back to John himself and thus needs to be taken very seriously. It receives further confirmation in that it is supported by the supplementary nature of the book's contents to the Synoptics.

All this leads to the fifth and final line of thought, which comes directly from the text itself. In John 10:10, Jesus says, "I came that they might have life, and they might have it fully." This verse perfectly captures both sides of the results of belief (an idea of paramount importance to John!), namely, being born again and then growing in that new life. Tying all of these ideas together, the following purpose is suggested:

John wrote to people who were familiar with the story of Jesus to explain to them who He was (the resurrected Son of God) so that, by believing, they would not only have life, but they would have life abundantly. This was especially important in his own day, when people had begun to misunderstand who Jesus was by denying some central aspect of who He is, such as His deity, His humanity, His resurrection, or His sufficiency. His Gospel, then, is at once both evangelistic and exhortative.

JOHN'S REFLECTIONS

Given the reflective nature of John's narration, attention will now be turned to two key reflections, both of which are directed explicitly toward the reader and require belief in the resurrection if one is to be saved.

John 3:16

It is common to read John 3:16 and get the feeling that the words do not sound like Jesus' own. Indeed, many scholars, both of conservative and liberal persuasions, have argued that John 3:16-21 are the Evangelist's reflection on Jesus' words to Nicodemus in verses 14 and 15.³⁸ Leon Morris sums up the difficulty succinctly:

All are agreed that from time to time in this Gospel we have the meditations of the Evangelist. But it is difficult to know where these begin and end. In the first century there were no devices such as inverted commas to show the precise limits of quoted speech. The result is that we are always left to the probabilities, and we must work out for ourselves where a speech or quotation ends.³⁹

³⁸ See Elmer Towns, *The Gospel of John: Believe and Live* ([s.l.], AMG Publishers, 2002) and Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: a Commentary* as two representative examples.

³⁹ Morris, 228.

In short, there are at least two problems in trying to separate Jesus' words from the Evangelist's. First, John, at times, moves seamlessly from his speaker's words to his own, and second, the Greek language simply did not have the same means for signaling direct, verbatim quotation as English does. Indeed, such exact quotation may not have even been expected so long as the speaker's statements were accurately represented.⁴⁰ Thus, the question of the origin of the words in 3:16-21 is both a valid and difficult one.

In general, four arguments should be put forward that, when taken together, seem to weigh in favor of the section belonging to John rather than Jesus.

First, the verses seem very much an "application to the reader of the significance of that conversation."⁴¹ On the other hand, when speaking to His contemporaries, Jesus' words were often difficult to grasp, if not cryptic (cf.

⁴⁰ This is not to say that the New Testament authors, including John, were not interested in Jesus' words. The exact nature of quotation in the Bible has long been discussed. Conservative scholars usually distinguish between *ipsissima verba* (Jesus' "very words") and *ipsissima vox* (His "very voice"). For a defense and explanation of this, see Darrel Bock's "The Words of Jesus in the Gospels: Live, Give, or Memorex" in *Jesus Under Fire*, ed. Michael J. Wilkins and J. P. Moreland (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 74-99.

⁴¹ Bruce, 89.

2:19; 3:3-15; 4:10-24, 32-38; 6:26-58; 7:33-39; 8:19-29, 58; 10:1-18; 12:34; 13:7-10; 14:1-7; 16:16-17, etc.). Jesus Himself even stated that He spoke figuratively (16:25). Against this, 3:16-21 seems entirely explanatory, and thus out of step with Jesus' methodology.

Second, the passage explains Jesus' reference in 3:14-15 of His death and resurrection. That is, John 3:16 "draws attention to the sacrifice involved for God the Father in sending his Son to save the world."⁴² Yet this very sacrifice had not yet occurred. It makes far more sense for John to emphasize and explain Jesus' statements in the light of history than for Jesus to expound on an event only to which He had only vaguely referred.

Third, both the words "loved" and "gave" are past tense.⁴³ While it is possible for a speaker to talk of a future event as past so as to emphasize its certainty (cf. Rom. 8:30), it is more natural to take the past tense as John's reference to a past event, especially given John's propensity for such explanatory comments (cf. 1:16-18; 12:37-41, etc.).

⁴² Kostenberger, 129.

⁴³ Towns, 32.

Fourth, several words in the passage, and two in 3:16 specifically, argue strongly against them having come from Jesus' lips. The first, "gave", will be discussed in more detail below. For now, it will only be noted that everywhere else in John's gospel, Jesus refers to Himself as having been "sent" by the Father (41 times)⁴⁴ though never as having been "given". The second is the oft-commented on "only-begotten." The word is applied to Jesus three other times, 1:14, 18; and 1 John 4:9, and in each of those cases, it is used by the Evangelist, not Jesus. That the word is never used by Jesus of Himself but is used by John to describe Him stands in favor of the passage being from John rather than Jesus. The same can be said of two other phrases in John 3:16-21, namely, "believe in the name of" and "do the truth", which occur elsewhere in John 1:23; 2:23; 1 John 5:13, and 1 John 1:6, respectively, and never in the mouth of Jesus.⁴⁵

It seems, then, that one is on safe ground in asserting that John 3:16-21 is John's explanation of Jesus'

⁴⁴ See Appendix A for a full table on the usages of *Apostellō* and *Pempō*.

⁴⁵ B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: the Authorized Version with introduction and notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: WM. B. Eerdmans, 1975), 54.

words rather than considering them part of the original conversation. Thus, one can turn to examine the actual passage:

For this is the way God loved the world: He gave His One and Only Son, so that everyone who believes in Him would not perish, but would instead of everlasting life.

The word "for" (*gar*) points to the immediately preceding context. There, Jesus had just told Nicodemus that "the Son of Man must be lifted up." (3:14, NIV) The word "lifted up" (*hupsoō*) "has intentionally a double sense in all the passages in which it occurs . . . It means both exaltation on the cross and exaltation to heaven."⁴⁶ That the word has this double meaning is confirmed by Jesus' usage of it again in 12:32 and John's explanation in 12:33, "This he said, signifying what death he should die." (NIV)

John, not wanting the reader to miss the importance of Jesus' words, thus explains, in the light of history, what He meant. God loved the world by giving His Son. The word "gave" is of special importance. Though it occurs 75 times in John's Gospel, it never again refers to Jesus.⁴⁷ The

⁴⁶ Georg Bertram, "Hupsos," s.v. *The Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words*, vol. 8, eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), 610.

⁴⁷ See Appendix B for a full table of all usages of the word *didōmi*.

sacrificial tone of the word can hardly be missed, especially given its explanatory application of Jesus' being "lifted up." Further, while John nowhere else says that Jesus was "given" by God, the phrase is common in Paul: Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25; 1 Tim. 2:6; Titus 2:14. In all of these instances, Paul is referring explicitly to Jesus' atoning death. Likewise, John makes the same point.

Finally, John says that God gave Jesus so that everyone might have everlasting life by "believing in Him." The antecedent of "Him" is "the Son," and the Son is expressly described as "given." Thus, it seems that John would have his readers place their faith in "The Given One" rather than merely "The Sent One." No such demand was placed on Nicodemus. Far from it, in this passage Jesus refers only to His origins—His being sent—which is consistent with Jesus' other statements (see, for instance, John 6:25-59). In any case, it is apparent that John 3:16 displays a remarkably more developed Christology than that of 3:1-15. To believe that revelation is to "certify that God is true" (John 3:33). To deny it is to reject God's revelation concerning His Son. Thus, in John 3:16, John

tells the reader that he is responsible to believe in Jesus' resurrection if he is to be saved.⁴⁸

John 20:30-31

A proper interpretation of 20:30-31 must understand it as a summary of the resurrection narrative recorded in chapter 20. In this light, five things about the passage become apparent.

First is the relationship between the two *hina* clauses in verse 31. Both can be classified as adverbial dependent purpose clauses.⁴⁹ The first shows that the reason John selected the material in chapter 20 is so that the reader

⁴⁸ This presents a particular problem for those who follow Hodges' hermeneutic. Bob Wilkin, for instance, accuses J. B. Hixon of proclaiming two self-contradictory gospels. He says of Hixon's two gospel presentations,

In one someone must believe in Jesus Christ as the One who gives eternal life to all who trust Him and Him alone for it. In the other a person must merely believe in Jesus Christ as the only One who can give him eternal life.

See Wilkin's "A Review of J. B. Hixon's *Getting the Gospel Wrong*," in the *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* (Spring 2008), 12. Surely, if saying that to believe in the One who gives eternal life versus the One can give eternal life are different gospels, then to believe in Jesus as the Sent One as compared to the Given One are two more greatly differing gospels!

⁴⁹ See Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 664.

would believe⁵⁰ "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." The second clause shows that the reason John wants the readers to believe the first clause is so that they might have life.⁵¹ One may paraphrase the passage this way: "If you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, then you have life; so I wrote this chapter to prove it to you." Thus, one has a very clear statement on the exact nature of the Gospel from John directly to the reader: to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, is to have life.

Second, the phrase "the Christ, the Son of God" is a restatement of Martha's confession in 11:27. It should first be noted that the terms could be used synonymously⁵², and on Martha's lips, they likely were.⁵³ This is because

⁵⁰ Though some would try to argue toward the general purpose of the gospel based on the textual variant here, the debate will be dismissed here for two reasons. First, it has already been established that John 20:30-31 is not the purpose statement of the Gospel, and second, Bruce is surely correct when he says that "we are not shut up to two mutually exclusive alternatives . . . John's record has the power to awaken new faith and to revive faith already awakened." (Bruce, 395). Also, cf. John 10:10.

⁵¹ It is probably best to take *pisteuontes* here as an adverbial participle of condition, in which the "participle implies a condition on which the fulfillment of the idea indicated by the main idea depends." See GGBB, 632.

⁵² Bruce, 395.

⁵³ Bernard, 685.

the Jews, in view of Psalm 2, considered "the Christ" to be "the Son of God" in an adoptionistic sense of the word.⁵⁴ In the Synoptics, this is almost certainly the case, but more seems to be going on in John.

First, while the term "Christ" certainly had eschatological tones to the Jewish ear, and while it certainly was and should have been understood in terms of the Jewish Kingdom, John appears to have a more personal meaning of the term in mind. Put differently, one may say that in the Synoptics, Christ is the Savior of Israel, whereas in John, Christ is the Savior of the Individual.⁵⁵ Indeed, 11:27 expressly links Jesus' role as Christ with His being the Guarantor of eternal life. In that verse, the reason Jesus can guarantee eternal life is that He, as the Christ, will raise all believers on the last day.⁵⁶ Other passages confirm this view. John 4:42 calls the Christ "the

⁵⁴ George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2nd ed. (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1999), 388.

⁵⁵ This is not to say, of course, that John is ignorant of or denies that Jesus is the savior of Israel. Theologically, it is only true that Jesus can save individual believers because He is the savior of Israel. But John touches this only lightly; his focus is on Jesus' ability to save people rather than the nation.

⁵⁶ John H. Niemelä, "The Cross in John's Gospel." *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* (Spring 2003), 24.

savior of the world," which brings the reader immediately back to John 3:16-18. John 17:3 also equates Jesus' Christhood with eternal life.

The term "the Son of God" is also important. One of the major themes of John is Jesus' Sonship, with the Evangelist often employing title "Son of God" or often the unqualified "Son". While a full study of this idea is outside the scope of this paper, it should be noted here that a major aim of John seems to be making explicit Jesus filial relationship to the Father.⁵⁷ Whatever adoptionistic ideas the Jews had about "the Son of God," John expected his readers to see its exalted meaning. For John, the Son of God is more than the nation's king. He is God.

As the meaning of these two separate terms are unfolded throughout the Gospel, the full meaning of John 20:30-31 becomes apparent. Jesus is not simply the promised king of Israel, but He is the Guarantor of eternal life and even God Himself.

This is further confirmed by looking at the third major aspect of the verse, the immediate context. Thomas had just made his great Christological confession: "My Lord

⁵⁷ Guthrie, 240.

and my God!" (20:28) George Beasley-Murray explains the connection this way:

The confession that the Evangelist would lead the uncommitted to make and the committed to maintain is that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*. That may appear as an unexpected reduction of the confession of Thomas, but it depends on the content read into the titles. For Jews, "Messiah" and "Son of God" would be synonymous, the latter being understood in adoptionist terms in line with the second Psalm, where the king at his coronation enters on the status of the Son of God. In this Gospel *Son of God* is the key concept of the relation of Jesus to God, being strictly synonymous with the absolute use of "the Son"; consequently the term *Messiah* also is raised in significance.⁵⁸

Given the raised significance of the titles from their ordinary usage, coupled with the strongest Christological statement in the book, it is clear that to believe "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" is to believe a good deal more than only something about Jesus' eschatological significance, that is, His being the One promised from Old Testament times.

The fourth major observation about this passage is the tense of the word "is." It is well known that John makes explicit use of the present tense to make very important theological points. John 6:47, for instance, emphasizes the fact that believers have eternal life right now. John 8:58

⁵⁸ Beasley-Murray, 388.

uses the absolute present tense both to prove Jesus' divinity and to identify Him with Yahweh.

In context of the resurrection appearances, 20:31's use of the present becomes very significant. It is not sufficient to believe that Jesus "was" the Christ, the Son of God. One must believe that Jesus "is" the Christ, the Son of God. But, as previously shown, John's readers already knew the story of Jesus, which means they already knew about the crucifixion. Also, the resurrection story, to which 20:30-31 is intractably connected, presupposes the crucifixion. But if John's readers were aware of Jesus' death, then His resurrection is inseparable from His being Christ and Son of God, for one cannot believe that Jesus is that presently if one believes Him to still be dead. Indeed, given Thomas' confession in 20:28, it seems that the resurrection is not merely proof that Jesus is Christ, but it is part of what it means that He is Christ.

This is borne out by the final observation. Returning to Thomas, he expressly stated, "I will not believe" (20:25). This was in response to the Twelve's news that they had seen Jesus resurrected. When Jesus appeared to him and Thomas made his confession, Jesus' responded that he believed because he saw, but "blessed are those who do not

see and still believe." (20:29) The belief in question here is the belief in the resurrection, but coming on the heels of Thomas' confession, it surely includes that as well. But as has been noted, that confession is directly tied to Jesus being the Christ, the Son of God in 20:31. Thus, Jesus Himself states the necessity of future believers' affirmation of His resurrection. This is confirmed by 11:27, where Jesus claimed to be the resurrection. The connection between that claim and His actual resurrection here is thus undeniable.

John 20:30-31, then, gives the clearest possible statement as to the Gospel in the book, for

John does not leave the reader in any doubt as to what the *content* of their faith was to be. It was not merely a general faith but a particular view of Jesus which John sought to inculcate, a view of Him under two distinct, yet closely connected ascriptions—the Christ and the Son of God.⁵⁹

According to John, if one believes that understanding of Jesus—the view that had been taught since Pentecost and was in John's day under attack⁶⁰—then one would have eternal life.

⁵⁹ Guthrie, 271-72.

⁶⁰ John Phillips, *Exploring the Gospel of John: an Expository Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1989), 387.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that, based on a proper understanding of John's purpose (to bring abundant life based on a proper understanding of Jesus), the reflective nature of John's Gospel shows that one cannot take the pre-resurrection Gospel presentations and apply them directly to a post-resurrection world. They must be understood in light of John's own statements directly to the (post-resurrection) reader. Two such statements, 3:16 and 20:30-31, expressly require belief in the resurrection as part of the Gospel. John 3:16 emphasizes belief in the completed nature of Jesus' mission; 20:30-31 requires believing that Jesus is presently the Resurrected, Divine Guarantor of eternal life.

These aspects were clearly not required of Jesus' contemporaries. Thus, Hodges and his defenders are wrong in their claim that John's Gospel presents no change in the Gospel post-resurrection. All men today are required to place their faith in Jesus as the resurrected Son of God. For unbelievers, such faith results in everlasting life. For believers, such faith results in abundant life.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction and Commentary with Notes on the Greek Text*. London: S.P.C.K., 1965.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*, 2nd ed. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1999.
- Bertram, Georg. "Hupsos," s.v. *The Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words*, vol. 8, eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- Bock, Darrel. "The Words of Jesus in the Gospels: Live, Give, or Memorex" in *Jesus Under Fire*, ed. Michael J. Wilkins and J. P. Moreland. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: a commentary*. Tr. G.R. Beasley-Murray, ed. R. W. N. Hoare J.K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Carson, D. A., Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.
- Carson, Donald A. "The purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 reconsidered," *The Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 4 (December 1987): 639-651.
- Culpepper, Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

- 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*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996: 240-252.
- Hodges, Zane. "How to lead people to Christ," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 13 (Autumn 2000): 3-12.
- Kostenberger, Andreas J. *John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Law, Robert. *Tests of Life*, 2d ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1909.
- Leon Morris. *The Gospel according to John: the English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.
- Lightfoot, R. H. *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Epistles of John*, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to John: the English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.
- Niemelä, John H. "The Cross in John's Gospel," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* (Spring 2003):
- _____. "Finding True North in First John", *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* 6 (July-September 2000): 25-48.
- O'Rourke, John J. "Asides in the Gospel of John," *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979): 210-19.
- Phillips, John. *Exploring the Gospel of John: an Expository Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1989.
- Pink, Arthur W. *Exposition of the Gospel of John*, vol.3. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1945.

- Tenney, Merrill C. "The Footnotes of John's Gospel,"
Bibliotheca Sacra 117 (Oct 1960): 350-64.
- Towns, Elmer. *The Gospel of John: Believe and Live*. [s.l.]:
AMG Publishers, 2002.
- Wallace, Daniel. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics*. Grand
Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel according to St. John: the
Authorized Version with introduction and notes*. Grand
Rapids, MI: WM. B. Eerdmans, 1975.
- Wilkin, Robert N. "A Review of J. B. Hixon's *Getting the
Gospel Wrong*," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical
Society* (Spring 2008), 12.

APPENDIX A

The table below lists all the verses in which the word *apostellō* is used. The second column lists the sender; the third who is sent; the fourth lists who made the statement.

Verse	Sender	Sent	Voice
John 1:6	God	John	Narrator
John 1:19	Jews	Priests	Narrator
John 1:24	Jews	Pharisees	Narrator
John 3:17	God	Jesus	Narrator
John 3:28	God	John	John
John 3:34	God	?	Narrator
John 4:38	Jesus	Disciples	Jesus
John 5:33	Jews	[word]	Jesus
John 5:36	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:38	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:29	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:57	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 7:29	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 7:32	Pharisees	Officers	Narrator
John 8:42	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 9:7	-	-	Narrator
John 10:36	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 11:3	Sisters	[word]	Narrator
John 11:42	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:3	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:8	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:18	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:18	Jesus	Disciples	Jesus
John 17:21	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:23	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:25	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 18:24	Annas	Jesus	Narrator
John 20:21	God	Jesus	Jesus

1 John 4:9	God	Jesus	Narrator
1 John 4:10	God	Jesus	Narrator
1 John 4:14	God	Jesus	Narrator
Rev 1:1	God	Revelation	Narrator
Rev 5:6	God	"Seven Spirits"	Narrator
Rev 22:6	God	Angel	Angel

The table below lists all the verses in which the word *pempō* is used. The second column lists the sender; the third who is sent; the fourth lists who made the statement.

Verse	Sender	Sent	Voice
John 1:22	Jews	Priests	Priests
John 1:33	God	John	John
John 4:34	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:23	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:24	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:30	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:37	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:38	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:39	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:40	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:44	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 7:16	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 7:18	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 7:28	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 7:33	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 8:16	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 8:18	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 8:26	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 8:29	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 9:4	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 12:44	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 12:45	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 12:49	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 13:16	General	General	Jesus
John 13:20	Jesus	General	Jesus
John 13:20	God	Jesus	Jesus

John 14:24	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 14:26	God	Holy Spirit	Jesus
John 15:21	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 15:26	Jesus	Holy Spirit	Jesus
John 16:5	God	Jesus	Jesus
John 16:7	Jesus	Holy Spirit	Jesus
John 20:21	Jesus	Disciples	Jesus
Rev 1:11	Jesus	Word	Jesus
Rev 11:10	People	Gifts	Narrator
Rev 14:15	God	Angel	God
Rev 14:18	God	Angel	God
Rev 22:16	Jesus	Angel	Jesus

APPENDIX B

The table below lists all the verses in which the word *didwmi* is used. The second column lists the sender; the third who is sent; the fourth lists who made the statement.

Verse	Giver	Gift	Recipient	Voice
John 1:12	God	Salvation	Believers	Narrator
John 1:17	Moses	Law	[Jews]	Narrator
John 1:22	[John]	Answer	Jews	Jews
John 3:16	God	Jesus	World	Narrator
John 3:27	God	[Understanding]	World	John
John 3:34	God	Spirit	[Men]	Narrator
John 3:35	God	Everything	Jesus	Narrator
John 4:5	Jacob	Land	Joseph	Narrator
John 4:7	[Woman]	Drink	Jesus	Jesus
John 4:10	[Woman]	Drink	Jesus	Jesus
John 4:10	Jesus	Living Water	Woman	Jesus
John 4:12	Jacob	Well	Samaritans	Woman
John 4:14	Jesus	Living Water	World	Jesus
John 4:14	Jesus	Living Water	World	Jesus
John 4:15	[Jesus]	Living Water	Woman	Woman
John 5:22	God	Judgement	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:26	God	Life	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:27	God	Authority	Jesus	Jesus
John 5:36	God	Work	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:27	Son of Man	Enduring Food	World	Jesus
John 6:31	God	Manna	Israel	Jews
John 6:32	Moses	Bread	World	Jesus
John 6:32	God	True Bread	World	Jesus
John 6:33	Jesus	Life	World	Jesus
John 6:34	[Jesus]	Bread	Crowd	Crowd
John 6:37	God	Believers	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:39	God	Believers	Jesus	Jesus
John 6:51	Jesus	Flesh	World	Jesus

John 6:52	[Jesus]	Flesh	Crowd	Crowd
John 6:65	God	Will to come	World	Jesus
John 7:19	Moses	Law	Jews	Jesus
John 7:22	Moses	Circumcision	Jews	Jesus
John 9:24	[Man]	Glory	God	Jews
John 10:28	Jesus	Eternal Life	Sheep	Jesus
John 10:29	God	Sheep	Jesus	Jesus
John 11:22	God	Anything	Jesus	Martha
John 11:57	Chief Priests / Pharisees	Orders	People	Narrator
John 12:5	[Mary]	Money	Poor	Judas
John 12:49	God	Words	Jesus	Jesus
John 13:3	God	Everything	Jesus	Narrator
John 13:15	Jesus	Example	Disciples	Jesus
John 13:26	Jesus	Bread	[Judas]	Jesus
John 13:26	Jesus	Bread	Judas	Jesus
John 13:29	Judas	Something	Poor	Narrator
John 13:34	Jesus	Command	Disciples	Jesus
John 14:16	God	Spirit	Disciples	Jesus
John 14:27	Jesus	Peace	Disciples	Jesus
John 14:27	Jesus	-	-	Jesus
John 14:27	World	-	-	Jesus
John 15:16	God	Anything	Disciples	Jesus
John 16:23	God	Anything	Disciples	Jesus
John 17:2	God	Authority	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:2	Jesus	Eternal Life	[Believers]	Jesus
John 17:2	God	Believers	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:4	God	Work	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:6	God	[Disciples]	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:6	God	[Disciples]	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:7	God	Everything	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:8	Jesus	Words	Disciples	Jesus
John 17:8	God	Words	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:9	God	Believers	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:11	God	Name	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:12	God	Name	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:14	Jesus	Words	Disciples	Jesus
John 17:22	Jesus	Glory	Believers	Jesus
John 17:22	God	Glory	Jesus	Jesus

John 17:24	God	Believers	Jesus	Jesus
John 17:24	God	Glory	Jesus	Jesus
John 18:9	God	Believers	Jesus	Jesus
John 18:11	God	Cup	Jesus	Jesus
John 18:22	Guard	Strike	Jesus	Narrator
John 19:3	Soldiers	Strike	Jesus	Narrator
John 19:9	Jesus	Answer	[Pilate]	Narrator
John 19:11	[God]	Power	[Pilate]	Jesus
John 21:13	Jesus	Bread	Disciples	Narrator