JOHN A. DENNIS

Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 217

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

217

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

Mohr Siebeck

JOHN A. DENNIS, born 1962; 1991 M.Div. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary; 1994 S.T.M. Boston University; 2003 Ph.D., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Louvain); presently Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Katholieke Universiteit in Belgium.

ISBN 3-16-148821-0
ISBN-13 978-3-16-148821-4
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)
978-3-16-157069-8 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de.*

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Held in Rottenburg/N.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This book is a revised version of my Ph.D. dissertation that was defended at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven on December 15, 2003.

A Ph.D. dissertation is not created *ex nihilo* to be sure. Many people have contributed to this work in various ways. Unfortunately, I only have the space to mention a select few. Pride of place goes to my Doktorvater Prof. Reimund Bieringer. I owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. Bieringer who took great interest in my professional and personal life during my studies and research in Leuven. He has provided me with many opportunities over the years that have greatly benefited my academic career. Prof. Bieringer skillfully and patiently directed my work and particularly the dissertation that stands behind this book. His keen insights into the text and his constructive criticisms made this work much better than it would have been otherwise. Prof. Bieringer's patient but rigorous approach to supervision is one that I hope to emulate in my own teaching career. I count it the highest privilege to have studied under Prof. Bieringer.

I would also like to express my deepest appreciation to my former seminary teacher Prof. Dr. Scott Hafemman of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Prof. Hafemann's influence on me continues to this day. It was in his classes that I learned the art of exegesis and the art of asking good questions of the text. As I watched him teach the New Testament with passion and skill I knew that I had to rethink my academic specialty from systematic theology to New Testament exegesis. I am grateful for his encouragement, counsel, and friendship over the years.

I am also extremely grateful to Leuven's Faculty of Theology for providing me with a rewarding experience both as a student, researcher, and teacher. I have learned so much from my years in Leuven. A few professors should be specifically mentioned. Prof. Gilbert Van Belle has shown great interest in my work and allowed me to work with him this last year. I am grateful for his encouragement. Prof. Dr. Mathijs Lamberigts, dean of Leuven's Faculty of Theology, has been supportive of my work and career in many ways. I am thankful to him for his support in my research and teaching opportunities in Leuven. I will leave Leuven soon for my new post at the *International Christian College*, Glasgow, and I do so with fond memories and deep appreciation.

The last year of my doctoral work in Leuven was funded by a doctoral scholarship from the *Onderzoeksraad* of the K.U. Leuven. In addition, the council awarded me a Post-Doctoral Fellowship (2003-2005). I am extremely

grateful for this support without which I could not have continued my work here in Leuven.

Many friendships over the years in Belgium have also greatly contributed to whatever success I have attained. The following deserve special mention: Jean and Lies Jacobs, Phil and Linda Gottschalk, Jonathan Yates, Brian and Heidi Matz, Jo and Renée Köhler-Ryan. My closest friends in the USA, Rev. John Guerre and Steven Tsoukalas, have provided much support and friendship over many years. I am grateful to my brother and sister-in-law, Patrick and Sandy Dennis, who have prayed for me on numerous occasions throughout my academic journey. My mother, Carolyn Holtrey, has always been there to believe in me. I draw much strength from her.

Many thanks are also due to Michael Funk Deckard for the many hours he put into editing this work. His keen eye saved me from many mistakes. Any mistakes that remain, and I am sure some have escaped my eye, are of course my responsibility. I would also like to thank Emmanuel Nathan for helping me with some last minute formatting issues. I appreciate the hours that Brian Matz put into to some last minute help with the indexes. Brian saved me from many days of extra work.

I am very grateful to Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey for accepting this work for publication in the WUNT 2 series and to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and Jana Trispel at Mohr Siebeck for their assistance and great patience.

Acknowledgments would not be complete without communicating my deep appreciation and love to my wife Julia for her great patience during this last year. This work and other responsibilities at the University demanded so much of my time. She has been a constant source of encouragement in all things. I am grateful for her enthusiastic help with the indexes and last minute editing. This work is to a great degree hers as well. Life is simply better with her in it. I dedicate this work to her. Ich liebe dich!

John A. Dennis
Leuven, Belgium
August 2006

Table of Contents

Chapter 4: The Motifs of John 11.47–52 Inside the Gospel

Chapter 5: The Restoration of Israel in John 9–11

Chapter 6: The Restoration of Israel in 11.47–52 in Light of 11.51–52

Abbreviations

The abbreviations employed in this work are taken from P.H. Alexander, et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near East, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999). Abbreviations not found there are listed below:

BDAG	Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Christian Literature.* Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, ^{3}2000.
BDF	Blass, D. and Funk, R.W. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, ^{3}2000.
EÜ	*Die Bibel: Altes und Neues Testament: Einheitsübersetzung.* Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
FG	Fourth Gospel
LEH	Lust, J., Eynikel, E. and Hauspie, H. *A Greek – English Lexicon of the Septuagint.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.
MT	Masoretic Text
NT	New Testament
NRSV	*The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrapha / Deuterocanonical Books.* New Revised Standard Version. Edited by B.M. Metzger and R.E. Murphy. NY: Oxford University Press, 1991.
OT	Old Testament

Introduction

A number of studies have investigated various aspects of John's relationship with his Jewish heritage in general and aspects of his use of Jewish restoration theology in particular: for instance, John's identification of Jesus with Jewish wisdom traditions (evident most clearly in the prologue of the Gospel but also throughout the entire narrative),[1] Jesus as the presence of YHWH dwelling with his people (John 1.14)[2] and as the Temple (John 2.13–22; cf. 14.2),[3] Jesus as the fulfillment of Jewish festivals/feasts (such as Passover, tabernacles),[4] Jesus' relation to Jewish purity rites (John 2.1–11),[5] Jesus' identification with the manna provided for Israel in the Sinai wilderness (John 6),[6] Jesus as Eze-

---

[1] B. Witherington, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995); C.A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTSS 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 77-99; James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM Press, 1980), 163-212; B. Lindars, "Traditions Behind the Fourth Gospel," in *L'Evangile Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (ed. M.de Jonge; BETL 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 107-124.

[2] M.-E. Boismard, *Moise ou Jésus: Essai de Christologie Johannique* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), 100-105; C.R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (CBQMS 22; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989). Jesus as the Logos (λόγος) who dwells or tabernacles among his people (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν) in John 1.14 probably draws on both Exodus traditions as well as Jewish Wisdom traditions such as those found in *1 Enoch* 42 and Sirach 24. See N.T. Wright, *New Testament and the People of God: Volume One of Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 415 and Witherington, *John's Wisdom*.

[3] A.R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSS 220; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); F. Siegert, "'Zerstört diesen Tempel...!' Jesus als 'Tempel' in den Passionsüberlieferungen," in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels: Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung* (ed. J. Hahn; WUNT 147; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 108-139; M.L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2001); J. Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue in John," *NTS* 45 (1999), 51-69; M. Kinzer, "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: SBL, 1998), 447-464; X. Leon-Dufour, "Le Signe du Temple," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 39 (1951/2), 155-175.

[4] G.A. Yee, *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989).

[5] L.P. Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSS 145; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); F. Manns, *Le Symbole Eau-Esprit dans le Judaisme Ancien* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 19. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1983).

[6] P. Borgen, *Bread From Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (Leiden: Brill, 1965); D.M. Swancutt, "Hungers Assuaged by the Bread from Heaven: 'Eating Jesus' as Isaianic Call to Belief: The Influence of Isaiah 55 and

kiel's shepherd who gathers his sheep and restores Israel (10.7–16),[7] and other aspects of John's use of restoration themes.[8] Nevertheless, there have not been any studies that have attempted to elucidate systematically the presence and function of restoration theology in the FG[9] as a whole or on the basis of one Johannine passage.[10]

In a modest attempt to address this lacuna, the present study sets out to investigate the presence and function of restoration theology in 11.47–52[11] as a way of exploring John's appropriation of restoration theology more generally. I limit then the scope of the aspects (or motifs) of restoration for consideration by tailoring the investigation to the presence and function of restoration theology specifically expressed in John 11.47–52. The rationale for this limitation is as follows: An attempt to study all of the elements of restoration theology that John employs would obviously be impracticable for a single study and thus some kind of limitation is necessary. Most importantly, John 11.47–52 is a pivotal passage for my purposes because, as will be shown, it employs key restoration motifs[12] in the construction of its argument, motifs that are also present elsewhere in the Gospel. Furthermore, these motifs echo some of the most important elements of Israel's restoration theology present in the OT[13] and in Second Temple Judaism. In addition, John 11.47–52 is a pivotal pas-

---

Psalm 78 (77) in John 6.22–71," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C.A. Evans, C.A. and J.A. Sanders; JSNTSS 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

[7] See especially J. Schreiner, "Ezechiel 34 im Hintergrund des johanneischen Wortes vom guten Hirten," in *Nach den anfängen Fragen* (ed. C. Mayer, K. Müller and G. Schmalenberg; Gießen: Evangelische Theologie und Katholische Theologie, 1994), 589-606; B. Kowalaski, *Die Hirtenrede (Joh 10,1–18) im Kontext des Johannesevangeliums* (Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelwerk GmbH, 1996); J. Beutler, "Der alttestamentlich-jüdische Hintergrund der Hirtenrede in Johannes 10," in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context* (eds. J. Beutler & R.T. Fortna; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 18-32; M.K. Deeley, "Ezekiel's Shepherd and John's Jesus: A Case Study in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (eds. C.A. Evans & J.A. Sanders; JSNTSS 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 252-264.

[8] J.A. Draper, "Holy Seed and the Return of the Diaspora in John 12:24," *Neot* 34 (2000), 347-359; J.A. Steiger, "Nathanael – ein Israelit, an dem kein Falsch ist," *BTZ* 9 (1992), 50-73.

[9] Throughout this study "FG" will be employed as the abbreviation for "Fourth Gospel."

[10] A.C. Brunson's study, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John* (WUNT 2/158; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), is the only work on the FG that significantly incorporates an aspect of restoration theology. Brunson's treatment of Psalm 118 in John's Gospel argues that the Psalm was understood in Judaism prior to the FG in the context of a "new exodus" and that in the FG itself the Psalm's use similarly echoes new exodus restoration associations.

[11] In chapter 2, I will argue that the limits of the pericope are 11.47–53. However, I will usually refer to the pericope as 11.47–52 since the main motifs of this passage that I am concerned with are contained in vv.47–52.

[12] See the brief description of these motifs in the next section.

[13] Throughout this study "OT" will be used for Old Testament.

sage in the dramatic plot-line of the Gospel. In 11.47–52, the reader discovers that Jesus' mission will bring about Israel's restoration not simply in spite of but precisely *because of* Jesus' death. More specifically, the uniqueness of this passage for the purposes of this study lies in the fact that its motifs are employed to show that Jesus' death by "his own" (cf. 1.11) will bring about the realization of Israel's long awaited restoration.

In light of the fact that 11.47–52 functions as a crucial peak in the story of Jesus' restoration ministry to Israel, it is not surprising to discover that the restoration themes employed here occur elsewhere in John's Gospel. Thus, John 11.47–52 functions to explicate these themes elsewhere in the Gospel and, conversely, the presence and function of these restoration themes elsewhere in the Gospel serve to further enlighten the nature of the argument of 11.47–52.[14] This study will show then that John 11.47–52 reveals a crucial function of restoration theology in the FG, namely, to interpret Jesus' death. W. Wilkens was certainly correct when he observed "dass in 11,47ff massgebliche Aussagen über das Verständnis des Todes Jesu im Johannesevangelium gemacht werden."[15] In light of the uniqueness of John 11.47–52 just outlined, this passage is an ideal one which allows the interpreter to "enter into" John's appropriation of restoration theology.[16]

1. Plan of the Study

The stated aim of this study is to investigate the presence and function of restoration theology in the FG *in the light of* John 11.47–52. This will be accomplished in the following steps. The remainder of this introductory chapter will describe the method and scope of the study. Chapter 1 surveys the scholarly approaches to John 11.47–53 and reveals the uniqueness of the present study. Chapter 2 investigates the function of 11.47–52 in the overall plot of the Gospel and the structure of the pericope's argument. I conclude that the opposition by the *Ioudaioi*[17] and

---

[14] There is always a reciprocal relationship between a given pericope and the larger narrative in which the pericope is found. One of the aims of this study is to unearth the relationship between the central motifs of 11.47–52 and other passages in the Gospel.

[15] W. Wilkens, *Zeichen und Werken: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des 4. Evangeliums in Erzählungs- und Redestoff* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1969), 72. Wilkens, however, assessed these "decisive statements" in a very different way than the present study does.

[16] The motifs of John 11.47–52 do not, of course, exhaust John's use of restoration theology.

[17] My procedure throughout this work is to use the term *Ioudaioi* rather than the translation "Jews." I do so because I am convinced that the term "Jew" is misleading in that its modern connotation does not correspond to the meaning of the term *Ioudaioi* in John's Gospel. In this regard, I follow the position of D. Boyarin, "The Ioudaioi in John and The Pre-History of Judaism," in *Pauline Conversations in Context: Essays in Honour of Calvin J. Roetzel* (ed. J.C. Anderson, P. Sellow and C. Setzer; JSNTSS 221; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), who argues that

their leaders to Jesus progressively increases throughout John's Gospel, climaxing in 11.47–53 where the Jewish leaders set into motion their concrete plan to put Jesus to death. Although the leaders think that their destruction of Jesus will save their "place" and "nation" from the Romans, the ideal reader knows that Jesus' death clearly did not prevent this disaster. Ironically, according to John, Jesus' death will save the "place" (or the Temple) and the "people," but in a way that the leaders could never have foreseen. In short, the argument and rhetoric of 11.47–53 is intended to reveal John's unique understanding of the effects of Jesus' death.

Chapter 3 attempts to hear the motifs of John 11.47–52 in their late first century Jewish setting. I argue that the motifs used to construct 11.47–52, namely, foreign domination, the threat of the destruction/perishing of the "place," "people," and "nation" combined with the restoration hope of the "gathering of the dispersed children of God into one," would have been heard in John's post-70 CE context as poignant references both to Israel's plight and Israel's restoration hopes: John has related the effects of Jesus' death to the plight and restoration of Israel. In doing so, John shows that Jesus' death, which is planned by the Jewish leadership in 11.47–50, does not indicate Jesus' defeat but, ironically, reverses the plight of Israel. This argument is particularly relevant in John's post-70 context when many Israelites were forced to rethink their identity in light of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as well as Israel's continuing dispersion, exile and domination.

In Chapter 4 we return to the text of the FG in order to investigate the motifs of John 11.47–52 in other key passages in the FG. Since the restoration motifs echoed in the argument of John 11.47–52 are used *in service of* communicating John's view of Jesus' death, chapter 4 studies other passages in the FG where the motifs of 11.47–52 are specifically present *in connection to* the death of Jesus. This chapter argues that the motifs that comprise the argument of 11.47–52 and explain John's understanding of Jesus' death are in fact present elsewhere in the Gospel. For instance, Jesus' death is presented as the event that breaks the true domination and oppression facing Israel (John 8 and 12). Jesus' death and resurrection establishes the eschatological dwelling "place" or "Temple" for the re-

---

Ioudaios in the Fourth Gospel is not equivalent with our modern term "Jew" (that is, it is not equivalent to the designations "Israelite," "member of the religion of 'Judaism'" or the like). The *Ioudaioi* in John comprise "a particular hegemonic sect of Jews…" (pp. 238-239). They are "the ancestors of the 'returnees' from Babylon or the elites who formed the confessional community of *Yahud* located in Judea and who very quickly clashed culturally and religiously with the Israelites who were "the people of the land" (pp. 224-225). Likewise, this is what I mean by the term *Ioudaioi* unless otherwise noted. With regard to the adjective "Jewish," my procedure will be to retain its use but with the important caveat that it may connote different entities: for instance, when I use "Jewish tradition/context/tradition/heritage/setting," I mean the broad Israelite setting or context (encompassing both Judean and other Israelite traditions including Galilee, Samaria and even the Diaspora) unless otherwise noted.

stored community (John 2.17–22; 4.10, 13; 14.2–23). The hope that the day of restoration would include a new arrival of the divine presence and/or Temple will be shown to have been widespread within Second Temple Judaism. John's view that, in Jesus' death and resurrection, the new "place" or Temple would be established for the restored community should be seen as his unique answer to this Second Temple Jewish expectation. Finally, it will be argued that Jesus' death effects the gathering of Israel (John 6; 12) and thereby reverses the dispersion and exile of God's people. Thus, the effect of Jesus' death as that which restores Israel is shown to be a consistent concern of the evangelist.

Chapter 5 demonstrates that the immediate pre-text of John 11.47–52, namely, John 9.1–11.44, reveals a concerted effort to portray Jesus as the restorer of Israel. John does this by means of restoration symbolism, signs, and second Exodus imagery, all of which are steeped in Old Testament/Jewish traditions and which would have made sense in a first century Jewish setting. In John 9–11, Jesus' restoration ministry is narrated in the context of Jewish opposition and division. After Jesus' greatest sign, the raising of Lazarus, Jewish opposition climaxes in the concrete plan to kill Jesus in 11.47–50, 53. Once again, it is this ultimate opposition to Jesus that ironically fulfills his restoration purposes for Israel.

In chapter 6 we enter back into the focus text in order to investigate, in a closer and more concerted way, the climax of 11.47–52, namely, John's interpretation of Caiaphas' words in vv.51–52. This will be done by studying the following key terms and concepts: "nation," "people," "gathering of the dispersed," and "children of God." The overarching goal will be to determine the Johannine meaning and referent of the "children of God who are dispersed" in 11.52b. In other words, whose restoration is in view in 11.52b?

After attempting to understand the function of the motifs in John 11.47–52 and particularly the terminology in 11.52b, the seventh chapter sets out to suggest a plausible social function for the unique use of restoration theology in John 11.47–52. This chapter highlights the fact that John's argument in 11.47–52 and particularly the use of restoration theology in it not only served a literary (i.e. Gospel narrative) function, but also a social function, that is, a legitimating function for the readers of the Gospel. The study comes to a close in chapter eight with a conclusion summarizing the principal results and suggesting some implications.

2. Methodological Considerations

2.1 Attempts at a Synthesis Between Synchronic and Diachronic Methods

The FG surely is the product of sources (which are not recoverable) and editorial activity to some degree. These facts are not irrelevant to the interpretation of the FG. The final form of the FG is also a narrative or story about the sig-

nificance of Jesus the Messiah, complete with plot and subplots, primary and secondary characters, literary techniques such as symbolism, foreshadowing, repetition, irony, chiasm, and inclusio. The FG as story has a narrative logic and unity in its own right apart from questions of sources, redaction, or compositional history. These "narrative features" of the FG must be taken seriously if we want to do justice to this Gospel.

The narrative of the FG was produced to address particular needs of real people in a real historical and social situation in the late first century CE and as such it is a product of its own time and milieu. Thus, attempting to understand the historical-social dimension, or better, the historical-social function of the FG is crucial to understanding the text. These brief comments reveal the method used in the present study, namely, a synthesis between narrative and historical-contextual approaches. Thus, it may be helpful at this point to briefly survey a few recent studies that similarly combine these two methods and the rationale for doing so.

In the wake of dissatisfaction with the *de*-historicizing approaches of some narrative-critics[18] and (what some perceive as) the over-interpretation of J.L. Martyn's[19] historical reconstructions, many scholars are seeing the need for a combination of synchronic and diachronic approaches in an effort to do justice to a work that is both a *narrative* and a product of a socio-historical context. J.A. Du Rand reflects this impulse:

> The historical information on the possible socio-cultural setting of the Johannine community (although hypothetical) should be linked up with the text-immanent analyses. To bind the text together, its cohesion and coherence on the surface level should be analysed to respond methodologically to the syntactic dimension. The logical and temporal relations underlying the text form the conceptual patterns of the semantic organisation of the text, and the pragmatic dimension, then, makes use of the syntactic and semantic analysis and describes the meaning to be materialised in the relation between narrator and audience.[20]

M. Stibbe seems to be the first scholar to have employed in a systematic fashion a method that unites literary and socio-historical approaches. In direct opposition to Culpepper's de-historicizing tendency, Stibbe wished "to introduce a form of narrative criticism which does full justice to John as a first-century narrative by taking into account historical questions concerning sources and community."[21]

Stibbe also distinguishes his method from redaction-critical studies that tend to allegorize details of the FG into incidents from the community's reconstructed

---

[18] Particularly the approach of R. A. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

[19] J.L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968, [2]1979).

[20] Du Rand, "A Synchronic and Narratological Reading of John 10 in Coherence with Chapter 9," in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context* (ed. J. Beutler and R.T. Fortna; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 96.

[21] M. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS 73; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 12.

history. Stibbe suggests "a more cautious method in which rigorous literary analysis and sociological explanation work together in harmony."[22] Concretely, "this means to begin with a close analysis of the language in the narrative and then infer its plausible sociological function in the Johannine *Sitz im Leben*."[23]

S. Motyer's study, *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and "the Jews*,"[24] similarly attempts to combine narrative and historical criticism. In Motyer's attempt to elucidate the FG's polemic against "the Jews," he argues for a method that takes the text seriously as a narrative story or "address" to a real historical and social context. Motyer's method then is a combination of narrative criticism which seeks to understand the narrative dimension of the text and historical criticism that studies the situation in which and for which the narrative was intended to be read. Although Motyer recognizes that source-criticism "is a central feature of any historical approach," in the end, he does "not tackle it on the ground that the historical setting and function of the final form of the text represents a self-contained and legitimate study of quite sufficient proportions!"[25]

Motyer turns to J.D.G. Dunn[26] for further refinements to his method. Dunn suggests a method that first situates the Gospel in the broad late first century Jewish setting. This includes seeking for "points of sensitivity" within the text – "points at which an effort is evidently being made to clarify some confusion or to counter opposing views."[27] In contradistinction to the approach of Martyn, Dunn and Motyer rightly broaden the study of the FG's background to include an "awareness of where the concerns of the Gospel seem to lie, to look at the broad scene in which it seems to be at home" – namely, late first century Judaism.[28] In other words, Dunn and Motyer are not content to reconstruct the social setting of the FG on the basis of a methodological movement that begins with forming a theory about the social setting of the FG from what they find in the text and then inferring this theory *onto* a hypothetical social location of the Johannine community. This leads to undue selectivity both regarding what is judged to be "evidence" in the text and what is considered to be background evidence crucial to

---

[22] Ibid., 148.

[23] Ibid.

[24] S. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and "the Jews"* (PBTM; Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1997). See also Motyer, "Method in Fourth Gospel Studies: A Way Out of the Impasse?" *JSNT* 66 (1997), 27-44.

[25] Ibid., 32. Motyer's method, like Stibbe's, has affinities with the sociological approaches of T. Onuki, *Gemeinde und Welt im Johannesevangelium* (WMANT 56; Neukirchen: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1984) and D. Rensberger, *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988) in that they attempt to understand the social function of the final form of the FG.

[26] Dunn, "Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time," in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982* (ed. P. Stuhlmacher; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 309-339.

[27] Ibid., 318.

[28] Motyer, *Your Father*, 33.

confirm the theory.[29] What is needed according to Motyer and Dunn is for the interpretive net to be cast much more broadly by making use of *all* of the available information we have about the needs, anxieties, concerns and broad situation of late first century Judaism. When this is done only then can we be reasonably confident that our "net" has not been obscured by scholarly shortsightedness or unsound use of inference. The conviction that underlies this assumption is that only "by uncovering its [FG] historical context can we hope to hear it as the first readers were intended to hear it, the allusions and nuances as well as the explicit teaching."[30] This is precisely the conviction that underlies the present study.

2.2 The Method and Scope of the Study

As I have mentioned, this study will make use of a method that combines narrative-critical and historical-contextual approaches. In this regard, my method has close affinities with Stibbe, Dunn, and particularly Motyer. As such, the method of this study attempts to take seriously the final form[31] of John's Gospel *and* the historical context which this Gospel was intended to address. This combination of approaches is particularly suited to my purposes since I attempt to understand John's restoration theology (both as it is used in John 11.47–52 and other key places in the Gospel) as it would have likely been *heard* in its late first century Jewish context.[32] The method therefore aims at a sensible dialectical conversation between the FG and its broad social-historical background. M.A. Elliott has described well this dialectical relationship between text and background and its importance for exegesis as follows: "There is a kind of circularity involved in exegeting historical texts: the texts throw light on the background, which throws light on the texts, which shed still more light on the background, and so on."[33]

---

[29] Ibid., 28-30.

[30] Dunn, "Let John Be John," 295.

[31] As represented by the text of NA^{27}.

[32] A similar type of *hearing* or *listening* method is employed by T. Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1–42* (WUNT 2/31; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988). She states: "Contextual study may be described as a 'listening approach' in that it lets the Gospel dictate its own hermeneutical principles and pays attention to the different levels of Johannine rhetoric briefly surveyed above. Thus, the method fosters attention not only to what is being said in the text, but, most importantly, to how and, ultimately, to why. The 'why' belongs on the level of speculation and can only be inferred from the 'what' and the 'how' in corroboration with other possible contemporary evidence which may lie outside the Gospel itself. In the last analysis, therefore, the contextual method is essentially a synchronic approach since it seeks to coordinate the different levels of meaning, the literary and the theological, the historical and the hermeneutical, with a view to offering a unified interpretation of the Evangelist's conception of mission" (51).

[33] Elliott, *Survivors of Israel*: A *Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000), 187.

In addition, the method of this study also has a necessary theological component since the FG is fundamentally a *theological* text.[34] In this regard I agree with the assessment of S. Hamid-Khani when he states that the FG was written out of deep theological concerns. The Jewish and Christian Scriptures

> were written to say something about God, something about humans and their relation to their creator and, with these in the background, something about the way humans ought to relate to each other. The fundamental moving dynamic and impetus behind these writings were theological, spiritual, and moral concerns.[35]

The Fourth Evangelist made his reasons for writing clear enough: ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύ(ς)ητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ (John 20.31). Thus, it is in light of this theological conviction that the FG in general, its individual pericopai, and its restoration theology in particular should be understood.

The combination of narrative and historical methodologies has the following implications for how I approach the text of John. First, I assume a fundamental unity of the final form of the FG. Regardless of the possible composition history and sources[36] behind the FG, the fact remains that there seems to be a fairly widespread opinion that the FG is stylistically "cut from the one cloth"[37] and that the compositional integrity can be assumed.[38] Additionally, approaching the Gospel as a unified whole both coheres with its genre as biography[39] and provides a much more secure object of study as opposed to the often speculative nature of source and redaction theories. Thus, whatever possible meaning and function the FG's material may have had in prior contexts, its meaning in the present form of the Gospel will be my focus.[40] In light of this methodological approach, this study is not concerned with the issues of tradition and redaction criticism since my narrative approach assumes the unity of the Fourth Gospel. It must be made clear

---

[34] I do not want to give the impression here that narrative, social-historical and *theological* aspects of the text are easily separable. Theology is obviously also part of the dialectical relationship between texts and historical-social background.

[35] Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT 2/120; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 21.

[36] See G. 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).

[37] D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According John* (IVP. Leicester/Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1991), 41.

[38] M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (Philadelphia: SCM, 1989), 89-92; Nicholson, *Death as Departure*, 14-17; R. Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology* (SBLDS 67; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 3-4.

[39] See R.A. Burridge, "About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (ed. R. Bauckham; Grand Rapids, Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 127.

[40] Thus, I assume the present form of the Gospel is the work of one hand. This "one hand" is referred to throughout the study as "John," "the Evangelist," "the author." For my purposes, "John" and the "narrator" are also used interchangeably.

however that this approach does not mean to suggest that the methods of tradition and redaction criticism are of no use in the interpretation of the FG. Rather, these methods are simply not immediately relevant for the purposes of the present study.

Second, my historical-contextual reading of the FG focuses on the OT and Second Temple Judaism as the background and interpretive soil in which the Gospel took shape. This is justified on two fronts. There is a general consensus that the core of the Johannine tradition derives from Palestine[41] [in the academic sense of Judea, Galilee, Samaria], and that the provenance of the finished Gospel is a Diaspora context,[42] specifically, the late first century Diaspora synagogue.[43] Furthermore, there is likewise a consensus that the thought-world of John's Gospel is profoundly Jewish and entrenched in the OT.[44] These assumptions will be validated throughout the study. However, this does not mean to suggest that reading John against the background of other NT texts and particularly the Synoptics would be an invalid enterprise. Rather, comparing John's use of restoration theology with the rest of the NT may in fact reveal profound insights into the FG. However, due to the limitations of this study, I shall not consider the rest of the NT in the scope of the present investigation.

I have attempted to approach this study thoroughly in view of its limited aims (namely, to elucidate John's restoration theology in and through 11.47–52). Nevertheless, many important exegetical details and issues regarding 11.47–52 and

---

[41] Evans, *Word and Glory*, 147-150; W.H. Brownlee, "Whence the Gospel of John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C.H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 166-94; G. Quispel, "Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 137-55; J.H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3.13–4.26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 15 (1969), 105; Brown, *John*, I.LIX-LXI; Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 423; K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958), 131-33.

[42] Brown, *John*, I.CIII; Evans, *Word and Glory*, 146-150.

[43] See J.J. Kanagaraj, *"Mysticism" in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background* (JSNTSS 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 13; J.L. Martyn, "A Gentile Mission that Replaced an Earlier Jewish Mission?" in *Exploring the Gospel of John* (ed. R.A. Culpepper and C. Clifton Black; Louisville: John Knox, 1996), 125; J. Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991); K. Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: ein Versuch über das Johannesevangeluum* (München: Kaiser, 1990), 75-104; Evans, *Word and Glory*, 146-150; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco, TX.: Word, 1986), xlviii.; Brown, *John*, I.CIII; R. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), 147-172; idem, "The Gospel of John," *ABD* 3 (1992), 912-931; S. Pancaro, "Relationship of the Church to Israel," *NTS* 21 (1975), 402-403; D. Moody Smith, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1984), 181-182; W.C. Van Unnik, "The Purpose of John's Gospel," in *Studia Evangelica* (ed. K. Aland, F.L. Cross, J. Danielou et al.; Berlin: Akademie, 1959), 410.

[44] See particularly the study of Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment.*

Index of Ancient Sources

1. Old Testament

2. Old Testament Apocrypha

3. Pseudepigrapha

4. New Testament

5. Qumran

6. Josephus

7. Philo

8. Rabbinic Writings and Related Literature

9. Targums

10. Samaritan Traditions

11. Early Christian and Gnostic Writings

Selective Index of Modern Authors

Index of Subjects

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Alphabetical Index of the First and Second Series

Elledge, C.D.: Life after Death in Early Judaism. 2006. *Volume II/208.*
Ellis, E. Earle: Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. 1978. *Volume 18.*
– The Old Testament in Early Christianity. 1991. *Volume 54.*
Endo, Masanobu: Creation and Christology. 2002. *Volume 149.*
Ennulat, Andreas: Die 'Minor Agreements'. 1994. *Volume II/62.*
Ensor, Peter W.: Jesus and His 'Works'. 1996. *Volume II/85.*
Eskola, Timo: Messiah and the Throne. 2001. *Volume II/142.*
– Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology. 1998. *Volume II/100.*
Fatehi, Mehrdad: The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul. 2000. *Volume II/128.*
Feldmeier, Reinhard: Die Krisis des Gottessohnes. 1987. *Volume II/21.*
– Die Christen als Fremde. 1992. *Volume 64.*
Feldmeier, Reinhard and *Ulrich Heckel* (Ed.): Die Heiden. 1994. *Volume 70.*
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T.: Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology. 1997. *Volume II/94.*
Förster, Niclas: Marcus Magus. 1999. *Volume 114.*
Forbes, Christopher Brian: Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment. 1995. *Volume II/75.*
Fornberg, Tord: see *Fridrichsen, Anton.*
Fossum, Jarl E.: The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. 1985. *Volume 36.*
Foster, Paul: Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel. *Volume II/177.*
Fotopoulos, John: Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth. 2003. *Volume II/151.*
Frenschkowski, Marco: Offenbarung und Epiphanie. Volume 1 1995. *Volume II/79* – Volume 2 1997. *Volume II/80.*
Frey, Jörg: Eugen Drewermann und die biblische Exegese. 1995. *Volume II/71.*
– Die johanneische Eschatologie. Volume I. 1997. *Volume 96.* – Volume II. 1998. *Volume 110.* – Volume III. 2000. *Volume 117.*
Frey, Jörg and *Udo Schnelle (Ed.):* Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums. 2004. *Volume 175.*
– and *Jens Schröter* (Ed.): Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament. 2005. *Volume 181.*
Freyne, Sean: Galilee and Gospel. 2000. *Volume 125.*
Fridrichsen, Anton: Exegetical Writings. Edited by C.C. Caragounis and T. Fornberg. 1994. *Volume 76.*
Gäbel, Georg: Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes. 2006. *Volume II/212.*
Gäckle, Volker: Die Starken und die Schwachen in Korinth und in Rom. 2005. *Volume 200.*
Garlington, Don B.: 'The Obedience of Faith'. 1991. *Volume II/38.*
– Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance. 1994. *Volume 79.*
Garnet, Paul: Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. 1977. *Volume II/3.*
Gemünden, Petra von (Ed.): see *Weissenrieder, Annette.*
Gese, Michael: Das Vermächtnis des Apostels. 1997. *Volume II/99.*
Gheorghita, Radu: The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews. 2003. *Volume II/160.*
Gräbe, Petrus J.: The Power of God in Paul's Letters. 2000. *Volume II/123.*
Gräßer, Erich: Der Alte Bund im Neuen. 1985. *Volume 35.*
– Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte. 2001. *Volume 137.*
Green, Joel B.: The Death of Jesus. 1988. *Volume II/33.*
Gregg, Brian Han: The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q. 2005. *Volume II/207.*
Gregory, Andrew: The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus. 2003. *Volume II/169.*
Grindheim, Sigurd: The Crux of Election. 2005. *Volume II/202.*
Gundry, Robert H.: The Old is Better. 2005. *Volume 178.*
Gundry Volf, Judith M.: Paul and Perseverance. 1990. *Volume II/37.*
Häußer, Detlef: Christusbekenntnis und Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus. 2006. *Volume 210.*
Hafemann, Scott J.: Suffering and the Spirit. 1986. *Volume II/19.*
– Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel. 1995. *Volume 81.*
Hahn, Ferdinand: Studien zum Neuen Testament. Volume I: Grundsatzfragen, Jesusforschung, Evangelien. 2006. *Volume 191.* – Volume II: Bekenntnisbildung und Theologie in urchristlicher Zeit. 2006. *Volume 192.*
Hahn, Johannes (Ed.): Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. 2002. *Volume 147.*
Hamid-Khani, Saeed: Relevation and Concealment of Christ. 2000. *Volume II/120.*
Hannah, Darrel D.: Michael and Christ. 1999. *Volume II/109.*
Harrison; James R.: Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context. 2003. *Volume II/172.*
Hartman, Lars: Text-Centered New Testament Studies. Ed. von D. Hellholm. 1997. *Volume 102.*
Hartog, Paul: Polycarp and the New Testament. 2001. *Volume II/134.*
Heckel, Theo K.: Der Innere Mensch. 1993. *Volume II/53.*
– Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium. 1999. *Volume 120.*

For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D–72010 Tübingen/Germany
Up-to-date information on the internet at www.mohr.de