While it is a tragic fact that the Gospel of John has contributed to anti-Semitism and religious violence during some chapters of Christian history, John is not anti-Semitic. It was written by a Jewish writer, about a Jewish messianic figure, targeted first toward convincing Jewish audiences that Jesus was indeed the Jewish Messiah. Salvation is “of the Jews,” according to the Johannine Jesus, and each of the “I-am” sayings embodies a classic representation of Israel. John is no more “anti-Semitic” than the Essene community or the prophetic work of John the Baptist. On the other hand, “the Jews” sometimes typify the unbelieving world and are portrayed as primary adversaries of Jesus and his followers, despite the fact that some are also presented as coming to faith in Jesus. The Ioudaioi in John can be seen to represent several associations, ranging from “the Judeans” (suggesting north-south divisions) to the religious leaders in Jerusalem (or locally in a diaspora setting), who actively oppose Jesus and the growth of his movement.

The main problem is with interpreting John wrongly or with allowing flawed interpretations to stand. When read correctly, the Fourth Gospel not only ceases to be a source of religious acrimony; it points the way forward for all seekers of truth to sojourn together, across the boundaries of religious movements, time, and space.

A few years ago on display at Yale’s Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library was the block-print collection of Fritz Eichenberg’s works, and of prime notoriety within the collection was a striking print of a Jewish Holocaust victim on a cross. This haunting image (“The Crucifixion,” 1980) highlights ironic tragedies on several levels, making its prophetic points along the way. The on-looking guard at the crucifixion is not a Roman soldier, but a Nazi SS officer. The Golgotha site is not a hill in Jerusalem, but a death camp adorned with jagged barbed wire in the foreground, a menacing guard-tower beacon in the background, and the names of eleven death camps posted on a signpost. Central within the print, however, is the tragic figure of a man on a cross wearing the Jewish Star of David on his jacket. As a Jewish European himself, Eichenberg not only portrays this figure as a tragic victim in the singular, but as a

1 This is an expanded edition of the essay by the same title in John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context, edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson, Resources for Biblical Study 87 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017) 265-311, without the appendices below and other sections. That book represents a state of the art collection of essays by an outstanding selection of international authorities, addressing an extremely important subject in contemporary society. These essays were presented at the “John and Judaism” held at the McAfee School of Theology, November 2015.

2 As important books and collections on the subject have shown: Culpepper 1987; Dunn 1991/2006; 1992; 1999; Kysar 1993; Rensberger 1999; Bieringer et al, eds. 2001; Reinhartz 2001abc; Lieu 2002; Pesch 2005; Heemstra 2009; Donaldson 2010; Trachtenberg 2012; van Belle 2013; Frey 2013g; Nicklas 2014.

3 Fritz Eichenberg, a Jewish German-American who escaped Germany in 1933, contributed dozens of wood-block ink prints to The Catholic Worker, edited by Dorothy Day. This image, first published in his Dance with Death (1983; cf. Ellsberg 2004, 95), is also featured online in Hammond 2000.
typological representation of the mass victimization of the Jewish nation at the hands of Nazi Germany in particular, condemning also Christians and others for their anti-Semitism on the global stage in general. Ironically, Jesus of Nazareth came to break the cycles of violence in the world, but movements in his name have too often dreadfully failed to carry out that mission faithfully.

“The Crucifixion”
It is a sad fact that just as the Old Testament conquest narratives have been wielded by interpreters somehow to overturn the clear teachings of Jesus on peace and nonviolence, the Gospels of Matthew and John have been used to instigate and further anti-Semitism and religious violence by Christians and others. The vexing presentations of “the Jews” as the killers of Jesus at the hands of the Romans in these two Gospels have become fodder for prejudicial platforms against those of Semitic origins, sometimes motivated by political or economic reasons, and the voices of the wise and the discerning have too often gone unheeded. This is terribly sad, given the tragic outcome for the Jewish nation and the history of religious violence in western society. One’s first reaction might thus favor banning these or other religious documents from the marketplace of ideas altogether. Censorship, however, would produce a new set of prejudicial disasters, as inquisitions and book-burning schemes always create more problems than they solve.

Questions remain, however, as to whether the Gospel of John was indeed anti-Semitic in its conception and development, or whether such is a flawed reading of the text altogether. Exegesis trumps eisegesis when it comes to the responsible interpretation of biblical texts, and especially on world-impacting subjects it deserves to be applied. The thesis of this essay is that while John has played a role in anti-Semitism and religious violence, such influences represent the distortion of this thoroughly Jewish piece of writing, which actually provides ways forward for all seekers of truth and inclusivity if interpreted adequately. The Fourth Gospel represents an intra-Jewish perspective, standing against violence and force, forwarding a universalist appeal to all seekers of truth, while also documenting the dialectical engagement between revelation and religion.

1. The Phenomenology of the Issue and Various Approaches

Of several approaches to the problem of the presentation of Ioudaios and hoi Ioudaioi in John, a variety of solutions have emerged. Given the facts that Jesus is undeniably presented as “a Jew” in John 4:9, that salvation is “of the Jews” (4:22), that the evangelist displays evidence of being Jewish, and that his goal is to show that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah/Christ—fulfilling Jewish scripture, it cannot be said that the Johannine narrative is ethnically anti-Semitic. Then again, the narrator shows Jesus referring to religious authorities as bound to “your law” in John 8:17 and 10:34, and to “their law” in 15:25, so some individuation between Jesus of Nazareth and religious authorities in Judea is suggested by the text. The question centers on the character of what that individuation

---

4 If the Johannine Gospel is concerned with the revelation of truth, such cannot be furthered by force or violence (with de la Potterie 2007). Thus, Miroslav Volf’s work on exclusion and embrace (1996, 264-68) and Stephen Motyer’s analysis of truth in John (2008, 163-67) see John’s promise of liberation and redemption (John 8:32) as being rooted in truth rather than force. On the conquest narratives, Jesus, and nonviolence, see Anderson 1994, 2004b, 2004c.

5 This comes close to Maurice Casey’s approach to the truth of John’s Gospel. In Casey’s view (1996), because John is anti-Semitic it conveys no historically worthy content regarding Jesus of Nazareth, and it is to be disregarded by all persons with moral sensibilities and historical interests. Of course, Casey’s first inference is flawed exegetically (Just 1999), and few of his other views are critically compelling.

6 For instance, if references to “your” and “their” law represent John’s total rejection of the Torah and thus Judaism (Ashton 2007, 23), why does John’s story of Jesus feature no fewer than a dozen references to central passages from the Torah being fulfilled in Jesus, either typologically or prophetically (see below,
might have been, how it developed, and whether it reflects an intra-Jewish set of tensions or an extra-Jewish set of engagements between the emerging Jesus movement and its parental Judaism.

One approach is to see the Gospel of John as theologically anti-Jewish. John’s presentation of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah is seen by some interpreters as Christian supersessionism. Jesus not only fulfills the typologies of Israel, but he virtually becomes the new Israel displacing the need for the other. Within this approach John is seen as being written against Jewish people and/or members of the Jewish religion, seeking to supplant one religion with another. Therefore, this form of anti-Semitism may or may not be ethnocentric, but it certainly is “religiocentric” for holders of this view. The problem with that, however, is that John’s soteriology is also a universal one. The light enlightens everyone (John 1:9), Jesus’s reign is one of truth (18:36-37), and the true sign of discipleship is love, which knows no religious bounds (13:34-35). Authentic worship is neither in Jerusalem nor Samaria; rather, it transcends particular religious forms, locations, and expressions (4:21-24). John’s presentation of Jesus as the Messiah shows the Revealer to be challenging all that is of human origin, including Christian religion and power, as well as Jewish and Roman renderings of the same. John’s Jesus sets up no cultic meals of remembrance (John 13), and he himself did not baptize, despite his followers’ having done so (4:2). Therefore, John’s Jesus challenges creaturely religious practices rather than setting up one religion over and against another. John’s scandal is not that it is supersessionist—challenging Judaism; it is that it is revelational, challenging all that is of human origin as an affront to human-made religion, proper.

A second approach is to read hoi Ioudaioi as a reference to “the Judeans” (southerners versus Samaritans or Galileans) within Palestine or the Levant in general. These themes thus represent a regional struggle between a province and the center of the Jewish religious and political world. Certainly, Jewish people traveled to and from Jerusalem, and extensive evidence in the text bolsters such a reading. The Jewish nation would obviously have thought of Jerusalem as its center, so “Jerusalecentrism” may be a helpful way to understand the Johannine use of the term Ioudaioi as referring to Judeans in particular, not Jews in general. Thus, the “Jerusalemites” (7:25) are presented among the “Judeans” who were seeking to kill Jesus (7:1, 19, 25). As a northern-Palestinian narrative about its Mosaic prophet having been rejected by the leaders in Judea, north-south dialogues certainly would have reflected also a variety of regional and ideological concerns. This approach works fairly well for most of John’s presentations of hoi Ioudaioi, and this is where most of the Johannine analysis should focus its attention. Yet, associations extend beyond Judean-Galilean regional struggles to larger issues of centralized religion versus its challenges from the periphery. As with the rich and poignant tradition of the Jewish prophets before Jesus’s day, Jesus is not the first progressive figure to encounter an uneven reception at the center of Jerusalem’s religious elite. Thus, John’s north-south tensions reflect a series of dialectical engagements between the cult-oriented center of Jerusalem-based religion and the charisma-oriented periphery of first-century Galilean Judaism.

A third approach is to take hoi Ioudaioi to mean “particular Jewish authorities” who wanted to do away with Jesus, described as a struggle between the unauthorized

Appendix III)? According to Manns (1988, 30), despite the fact that John’s Jesus seems to distance himself from Jewish leaders, Jesus is still presented as fulfilling the heart of Jewish ideals.
prophet and official religious authorities. It certainly appears to be the case that in John (as well as in the other Gospels) religious authorities are presented as the ones most threatened by Jesus. Whether he was challenging their religious institutions, such as temple worship and its sacrificial systems (let alone the money-changing operations), or challenging the legalistic approaches to the Mosaic Law erected by scripture lawyers and scribes, Jesus is indeed remembered as evoking controversy among the religious leaders of his day. In that sense, John’s story of Jesus reflects an autonomous historical memory of the ministry and last days of Jesus, developed in theological reflection. Thus, Jerusalem’s Chief Priests, rulers, and Pharisees demand to know Jesus’s authorization, which leads to pointed debates over Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic authority. Then again, even in the way Caiaphas, the chief priests, the Pharisees, and the called council are presented, betrays political interests. Their willingness to "sacrifice" the Galilean prophet reflects an endeavor to prevent a Roman backlash against the Jewish populace (11:45-53). And of course, Judean-Galilean tensions between the Jesus movement and the Jerusalem authorities did not begin with his ministry or end with his death. Regional tensions are clear in the Johannine narrative, and later struggles between followers of Jesus and Jewish authorities are by no means late and only late. The ways that these groups are portrayed in John as being threatened by Jesus and his followers, including their reactions, might even reflect several phases of debates within the developing Johannine tradition, as Urban von Wahlde, Raymond Brown, and others have suggested.⁷

A fourth approach considers the presentation of religious authorities in John as narrative characters who represent the ambivalent relationships with local Jewish authorities by Johannine Christians in a diaspora setting, as they sought to convince family and friends that Jesus was indeed the Jewish Messiah, sometimes to no avail. This would involve a reflection of evolving religious dialogues within Johannine history and theology—a multi-level reading of the text. Plausibly, post-70 CE Johannine Christianity may originally have had a home within one or more synagogue communities within a Hellenistic setting, leading to some followers of Jesus being eventually distanced from the synagogue (aposynagōgos; cf. John 9:22; 12:42; 16:2) because of their willingness to confess Jesus openly. The Birkat ha-Minim (the curse against the heretics, effecting removal from the synagogue followers of “the Nazarene”) likely represents an orthodox attempt to discipline perceived ditheism within the Jesus movement, even if the primary interest was something short of expelling all Jesus adherents from all local synagogues. Such a view overstates likely realities. However, when Jesus adherents became distanced

⁷ In Brown’s paradigm (Brown 1979, 2003), the pre-Gospel stage of John’s composition involved tensions between Judeans, Samaritans, and Galileans (ca. 50-80 CE), while the stage in which the Gospel was written involved at least six sets of dialogues within the Johannine situation (ca. 90 CE): dialogues with “the world” (unbelieving Gentiles), “the Jews” (members of local synagogues), adherents of John the Baptist (even in Asia Minor), those Brown calls “crypto-Christians” (ones who remained in the synagogue as secret believers in Jesus), those he calls “Jewish Christian churches of inadequate faith” (those not accepting the divinity of Jesus or the eucharist as the true flesh and blood of Jesus) and “apostolic Christians” (Petrine-hierarchy institutional Christian leaders, who did not appreciate the spiritual work of the risen Christ through the Paraclete). Von Wahlde (1979, 1996, 2000, 2010a) sees gradations of difference between the ways that religious leaders are portrayed in John, arguing that the earliest edition of John referred to Jewish leaders as “Pharisees,” “Chief Priests,” and “rulers,” while the second edition referred to the adversaries of Jesus as the loudaioi. The latter term represents engagements with local synagogue leaders in the Johannine situation, according to von Wahlde’s paradigm.
from local synagogues and joined in with local Gentile believers in Jesus, it appears that some of them were courted back into the synagogue on the basis of Mosaic authority and Abrahamic blessing—contingent upon their diminishing or denying their belief in Jesus as the Messiah/Christ. This appears to represent the schism in the Johannine situation reported in 1 John 2:18-25.\textsuperscript{8} From this perspective, the narration of Jewish leaders’ acceptances and rejections of Jesus in earlier time periods served to explain how things had come to be the way they were in later generations, including the inconceivable theological problem of how Jewish leaders would continue to reject their own Jewish Messiah.\textsuperscript{9}

A fifth approach is to view John’s presentation of \textit{hoi Ioudaioi} as archetypes of the unbelieving world: \textit{ho kosmos}. As the Revealer from God, Jesus reveals nothing except that he is from God (according to Rudolf Bultmann\textsuperscript{10}), and this brings a crisis of faith for the world. Humans must be willing to accept the Revealer, but in doing so, they must forfeit their attachments to creaturely wisdom and the worldly scaffolding of human-made religion. Therefore, inauthentic existence is replaced by authentic, believing response to the divine initiative, and this is the \textit{crisis} effected by the Incarnation. The Jewish leaders opposing Jesus in the Johannine narrative thus represent human hopes in creaturely sufficiency, complete with its conventional successes, and this is why “the world” finds the coming of Christ an offense and a scandal. In this sense, the Johannine critique of \textit{hoi Ioudaioi} implies more than a contextual critique of religious antipathy to Johannine believers; it more generally and universally denotes the confrontation of humanity’s devised religious approaches to God by the eschatological advent of the Revealer. If the divine initiative scandalizes all that is of human origin—religious and political ventures that are creaturely in their character rather than of divine origin—the Johannine Jesus as the Christ must be seen as confronting Christian scaffolding and investments as well as Jewish and Roman ones. As the universal light, available to all (John 1:9), Jesus comes as the light illuminating those who walk in darkness (8:12; 9:5; 11:9), but they also must respond to the light even if it exposes the creaturely character of their platforms (3:18-21). In that sense, Jesus as the life-producing “bread” brings a crisis to the world: a crisis of decision as to whether one will make a stand for or against the Revealer.\textsuperscript{11} And yet, as John is highly theological, its content cannot be divorced from its originative and developing contexts. Thus, abstraction and particularity in John are inextricably entwined.

A sixth approach is to see John as \textit{pro-Jewish}. After all, nearly all persons and groups mentioned in John, except for the Romans, are either Jewish or Semitic, and Jesus

\textsuperscript{8} Note the antichristic errors of interpretation, as well as the distinctive errors of the Johannine Antichrists. Anderson 2007d, 2007e.

\textsuperscript{9} This is precisely the sort of issue faced by Paul a generation earlier in his writing of Rom 9-11, as Krister Stendahl’s treatment of Paul among the Jews and the Gentiles reminds us (1976), although the tables by now have been turned. Instead of Gentiles feeling inferior to more established Jewish members of the Jesus movement, the Johannine Gospel asserts the Jewishness of Jesus for the benefit of his audiences, whether they be Jewish or Gentile.

\textsuperscript{10} Jesus is the Revealer without a revelation (Bultmann 1955, 66); it is the “that-ness” (\textit{die Dass}) of God’s saving-revealing activity that calls for a response to the divine initiative rather than being concerned with the “how” or the “wherefore.” Or, as de la Potterie (1997, 78) puts it, “John’s theology is above all a theology of revelation.”

\textsuperscript{11} Thus, Jesus’s claiming to be the life-producing bread in John 6:35 invites audiences to make a stand “for or against the Revealer” (Bultmann 1971, 213).
is presented pervasively as the Jewish Messiah-Christ. Jesus is Jewish, and so are all of his disciples; those touched by his ministry—whom he heals, teaches, feeds, and challenges—are all Semitic or Jewish. While some of the Ioudaioi in Jerusalem mount opposition to Jesus, many of them also believe in him, and this fact has gone strangely unnoticed among several interpreters. Further, some leaders among “the Jews” also come to believe in Jesus, and others offer support to the grieving family of Lazarus. Even the Samaritans receive Jesus as the Messiah and welcome him to stay with them; despite his rejection in Nazareth as presented in Mark 6, many receive him in Capernaum—even within the household of the royal official (John 4:43-54). Greeks desire to meet Jesus in John 12:20-26, and this fulfills his sense of mission, as the blessings of Abraham are availed to the world. Climactically, the fulfilled word of Caiaphas, that the sacrifice of Jesus would gather the scattered children of God in the diaspora, is presented as an unwitting prophecy by the High Priest in John 11:49-52, extending the blessings of Judaism to the world. Therefore, while some of “his own” rejected Jesus as the Christ, as many as received him are welcomed into the divine family as children of God simply by believing in his name (John 1:10-13).

In addition to these particular approaches, it could be that hoi Ioudaioi in John can be used meaningfully in more than one of these categories, or that there may be other ways of understanding the use of the term in John besides the above options. Adequate interpretation of John and Judaism would thus involve a synthesis of multiple factors, and it is likely that at different stages of its development the Johannine tradition possessed distinctive approaches to the Ioudaioi in the Johannine situation. Thus, the literary contexts of the term’s usage must be considered in the light of what may be inferred about the history of the text and the history of the Johannine situation before constructing an exegetical appraisal of the best meaning(s) of the term originally, and thus for later generations. This forces an evaluation also of the history of interpretation, and it calls interpreters to make responsible judgments regarding the adequacy of interpretive applications in later generations.

2. Religious Violence as a Flawed Interpretation of John

While religious violence has sometimes been evoked by distortive readings of the Gospels, Jesus commands Peter to put away the sword in John 18:11, just as he does in the Synoptics (Matt 26:52; Luke 22:38). And, while John’s Jesus is portrayed as driving sheep and cattle with a whip of cords, the dove sellers are expelled with words, not force—not exactly a license for resorting to physical violence, and certainly not lethal force, against humans (John 2:15-16). Further, Jesus declares that his kingdom is one of truth; it is not of this world, which explains why his disciples cannot fight (John 18:36-37). It is not that truth may not be furthered by violence, a factor of permission; it cannot

---

12 As demonstrated below, in over a dozen instances Jews in Jerusalem are presented as believing in Jesus in the Gospel of John. While Griffith (2008) suggests that some of these may have turned away, accounting for some of the Johannine acrimony, the link between John 6:60-71 and 8:31-59 is not entirely certain; nonetheless, echoes of 1 John 2:18-25 are palpable in the narration of John 6:66 (Anderson 1996, 258).

13 And, there may also have been disagreements in the late first century as to what it meant to be Jewish—full stop (see Cohen 1993; 1999). In de Boer’s view, while issues of identity and behavior would also have been key (2001), there might have been disagreement over those very measures. Therefore, confusion in later generations of interpretation may reflect a historic reality: things were confusing back then, as well.
be furthered by violence, a factor of possibility. Rather, truth is furthered by
convincement, not coercion, and the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of truth—convicts persons of
sin, righteousness, and judgment (John 16:8). The truth is always liberating (John 8:32).
Yes, John’s narrative carries a good deal of religious invective—a factor of heated
debates with religious leaders in Jerusalem and/or a diaspora setting—but one must go
against the clearly counter-violent presentation of Jesus in John to embrace any form of
religious violence. Therefore, resorting to violence cannot be supported by an
exegetically faithful reading of the Gospel of John. It goes directly against the Johannine
stance against violence, corroborated also by the clear teachings of Jesus in the
Synoptics.14

A further consideration involves John’s presentation of Jesus as combatting the
spiral of violence of his day, every bit as pointedly as does the Jesus of the Synoptics.15
From the perspective of Jonathan Bernier, a strong case can be built that the issues related
to the aposynagōgos passages of John 9:22; 12:42; 16:2 were early rather than late.
According to Bernier, they reflect tensions in Jerusalem rather than in the diaspora, and
they are political in character rather than theological. Following the insurrection in
Sepphoris—near Nazareth—after the death of Herod in 4 BCE, when Judas the son of
Hezekiah raided Herod’s palace and confiscated weapons, Varus of Syria marched in,
putting down the rebellion and crucifying 2,000 Jews (Josephus, Antiquities 17.10.10;
Wars 2.5.2). A decade or so later, when Judas the Galilean launched a revolt against
Roman monetary taxation, founding the “fourth philosophy” Zealot movement, political
tensions again arose in Galilee. Therefore, the Birkat ha-Minim may have emerged as a
disciplining of perceived zealotry within Judean synagogues, lest as Caiaphas worried in
John 11:48-50, the Romans should step in and “destroy our place and nation.” Indeed, the
Birkat is clearly referenced later in Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho (ca. 150 CE), where
curses against Christians in the synagogues are referenced half a dozen times or so.16
And, Gamaliel II is associated with introducing the Birkat during the Jamnia period (70-
90 CE), but those later tensions with followers of the Nazarene (Jesus) may have
originated with concerns over Roman retaliation against messianic pretenders such as
Judas the Galilean, the Samaritan, Theudas, or the Egyptian.17

That being the case, the nearness of the Passover in John 2:13; 6:4; 11:55 is not
mentioned with theological significance in mind, but it references political tensions
related to Roman sensitivities regarding Jewish uprisings during Judaism’s greatest
nationalistic celebration, the Passover.18 In John 2 Jesus predicts the tearing down of the
temple and its rebuilding—a reference nonetheless to the resurrection and not the
temple’s eventual destruction in 70 CE. In John 6:14-15 the crowd wishes to rush Jesus
off for a hasty coronation as a prophet-king like Moses—an honor Jesus eludes by

15 Richard Horsley (1987) argues compellingly that Jesus of Nazareth sought to reverse spirals of violence
demic in the Levant over this period of time. Walter Wink (1992) contributed particular understandings
to how Jesus offered a “third way” in dealing with the fight-flight dichotomies of domination (Anderson
2014c, 34-38.
16 Horbury 1998.
17 This represents a more dialectical view of the Johannine-Jewish history of engagement in longitudinal
perspective. Rather than seeing the issue as being early only (Bernier 2013) or late only (Martyn 1968), it
may have involved earlier and later engagements, even over different issues (Anderson 2014, 52-55, 133).
escaping into the hills. In John 11 Caiaphas and the chief priests “sacrifice” Jesus politically as a means of staving off a Roman backlash (vv. 48, 50). Despite these politically laden tensions, however, John’s Jesus eschews violence and popularistic acclaim. Rather, he confronts authorities—both Jewish and Roman—by appealing to truth. He offers his followers unworldly peace (14:27), not a worldly kingdom (18:36-37). In post-resurrection appearances, Jesus then bestows peace upon his followers (20:19, 21, 26), and as Jesus’s kingdom is one of truth, despite tribulation experienced in the world, his disciples are promised peace because he has overcome the world (16:33). Therefore, on the basis of a clear and straightforward reading of the text, one cannot adequately base violent actions upon the presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel; to do so violates the text exegetically.

3. Anti-Semitism as a Flawed Interpretation of John

Despite the fact of John’s contributing to anti-Semitism, this is not to say that such is a sole or even a primary cause of anti-Semitism. It is to say, however, that unwittingly or otherwise, anti-Semitic attitudes have either emerged from readings of John or have resulted in the employment of John to support anti-Semitic agendas. It is a troubling fact, for instance, that Martin Luther’s theologization of “the Jews” as villains of the faith contributed to German anti-Jewish sentiments and preaching, which later played roles in the tragic unfolding of the Holocaust. And Luther, of course, is not alone in that matter. Samuel Sandmel reminds us of the anecdote he heard as a child: a man was beating up on Jewish people after attending a Christian worship service. When a policeman stopped him and asked him why he was doing so, he replied, “Because the Jews killed Christ.” The policeman said, “But that was 2,000 years ago,” to which the man responded, “That may be so, but I just heard about it today!”

This story points to problems of contemporary influence regardless of what a biblical text originally meant, and what it authentically means hence. It is what people make of a text and what people do in response to their understandings of it that present real problems, not just imaginary ones. A further distortion continues, however, in that some Christian catechisms have included derogatory portrayals of “the Jews” as a feature of theological anti-Semitism with profound sociological implications. The Jewish “law” is juxtaposed to the grace of God availed through Christ (1:17), and Christians all too often bolster their religious commitments by disparaging other religions, including their parental Jewish faith. My contention is that such approaches misunderstand what the

---

19 Indeed, anti-Jewish measures precede Christianity by many centuries (cf. 2 Macc 6), and even in the Common Era, anti-Semitic thrusts have come from many directions besides Christian ones. See, for instance, John Gager’s book on the origins of anti-Semitism exogenous to Christianity as well as endogenous to it (Gager 1983). Roman anti-Semitism is also apparent in John and in other Greco-Roman sources (Meeks 1975; Daniel 1979). On Luther’s anti-Semitism and its trajectories of influence, however, see Töllner 2007 and Probst 2012.
20 Probst 2012.
22 For the devastating ecumenical implications of theological anti-Semitism see Banki 1984, Leibig 1983, and Reuther 1979. Then again, the best hope for building better ecumenical and interfaith relations hinges upon clarifying what the Gospel of John is saying, as well as what it is not; see Knight 1968; Cargas 1981; Cook 1987; Kysar 1993; Beck 1994.
New Testament writings are claiming with regard to Jesus and to Judaism. All of its writers were Jewish, and to develop out of them an anti-Jewish worldview goes against the religion of Jesus, Paul, John and the heart of the New Testament. Jesus, Paul, and John were thoroughly *Jewish*—full stop. Thus, anti-Semitism among Christians might not have primarily emerged from reflective Bible study or exegetically adequate Christian teaching. More often than is acknowledged, anti-Semitism has been evoked from nonreligious sources, and for political or economic reasons that are then supported by the flawed citing of scripture or religious stances. Likewise, those disparaging Christianity might do so for political rather than religious reasons, so the fact of political and economic intrusions into religious dialogues and interfaith discussions merits critical analysis.

A less-obvious-yet-sinister fact thus involves the wrestling and employment of religious authority or motifs for the purposes of co-opting society into the toleration of, and even the conducting of, evil. Here religion itself becomes both a *pawn* and a *victim*, and in particular, the Gospel of John. Religious and nonreligious leaders alike resort to yoking sources of rhetorical equity to their programs, and religious authority is all too easily co-opted unwittingly. “God, Mom, and apple pie” get yoked to war efforts and marshaled nationalism, but is apple pie really the cause of militarism? Of course not, and neither are mothers or God. Thus, the authority of religion in general, and Fourth Gospel in particular, get used as pawns by the cunning in ways that are often undetected. Religious people must be skeptical of such ploys, especially because the religious tend to be more trusting, and uncritically so. Politically motivated leaders have and always will yoke religious values to their causes, whether or not they are personally religious, using societal authority to motivate audiences to do their bidding. This is especially the case if it involves the exalting of the home group and the villainizing of others. Inevitably, when resorting to violence is then rightly criticized, those who have used religion as a pawn then tend to blame it as a scapegoat. In blaming religious values for atrocities otherwise legitimated by such persons, they deflect the blame away from themselves, hoping to emerge personally unscathed. Thus religion in general, and the Fourth Gospel in particular, get blamed as scapegoats. This sequence characterizes the modern era extensively, and many a coopting or critique of religion should be seen as the misappropriation of its authority, especially if followed by its denigration, rather than representing the heart of authentic religious faith on its own.

A parallel example involves the presentation of Israel as God’s chosen people in the Bible, which has then yoked Christian fundamentalism to the Israeli cause against the Palestinians, many of whom are Christians. This has led to America’s providing billions of dollars in military aid to Israel’s use of violent force against populations internal and

---

23 In his book on Jesus and the transformation of Judaism, John Riches (1982) argues compellingly that the goal of Jesus of Nazareth was neither to do away with Judaism nor to displace it; it was to restore it to a better vision of itself. Likewise, Richard Horsley and Tom Thatcher (2013) argue that the original Johannine vision was the vitalization of Israel, not its supplanting with a new movement. What we see in the Johannine reflection upon the movement’s uneven reception within its own ambivalent history is an overall failure—at best only a partial success—in extending the grace of membership in the divine family to all who might respond in faith to the divine initiative (Culpepper 1980; Anderson 2011, 22-23, 35-38, 183-90).


25 Anderson 2004b.
external to its borders, including Christians, bolstered by simplistic “biblical” reasoning. Such appropriations of Gen 12-17, however, do not prove the Bible is anti-Christian, and neither does the fact that negative portrayals of the *Ioudaioi* in Matthew and John have contributed to anti-Semitic views historically prove these Gospels are anti-Semitic. The fault lies with anachronistic and inadequate interpretations of the Bible, including the fact that political uses of biblical themes at times function to demarcate opponents and to marshal support for causes in ways partisan. Just because religious texts possess authority, however, this does not mean that they will be employed in rhetorically adequate ways. Their misinterpretation and misuse must thus be challenged with rigor by serious scholars if exegetical integrity is to be preserved.\(^\text{26}\) Such is the goal of the present essay.

4. Anachronisms Then and Now

Despite the fact that John’s presentation of *Ioudaioi* and *hoi Ioudaioi* has contributed to anti-Semitism, though, the question remains as to whether the category “anti-Semitic” is appropriate for discussing religious tensions within the first-century Jesus movement. If meant by “anti-Semitic” is “against the Jewish people” within the first century and later eras, the answer is definitely “No.” Such a label is entirely anachronistic. The evangelist was himself Jewish, as were the leaders and core members of the Johannine situation. It would be akin to claiming the Essenes or John the Baptist were anti-Semitic in their vitriolic judging of the Judean status quo, or that the Pharisees were anti-Semitic because they opposed the Sadducees. Would any genuine scholar argue such a thesis? Obviously not! If Christianity had not separated from Judaism over the next century or more, the Johannine dialectical presentation of the *Ioudaioi* would not even be an issue—or, at least not an interfaith one.

Another unattended factor in the discussion is the modest beginnings of the Jesus movement followed by the growth of Christianity over the centuries. If the Jesus movement had not outgrown its parental Judaism in terms of size and reach, the Jesus movement would likely have been experienced simply as an irritating sect rather than a societal majority. In fact, the emerging Jesus movement was largely a fledgling stepsister to Judaism until several decades into the Constantinian era. It was only around 350 CE that its numbers within western society broke the 50 percent mark, according to Rodney Stark, and Christianity did not become the official religion of the Roman Empire until the Edict of Thessalonica in 380 CE under Theodosius.\(^\text{27}\) Therefore, it is anachronistic to envision followers of Jesus in the Johannine situation as anything but the smaller of competing religious groups.

On this account, Raymond Brown’s analysis of the Johannine community reflecting fledgling bands of believers seeking to negotiate the worlds of their Jewish

\(^{26}\) With Sean Freyne 1985, only as we examine closely the historical contexts of the developing Jesus movement, appreciating impassioned ideals and experienced losses, can we appreciate what is meant by Matthean and Johannine polemic regarding Jewish leaders, and more importantly—I would add—which is not.

\(^{27}\) Stark 1997. Assuming a 40 percent growth rate per decade, Stark estimates the numbers of Jesus adherents or Christians at the following dates to be: 40 CE—1,000; 50 CE—1,400; 100 CE—7,530; 150 CE—40,496; 200 CE—217,795; 250 CE—1,171,356; 300 CE—6,299,832; 350 CE—33,882,008 (p. 7). These figures, of course, are estimations based upon Stark’s informed calculations.
background and emerging fellowship with Gentile believers in Jesus makes sense. With some of their membership participating in synagogue worship on the Sabbath, with some meeting in house-churches for First-Day worship along with Gentile believers, and with some participating in both venues of worship, Jesus adherents within the post-70 CE Johannine situation must have been stretched in their capacities to manage community life effectively. They still appealed to Jewish family and friends that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah/Christ, and yet they also sought to extend the blessings of Judaism to Gentile audiences within the Roman imperial world. Thus, Johannine believers were fledgling minorities, not dominant majorities; so to read their community investments as oppressing minority groups is anachronistic and wrong.

That being the case, it is also wrong to compare Johannine Christianity too closely with Qumranic sectarians, although some features of Jewish motivational dualism cohere between Qumran’s War Scroll and Community Rule and the ethos of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles. The light-darkness thrust of the Johannine writings, however, is explanatory as well as motivational; it is Hellenistic as well as Jewish. It therefore does not simply chastise religious leaders for their failure to embrace the sapiential teachings and prophetic actions of the Revealer; it also calls for embracing the values of Judaism within a diaspora setting in terms of Jewish faith and practice. This is precisely what is going on in the later Johannine situation, where traveling ministers, likely two or three decades into the Pauline mission, are teaching assimilation and cheap grace rather than cultural resistance and costly discipleship. From the perspective of the Johannine Elder, the second antichristic threat was not a matter of secessionism; it involved the threat of invasive false teachings, advocating easy codes of discipleship supported by docetizing Christologies. This is why Ignatius called for the appointing of a singular episcopal leader in every church as a means of facilitating church unity against the rabid bites of those who would divide Christian communities by their false teachings. Thus, rather than seeing Johannine Christianity as a backwater sect, its struggles reflect engagements with Jewish communities, Greco-Roman culture, and emerging centers of the Jesus movement, rooted in seeking to maintain basic standards of Jewish ethos while also embracing newcomers to the faith from outside Judaism. In that sense, they were more cosmopolitan than sectarian—even more cosmopolitan than their synagogue-abiding counterparts.

---

29 On this anachronism the views of numerous interpreters founder; see, for instance, William A. Johnson (1989), which upon assuming John to be anti-Semitic and levied against Judaism as an extra-Jewish movement, finds his own suspicions confirmed without challenging the frailty of his initial assumptions.
30 Contra Ashton 2007, who sees Qumranic ethos “in the bones” of the Johannine evangelist, John’s rendering of Jesus and his ministry is crafted for reception in a Hellenistic setting (Anderson 1997, 2007b, 2016). Therefore, John’s explanatory dualism follows Plato’s Allegory of the Cave (Republic 7), showing that those rejecting Jesus sought to remain in the dark rather than coming into the light, lest it be exposed that their platforms are rooted in human origin rather than divine initiative (John 1:10-13; 3:18-21). John’s dualism is also motivational (like that of the Essenes) in that it calls for audiences to embrace the way of life, light, and truth rather than the ways of death, darkness, and falsity (Anderson 2011a, 187-90; 2011b).
31 Anderson 1997; 2007e. In particular, the invitation to ingest the flesh and blood of Jesus calls for embracing the way of the cross, as the bread that Jesus offers is his flesh given for the life of the world; Forestell 1974; Anderson 1996, 207-09.
32 Here I take issue with the thesis of Wayne Meeks (1972) that Johannine Christianity was sectarian. If John’s sector of early Christianity included Jewish and Gentile believers within an urban setting of the
Nonetheless, the diaspora-setting tensions between Johannine believers and synagogue leaders still appear to reflect a set of intra-Jewish struggles over the heart of Judaism rather than the periphery. John’s narrative is written by a Jew, about Jesus the Jew, who is believed to be fulfilling Israel’s divine vocation and global mission as a light to the nations and a blessing to the world. Thus, in no way can the thoroughly Semitic Gospel of John, the most Jewish of the Gospels, be considered anti-Semitic. If anything, John represents a radical view of the Jewish vocation, in that it sees Jesus as the embodiment of typological Israel as a means of blessing the nations. As being a descendant of Abraham means receiving a blessed inheritance, so any who believe in Jesus receive the power to become children of God (John 1:11-13). As the Law came through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus as the Jewish Messiah/Christ (1:16-17).

Therefore, the central struggle between the Johannine leadership and local synagogue leadership in the 80s and 90s of the first century CE involved struggles regarding how to actualize the blessings of Judaism as extensions of grace to the world. It is out of this contest over the heart of Judaism that the Johannine tensions with Jewish communities grew. Like the author of Revelation, who disparaged religious sibling-rivals as “those who claim to be Jews but are not” (Rev 2:9; 3:9), so the Johannine evangelist heralds Jesus as fulfilling the heart of Jewish ideals; his is a radically Jewish vision. Therefore, just as John cannot be considered anti-Semitic, neither can it rightly be considered anti-Jewish in the general sense, even if it betrays tensions with particular Jewish groups during its Palestine and diaspora settings. John’s presentation of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah/Christ reflects an intra-Jewish debate wherein the evangelist’s radical Jewish messianism is only partly compelling, eventually leading to the parting of the ways with its parental Judaism. That eventuality, however, is only prefigured in the Johannine writings, not yet actualized.

5. John’s Dialectical Presentations of Jesus and Judaism

Before searching out the “correct analysis” of the Fourth Gospel’s stance on Judaism, however, it must be acknowledged that the presentation of *hoi Ioudaioi* in John is itself a second generation Pauline mission, they would have been more cosmopolitan than sectarian. That was their challenge: how to help Gentile believers aspire to basic codes of Jewish faith and practice, being in the world but not of the world (John 17:15-16; 1 John 2:15-17; 5:21; Anderson 2007e). See also Kåre Fugsleth’s thesis (2005), challenging sectarian appraisals of the Johannine situation within its diaspora setting. With Culpepper 1980; Pancaro 1970; Marinus de Jonge 1978, and van der Watt 1995, inviting audiences into the divine family is the center of the Johannine Prologue and the rest of the Gospel. As a communal response to John’s story of Jesus (cf. 1 John 1:1-3), the Johannine Prologue reformulates the Jewish agency schema of the Johannine narrative (rooted in Deut 18:15-22) in a Hellenistic-friendly way, welcoming later audiences into the divine family across cultural bounds as an invitation of grace (Anderson 2016). Contra Meeks (1985) and others who over-read Johannine individuation from Judaism, the actualized parting of the ways before some time into the second century (and even so, unevenly) is critically questioned by recent scholarship: Lieu 2002; Nicklas 2014; Reed and Becker 2003; Dunn 2006; Shanks 2013; Charlesworth 2013. And, the reason that Katz (1984) argued against Martyn’s expulsion theory was the fact of Jewish-Christian closeness of fellowship well into the second century CE, around the time of the Bar Kokhba Rebellion in 132 CE.
dialectical one, not a monological rendering. C. K. Barrett pointed out long ago that unless the dialectical character of the evangelist’s thought and presentation of content is considered adequately, interpreters are likely to misconstrue the overall Johannine presentation of any given subject. Jesus is portrayed in John as the most human as well as the most exalted; as equal to the Father as well as subordinated to the Father. Both sides of John’s presentations must be considered in performing an adequate analysis of any Johannine subject. If not, the interpretation will be inevitably flawed. This is especially true on the subject of Jesus and Judaism within the Gospel of John.

On one hand, some of “the Jews” in John are presented as archetypes of the unbelieving world. They reject Jesus as the revealer of the deity, and the evangelist portrays them as those who remain in darkness instead of coming to the light—those who love the praise of men rather than the glory of God, whose father is not Abraham or Moses but the devil (John 8:44). Robert Kysar and John Painter have pointed this out effectively, and John’s presentation of quest and rejection stories reflects some of the agony within the only partly successful Johannine mission. Then again, John’s tradition is pervasively Jewish, and it presents a Jesus who embodies the heart of the true Israel, declaring, “Salvation is of the Jews.” It is also a fact that some of “the Jews” explicitly believe in Jesus, so they are not presented in totally negative light (8:31; 11:45; 12:11). This fact has often gone unnoticed by scholars, and all of Jesus’s followers and faithful associates in John are Jewish. Therefore, it cannot be said that John is monologically anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish, or even that it is pervasively so. Despite tensions between Jesus and Jewish leaders in John, the majority of Jewish and Semitic figures in John (which includes the disciples, women, and even Samaritans) become faithful followers of Jesus, even if it happens in a processive way. That is a textual fact.

Another point also deserves mention, which is to note that negative judgments are not reserved exclusively for “the Jews” in John; disciples and members of Jesus’s band are also judged harshly. First, those unwilling to ingest the flesh and blood of Jesus—a reference to assimilating the death of Jesus on the cross as a call to martyrological faithfulness (as in Mark 10:38-39)—have no life in themselves (6:51-54). Second, even some of Jesus’s disciples are scandalized by his hard saying, calling for embracing the

---

35 Note the highly dialogical character of a dozen of John’s key theological subjects in, especially presentations of the Ioudaioi. Even in John’s construction of the I-am sayings material, we see presentations of Jesus as fulfilling typological associations with the true Israel (Anderson 2011a, 190-93). Therefore, it is no surprise that first-rate scholars such as Zimmermann struggle with how to render John’s complex presentation of hoi Ioudaioi within its narrative (Zimmermann 2013).

36 Given that Barrett (1972) argues compellingly that the Fourth Evangelist was a dialectical thinker (cf. Anderson 1996, 136-65; 2004a), unless the evangelist’s multivalent presentations of the issue at hand are considered (with Meeks 1972; cf. Anderson 2011a, 25-43), one cannot claim to have interpreted the Fourth Gospel adequately.

37 According to Zimmermann (2013), John’s presentation of hoi Ioudaioi is uneven and highly problematic if a singular impression is sought, making a simplistic judgment—positive or negative—likely erroneous. Thus, the polyvalence of the Johannine narrative must be considered by interpreters if John’s theological, historical, and literary riddles are to be assessed adequately (Anderson 2008; 2011a, 25-90), and on this subject, all references to the word must also be accompanied with analyses of related Jewish themes (Lieu 2008).

38 Kysar 1993; Painter 1989.

39 The content here is martyrological, not ritually sacramental; with Borgen 1965; Anderson 1996, 110-36, 194-220.
way of the cross, and they abandon him and walk with him no longer (6:60-66).

Third, Peter (or someone among the Twelve) is also labeled by the evangelist as “a devil” (6:70), although the redactor clarifies that he must have meant Judas, the member of the Twelve who would betray Jesus later (6:71; 12:4; 13:2, 26; 18:2-5). Fourth, Jesus’s followers (including Peter) are presented as miscomprehending, which is always rhetorical and deconstructive in narrative (13:6-12; 14:5, 8-9, 22; 16:17-18; 21:15-17).

While Judas Iscariot is indeed presented as the clear villain in the text, it would be wrong to say that John’s Jesus is anti-Kerioth (the hometown of Judas, 6:71; 12:4; 13:2, 26), despite Kerioth’s being in the south and the fact that Judas is the only member of the Twelve who is explicitly referenced as being from Judea. Still, the negative judgment about Judas regards his acts of betrayal, not his place of origin. Nor should the Johannine Gospel be considered anti-Petrine or anti-apostolic because some disciples abandon him and he calls Peter a devil.

It is the particular actions of those unwilling to embrace the way of the cross, or of those miscomprehending the character of servant leadership, that John’s Jesus rebukes, not individual or groups of disciples, overall.

So it is with some of the Ioudaioi and some Jewish leaders in John. While a leader of “the Jews” in Jerusalem, Nicodemus, is presented as initially not understanding Jesus in John 3, he “comes ‘round” and stands up for Jesus in John 7:50-51. He even helps to bury Jesus in John 19:39-42 along with Joseph of Arimathea. Thus, it is particular actions or the lack thereof that are challenged by the Johannine Jesus, not generalized people groups. While Pilate is presented as an outsider to the truth in John 18-19, the royal official and his household come to believe in John 4:46-54. Likewise, the Greeks aspire to see Jesus in John 12:20-21, and the woman at the well becomes the apostle to the Samaritans in John 4. Therefore, the fact of positive presentations of Jewish individuals and groups must be held in tension with their negative or ambivalent portrayals, just as the negative portrayals of some of Jesus’s disciples in John must be held in tension with their positive presentations elsewhere.

Given the dialectical character of John’s renderings of different individuals and groups, it is a flawed inference to assume that all Jewish people are portrayed negatively, when most Jewish people in the Gospel of John respond to him positively and believe in him. The Samaritans and the Galileans welcome Jesus (4:39-45), and in Jerusalem the Pharisees dismay because “the whole world” is going after Jesus (12:19). Likewise, Peter’s confession is followed by Jesus’s statement that one of his followers is a devil (not simply a child thereof), and Judas is called the son of perdition. Note also that even the brothers of Jesus do not believe in him (7:5); this does not reflect, however, an anti-fraternal thrust. Thus, close followers of Jesus are not portrayed with general positivity, and Jewish actants within the narrative are not portrayed with pervasive negativity.

40 The flesh profits nothing (v. 63; Anderson 1996, 210).
41 Anderson 1996, 221-50; 2007c.
43 On this account, I believe Raymond Brown is wrong to distance the Johannine evangelist from Peter and the apostolic band, changing his position on his being the son of Zebedee to an unknown eyewitness figure—not one of the Twelve. The Johannine critique of Petrine leadership is just as easily viewed as a dialectical engagement within the core of Jesus’s closest followers rather than from the outside (Anderson 1991; 1996, 247-77). Thus, seeing the Fourth Evangelist as challenging hierarchical developments from within the Twelve, in the name of a more primitive understanding of the intentionality of Jesus for the movement following his wake, has great implications for ecclesiology and ecumenicity: Anderson 2005.
despite the fact that Judean religious authorities are presented as opposing Jesus and threatening others within their reach. Therefore, the fact of Johannine dialectical presentations of key subjects must be taken into account before assuming too facilely a monological Johannine thrust.  

6. *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* in the Fourth Gospel—Positive, Neutral, Negative, and Ambivalent Presentations

As the above analysis suggests, John’s 72 references to *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* deserve a closer analysis than simplistic judgments have allowed.  

For a polyvalent analysis of the Johannine narrative, see Anderson 2008.

With Lieu 2008. Thus, the translating of *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* in John is a notoriously challenging task (Bratcher 1974). The contextually sensitive approach of Stephen Motyer (2008, 152-53) works fairly well, as he renders these terms “these Jews, passionate about legal observance” (5:18); “the Jews there, whose opinion was highly regarded in all matters to do with the Law and its observance” (7:15); “the more hard-line Jews in the synagogue leadership” (9:22); and “those Jews who want to kill me” (18:36).
• Presentations of “Israel” or “Israelite” in the Fourth Gospel—All Neutral or Positive
  o John the Baptist came to reveal Jesus as the Messiah to Israel (1:31)
  o Jesus extols Nathanael as an Israelite in whom there is nothing false (1:47)
  o Nathanael lauds Jesus as the Son of God and the King of Israel (1:49)
  o Nicodemus, as a teacher of Israel, should understand the spiritual character of God’s workings (3:10)
  o The Jerusalem crowd welcomes Jesus as the blessed one coming in the name of the Lord, the King of Israel (12:13)

From this analysis four things are clear. First, some references to Ioudaios and Ioudaioi imply the Jewish religion and its adherents in general, but these references comprise only 18 of the 72 references—a small minority. Second, one of these references is positive, but the rest are neutral—simply explaining Jewish customs and practices to non-Jewish audiences. Third, none of these references are negative or ambivalent. Fourth, the positive, or at least neutral presentation of Judaism in the Gospel of John is all the more apparent when uses of “Israel” are analyzed. In all five instances, Israel-identity is presented as highly valued, and in two of them Jesus is proclaimed the King of Israel.

Therefore, there are absolutely no pejorative statements about the Jewish religion, Israel in particular, or Jewish persons in general in the Gospel of John as opposed to Judean or Jerusalem-centered Jewish leaders and groups who are opposed to Jesus the Galilean prophet. Thus, it cannot be claimed exegetically that the Johannine narrative disparages Judaism as a religious faith, or its adherents, overall. If anything, references to Jewishness and to “Israel” convey pervasively positive associations, and this is a textual fact in John’s story of Jesus.

By contrast, however, when Ioudaios or Ioudaioi occur with reference to particular religious leaders in Judea or in association with Jerusalem, the following positive, neutral, negative, and ambivalent associations are found in John’s narrative. This is where the analysis will be telling.

• “Judeans”—Jewish Leaders and Persons in Jerusalem and Judea—Positive
  o The Judeans are astonished at Jesus’s teaching because despite not having a formal education, no one ever taught as he did (7:15)
  o Jesus says to the Judeans who had believed in him, “If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples; and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free.” (8:31-32)
  o Many of the Judeans had come from Jerusalem to console Mary and Martha about their brother, showing empathy and love (11:18-19, 31)
  o Jesus was moved when he saw Mary weeping and the Judeans with her also weeping (11:33)

---

46 Assuming the two references to hoi Ioudaioi in John 6 refer to Judeans, despite the fact that the debate in the Capernaum synagogue occurs in Galilee. As in Mark 7:1, it could be that religious leaders from Jerusalem had come to Galilee to examine Jesus and the authenticity of his ministry. They could also be a reference to Jewish authorities in general (with von Wahlde 1982), as John 6 was likely added to the narrative in a later, diaspora setting (Lindars 1972, 46-63; Anderson 1996, 205-08).
• The Judeans were deeply moved at how much Jesus loved Lazarus—seeing him weeping (11:35-36)
• A great crowd of Judeans came also to see Lazarus, and many of the Judeans were deserting the Jerusalem-based opposition to Jesus and were believing in him (12:9-11)

• “Judeans”—Jewish Leaders in Judea—Neutral
  • The Judean leaders send priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask John, “Who are you?” (1:19)
  • Nicodemus is described as a leader among the Judeans; he is initially miscomprehending though interested in Jesus (3:1)
  • A discussion about purification arose between John's disciples and a Judean leader (3:25)
  • The healed lame man went and told the Judean leaders that Jesus had made him well (5:15)
  • The Judeans gather around Jesus and ask, “How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Messiah, tell us plainly.” (10:24)
  • As Jesus had told the Judean leaders, so he also tells his disciples, “I am with you only a little longer. You will look for me…. Where I am going, you cannot come.” (13:33)
  • Caiaphas was the one who had advised the Judean leaders that it was better for one person to die for the sake of the people (18:14)
  • Jesus claims to have spoken openly to the world, having taught in the synagogues and the temple—where the Judeans gather (18:20)

• “Judeans”—Jewish Leaders in Judea—Negative
  • The Judean leaders challenge Jesus asking what sign he will do regarding the destruction and rebuilding of the temple, as they claim it has been under construction for forty-six years (2:18, 20)
  • The Judean leaders begin persecuting Jesus because he was healing on the Sabbath (5:16)
  • The Judean leaders seek to kill Jesus because he was also calling God his Father, making himself equal to God (5:18; 7:1, 11; 10:31-33; 11:53)
  • The Judean leaders question how Jesus can be the bread that has come down from heaven, and how he can give of his flesh for people to eat (6:41, 52)
  • People in Jerusalem, the parents of the blind man, Joseph of Arimathea, and Jesus’s disciples were afraid of the Judean leaders (7:13; 9:22; 19:38; 20:19)
  • The Judean leaders fail to understand Jesus’s saying that people will not be able to find him and that they cannot join him, wondering if he will go to the diaspora, or whether he will commit suicide (7:35-36; 8:22)
  • Judean leaders accuse Jesus of being a Samaritan and having a demon (8:48, 52), misunderstanding his statement about his relationship to Abraham (8:56-57)
• The Judeans take up stones to kill Jesus for blasphemy (8:59; 10:30-33; 11:8)
• The Judean leaders did not at first believe the blind man had received his sight (9:18)
• The Judean leaders had already agreed that anyone who confessed Jesus to be the Messiah would be put out of the synagogue (9:22; cf. 12:42; 16:2)
• The Judean leaders negotiate with Pilate the death of Jesus, ironically accusing him of blasphemy and then committing the same, confessing they have no king but Caesar (18:31, 36, 38; 19:7, 12, 14, 20-21)

• “Judeans”—Jewish Leaders in Judea—Ambivalence:
  o Nicodemus, a leader among the Judeans, comes to Jesus “by night” exposing his miscomprehension of the Spirit and being born from above (3:1-8), and yet he later stands up for Jesus among the Jerusalem leaders (7:50-51) and helps to bury Jesus after his death on the cross (19:39-40)
  o Jesus was wary of going to Judea, where the Judean leaders were seeking to kill him, while his brothers encouraged him to go and perform signs so that people would believe in him (7:1-10)
  o The Judeans were divided with some saying, “He has a demon and is out of his mind. Why listen to him?” Others were saying, “These are not the words of one who has a demon. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?” (10:19-21)
  o Jesus wants to go to Judea, but his disciples warn that the Judeans are wanting to stone him (11:7-8)
  o Many of the Judeans who had seen Jesus raise Lazarus believed in him, but others went to the Pharisees and told them what he had done (11:45-46)
  o Jesus no longer walked among the Judeans but stayed with his disciples in Ephraim near the wilderness (11:54)

In analyzing the presentations of Ioudaioi as Judean religious leaders and Jerusalemites (7:25), several things are clear. First, in over a dozen instances, many of the Judeans believe in Jesus, and they are presented as comforting Mary and Martha over the death of Lazarus; Nicodemus begins his dialogue with Jesus in the dark, but he eventually stands up for Jesus in the face of strong opposition. Second, eight neutral references to the actions or customs of the Judeans inform the backdrop in socio-religious perspective regarding what happens within the narrative. Third, approximately three dozen (half of the references) to the Ioudaioi in John refer to Judean religious leaders, who question Jesus’s disturbance in the temple, his healing on the Sabbath, his claiming to be acting on behalf of the Father, and his garnering a following. They begin plotting to kill Jesus early on, and eventually they turn Jesus over to Pilate, who sentences to death the one he labels “the king of the Jews” (19:19-21). Fourth, ambivalence on this score is palpable in two ways: there are intense divisions among Judean leaders over Jesus, as some believe in him and others oppose them for doing so; and, Jesus and his companions express disagreement and ambivalence on whether to travel to Judea, where the religious
authorities are known to be seeking to kill Jesus. Fifth, some of these references could be considered “Jews” rather than Judeans: those questioning Jesus in 6:41 and 52 appear to be from Judea, although the discussion is set in the Capernaum Synagogue; the places where the Judeans gather (synagogues and the temple) in 18:20 could also be taken to refer to Jewish places of worship more generally, although that saying is delivered in Jerusalem.

The result of this analysis is that while many among the Judeans believe—as did also the Galileans, the Samaritans, and the Hellenists—half of the Ioudaioi references in John are to Judean leaders who question Jesus, fail to embrace his works and teachings, and seek to do him in. They see him as an affront to temple money-changing and animal-selling enterprises, and his healings on the Sabbath violate the Mosaic Law. In challenging a legalistic interpretation of Mosaic authority, Jesus appeals to the Mosaic Prophet schema rooted in Deuteronomy 18:15-22, whereby he is accused of being the presumptuous prophet, who speaks on his own behalf. Jesus responds that he says or does nothing except what the Father commands, which leads to his being accused of making himself equal to God, claiming God as his Father. Jesus predicts things in advance to show that he is the authentic Mosaic Prophet, but ironically, he is then accused of blasphemy by those committing blasphemy before Pilate, claiming to have no king but Caesar.

Palpable here also is the concern that if a popular uprising should threaten Roman concerns for security, especially during Passover festivities, the Romans would exact a preemptive backlash, causing hundreds or thousands to suffer or die. Therefore, the concerns of Judean leaders were not simply over halakhic interpretations of the Mosaic law; they had been on edge also about John the Baptist, and they appear threatened by the groundswell around the John-and-Jesus movement. They also may have wished to preserve their place within society, so John’s references to people privileging the praise of humanity over the glory of God reflects a critique of religious leaders seeking to preserve their societal status rather than being open to new revelations of God’s truth (5:41-44; 7:17-19; 8:50-54; 12:43). Further, in defending a legalistic understanding of Sabbath observance, Judean leaders are overlooking the love that was central to the healings. In terms of corroborative impression, as does the Synoptic Jesus, the Johannine Jesus also emphasizes the heart of the Mosaic law by his deeds and words. The center of God’s concern is love, and those rejecting Jesus and his mission do so because God’s love is not abiding in their hearts (5:42).

These themes are spelled out further in an analysis of other Jewish players in the narrative, even if they are not referenced as Ioudaios or Ioudaioi explicitly.

- The Chief Priests and High Priest
  - One of them, Caiaphas, who was the High Priest at the time, declares that it is better for one man to die on behalf of (instead of) the nation; from then on they seek to put Jesus to death (11:49-53)
  - The Chief Priests seek to put Lazarus also to death (12:10)

---

47 Wayne A. Meeks shows how this Jewish agency schema accounts for Jesus in John claiming to be equal to God (1990) as well as evoking a typical Jewish counter-move: challenging divine agency with allegations of one’s being the presumptuous prophet, also forewarned in Deut 18 (1976).
• The Pharisees
  o People questioning John’s authority were sent by the Pharisees, who later learned that Jesus was making more disciples than John (1:24; 4:1)
  o Nicodemus, a leader among the Judeans, was a Pharisee (3:1)
  o The Pharisees challenge the crowd for their believing in Jesus and claim they have been deceived; none of the Pharisees believed in Jesus (7:32, 47-48)
  o The Pharisees claim that Jesus is testifying on his own behalf—implicitly the presumptuous prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15-22 (8:13)
  o The Pharisees question the man born blind, claiming that Jesus could not be legitimate because he was a “sinner”—having performed a healing on the Sabbath (9:13-16)
  o Some of the Judeans report the raising of Lazarus to the Pharisees (11:45-46)
  o The Pharisees exclaim in dismay that “the whole world” has gone after Jesus (12:19)
  o Residents of Jerusalem refuse to confess adherence to Jesus openly for fear of the Pharisees, lest they be put out of the synagogue (12:42)

• The Chief Priests and the Pharisees
  o The Chief Priests and the Pharisees send the temple police to arrest Jesus, although they are later asked why they did not do so themselves (7:32, 45)
  o The Chief Priests and the Pharisees call a meeting to decide what to do about Jesus, and they command people to inform them about where Jesus was so that he could be arrested (11:47, 57)
  o Soldiers and temple police were sent by the Chief Priests and the Pharisees to arrest Jesus in the garden (18:3)

• The Authorities
  o The Jerusalemites are baffled because the authorities who had been trying to kill Jesus allowed him to continue speaking; they wonder whether they had come to believe in Jesus (7:25-26)
  o The Pharisees question whether any of the authorities or the Pharisees had come to believe in Jesus (7:47-48)
  o Many of the authorities believe in Jesus, but they are afraid to say so because of the Pharisees, lest they be expelled from the synagogue (12:42)

• The Crowd
While not named as “the crowd,” Jesus’s disciples believe following his first sign in Cana of Galilee, and many in Jerusalem believe in Jesus early in his ministry, on account of his signs (2:11, 23).

Jesus disappears into the crowd in Jerusalem; many believe in him on the basis of his signs, yet others claim that he is deceiving the crowds and that he has a demon—the crowd is divided on Jesus (5:13; 7:12, 20, 31-32, 40, 43).

The crowd in Galilee follows Jesus, interested in his works, though even some of his disciples abandon him and walk with him no longer (6:2, 5, 22, 24, 66).

Many in the Jerusalem crowd believe that Jesus is indeed the Mosaic prophet; they are accused of not knowing the Mosaic Law and declared to be accursed by the Judean leaders (7:40, 43, 49).

While not described as “the crowd,” many in Judea come to believe in Jesus as he revisits the baptismal site of John’s ministry, believing on account of his signs (10:40-42).

Jesus speaks for the sake of the crowd in Bethany, that they might believe, and many come to see Jesus and Lazarus after the sign (11:42; 12:9, 12, 18).

The crowd in Judea testifies to the raising of Lazarus and the thundering voice from heaven, and yet they also question the meaning of Jesus’s words regarding the uplifting of the Son of Man (12:17, 29, 34).

From the characterization of these groups of people, several associations become clear. First, the Chief Priests in Jerusalem plot to kill Jesus, and not only do they hand Jesus over to Pilate to be crucified, but they also plot to kill Lazarus, lest his testimony be compelling. Second, the Pharisees are presented as seeking to retard the popularity of John the Baptist and Jesus—alleging the crowd has been deceived—accusing Jesus of being the presumptuous false prophet as well as a sinner. They intimidate believing authorities and others with threats of synagogue expulsion if they confess Jesus openly. Third, the Chief Priests and the Pharisees collaborate (likewise in Matt 21:45; 27:62) in seeking to have Jesus arrested, and they call a meeting in Jerusalem to decide what to do about the rise of the Jesus movement and the fear of Roman retaliation. Fourth, unnamed authorities are presented as ambivalent. On one hand, they seek to have Jesus killed; on the other hand, some of them become secret followers of Jesus. Fifth, the crowd is presented as especially interested in the signs of Jesus, and they come to believe that he is the Prophet predicted by Moses despite being accused by the Pharisees of being ignorant of the Law and accursed.

From the above analysis of the characterization of Judaism, Jewish individuals, and Jewish groups in the Fourth Gospel, there is no negative presentation of Judaism in itself. Nor are individuals or groups maligned simply for being Jewish. Rather, those who welcome Jesus and believe are commended (all of them are Semitic or Jewish), and those who question Jesus, rejecting his words and works, are disparaged. Jesus is received and rejected in both Galilee and Judea, although his rejection in Galilee is minimal (some of his followers abandon him, and the Judeans question him in John 6), and his rejection in Jerusalem is most severely pronounced. There it is that the Chief Priests and the
Pharisees are synonymous with the *Ioudaioi* who challenge Jesus and endeavor to put him to death. These Judean religious leaders also intimidate the Jewish crowds and other authorities, accusing them of being accursed and threatening people with synagogue exclusion if they confess Jesus openly. The crowds are impressed with Jesus’s signs, and they identify him with the Prophet predicted by Moses, whose words come true and who speaks authentically the message that God has instructed. The Pharisees are threatened by Jesus’s popularity; they are offended by his healings on the Sabbath and scandalized by his claiming to be one with the Father. This is why they collaborate with the Chief Priests to put Jesus to death.

7. Jesus and the Judean Leaders in John—An Intra-Jewish Set of Tensions

As is clear from the above analysis, the engagements between Jesus and the *Ioudaioi* in John reflect largely, if not solely, tensions between the Jesus movement and the Judean religious leaders, even if they are narrated in a later setting. It is anachronistic thus to infer an actualized parting of the ways, as the Johannine Jesus movement is still grounded within the Jewish family of faith, though seeing Jesus the Christ as extending the blessings of Abraham and Moses to the rest of the world beloved of God. In that sense, the Gospel of John deserves to be regarded as reflecting “Johannine Judaism” perhaps even more fittingly than “Johannine Christianity.” John’s Jewish center of gravity is evidenced in its thoroughly Jewish presentations of the Johannine Jesus, differing emphases within its earlier and later material, and developing sets of engagements within the evolving Johannine situation. Therefore, rather than seeing the relation between Jesus and the Judean leaders in John as anti-Jewish, here we have *an intra-faith set of tensions, not an interfaith set of dialogues*. The Fourth Gospel’s intra-Jewish character and radically Jewish thrust can thus be seen in the following ways.

7.1. First, John’s Gospel is the most Jewish piece of writing in the entire New Testament. This is because John represents a radical view of the Jewish vocation, even though it is clearly in tension with the views of those managing the Jerusalem temple and its cultic practices (the Chief Priests) and those appealing to scripture-based understandings of the Jewish Covenant (the Pharisees). This is why the engagements between the Galilean prophet and these formidable groups in Judea are especially pronounced in the Johannine narrative, and therein lies the bulk of John’s negative presentations of Jewish leaders. The uneven acceptance and rejection of Jesus and his vision of the heart of the Jewish vocation is narrated alongside a robust appeal for Jewish and Gentile audiences alike to receive Jesus as the Messiah-Christ, availing inclusion in the divine family any and all who respond to that message (1:10-13). Thus, contra the two-level approaches of Martyn, Brown, and others, John’s story of Jesus appears to convey more about the first level of

---

48 In addition to the long-running critique of Martyn’s by Adele Reinhartz (1998, 2001a), note also critiques of the Brown-Martyn two-level reading of John overall: Klink 2009; Hägerland 2003. Then again, D. Moody Smith affirms the overall sketching of the Johannine situation as set forth by Martyn and Brown (Smith 1996), although not all of John’s riddles can be explained on the basis of a single dialogue with the local Jewish presence in a diaspora setting (Smith 1984).
history than later levels of theology. More specifically, most of John’s presentation of the ambivalent reception of Jesus by the Judean leaders coheres with topographical, religious, and sociological knowledge of pre-70 CE Jerusalem, and more specifically, cohering with the time period of Jesus’s ministry. Therefore, John’s story of Jesus, while conveying constructed theology in a narrative mode, also conveys remembered history within a theological appeal. And, on the first level of history, the Galilean prophet was indeed unevenly received in Jerusalem, where he was finally killed at the hands of the Romans, aided by the religious establishment.

In that sense, just as the Qumran community’s pitting of the Wicked Priest in Jerusalem against the Teacher of Righteousness poses a means of bolstering its vision for the heart of Judaism, John’s memory of Jesus performs something parallel. An example of this pro-Jewish set of commitments is the fact that John identifies Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. Each of the “I-Am” sayings in John bears associations with a typological image of the essence of Israel—within the vineyard of Israel, Jesus is the True Vine; alongside the light on the hill of Zion, Jesus is the Light of the World; among the shepherds of Israel, Jesus is the True Shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep; in addition to the bread which Moses gave—in the wilderness and via the Torah—Jesus is the heavenly Bread which God now gives, and so forth. Nathanael is the “true Israelite in whom no falsity exists,” and even the sonship of Jesus is portrayed in the trajectory of the authentic Israel. Jesus in John not only comes as the anticipated Jewish Messiah and the authentic Mosaic Agent of Yahweh, but he also embodies the heart of “a nation of vision,” Philo’s description of Israel.

In addition, the Fourth Evangelist reflects notably Jewish forms of exegetical operation in his presentation of Jesus’s ministry. First, as Peder Borgen has shown, John’s expansion upon the ministry of Jesus in ways cohering with Palestine-based midrashim and Philo’s homiletical expansions upon biblical texts reflects a thoroughly Jewish pattern of operation. Second, Jesus is also presented in John as fulfilling the prophecy of Moses in Deut 18:15-22, confirmed by his words coming true. Therefore, the Father and the Son are connected in John because the Son does only what the Father commands. Third, Jesus fulfils the typology also of Elijah/Elisha in the performing of his signs; thus, Moses and Elijah are not prefigured by John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel but by Jesus. Fourth, John’s Jesus fulfills Jewish scripture in the typological

---

49 Interestingly, the Gospel of John features more topographical and archaeologically attested details than all the other gospels put together: von Wahlde 2006; Anderson 2006b. See the contributions of vols. 1-3 in the John, Jesus, and History Project: Anderson/Just/Thatcher, eds. 2007; 2009; 2016.

50 Anderson 2006a, 175-89.

51 See Borgen’s engagement of Richter along these lines: Anderson 1996, 55-57.

52 Following the lead of Nils Alstrup Dahl 1997 (1962), Peder Borgen identifies numerous parallels between the Johannine development of the manna motif in Exod 16:4 (and Ps 78:24-25) and its developments in the Palestinian midrashim, targumic literature, and the writings of Philo (Borgen 1965).

53 For compelling treatments of the Johannine presentation of Jesus as fulfilling the Mosaic prophet typology of Deut 18:15-22, see Borgen 1997; Reinhartz 1992; Anderson 1999. See also Appendix II, below, where 24 parallels with this passage are found in John—especially Jesus’s word coming true, showing that he is indeed the authentic prophet, of whom Moses wrote.

54 Wayne A Meeks (1967) shows the many ways in which the typologies of Elijah and Moses are embellished and fulfilled in Samaritan literature and in John’s presentation of Jesus (Anderson 1996, 174-76, 192). This may also explain why the Fourth Gospel presents John the Baptist as denying that he is either Elijah or the Prophet (Moses)—contra Mark (Anderson/Just/Thatcher, eds. 2007, 20-21).
sense as well as in the predictive sense. In that sense, John’s scripture-fulfillment constructions reflect a distinctively Jewish pattern of worship and instruction designed to affirm the fulfillment of Jewish scripture in the ministry of Jesus. Fifth, John’s presentation of Jesus as the Son of Man also fulfills the typologies of the true Israel, confirmed likewise by the I-am sayings attributed to him by the evangelist.

In 1924, an orthodox Jewish scholar of rabbinics at the University of Cambridge made the remarkable statement: “To us Jews, the Fourth Gospel is the most Jewish of the four.” J. B. Lightfoot and C. K. Barrett likewise considered John the most Jewish of the Gospels, so a nuanced analysis is required before ascribing the Fourth Gospel an anti-Semitic label. It is precisely John’s pro-Jewish thrust that evoked consternation among competing visions of Jewishness with the developing Johannine tradition, and that is why tensions continued later within the emerging Johannine situation. Territoriality exists only between members of like species, and this is why Jesus adherents within the Johannine situation were subjected to discipline as their Christologies rose higher, and as their movement gathered strength. Thus, tensions with Jewish leaders in a Hellenistic setting shifted from the operations of the temple and healings on the Sabbath to monotheism versus ditheism and the inclusion of Gentiles within the Abrahamic family of faith.

7.2 A second feature of John’s intra-Jewish thrust can be seen in the development between John’s earlier and later material. Assuming that some later material was added to an earlier stage of John’s narrative composition, and that the Johannine Epistles were likely composed between the first edition of John’s narrative and its finalization, some interesting features of John’s Jewishness emerge. Of all John’s composition theories, the most convincing is a modification of Barnabas Lindars’ view, which accounts for all the major aporias in John with a minimum of speculation, and my adaptation of his view is as follows:

A Two-Edition View of Johannine Composition

- The first edition of John likely begins with the testimony of the Baptist in John 1 and concludes with 20:31 as an alternative to Mark (ca. 80-85 CE)

---

55 The Gospel of John features dozens of implicit and explicit fulfillments of Jewish scripture in the ministry of Jesus (Anderson 2011a, 83-85; see Appendix III, below).
56 Stephen C. Neill 1988, 338; emphasis mine.
57 Lightfoot 2015, 41-78; Barrett 1975.
58 On the pervasively Jewish background of John, see W. D. Davies 1996, who sees John’s assertion of a radically Jewish vision of Jesus and his mission as the reason that it received such strong opposition among some Jewish audiences. Put otherwise, territoriality exists only among members of like species, and more specifically, within the same gender.
59 This was the emerging consensus among several leading Johannine scholars in their analyses of the place of the Johannine Epistles as having been written within the composition process of the Gospel. Cf. Culpepper and Anderson, eds. 2014. For instance, Von Wahlde (2010a) follows Brown (2003) in seeing the Johannine Epistles being written in Ephesus between the second and third (final) editions of the Gospel.
• The Beloved Disciple continues to teach and preach, and the Johannine Elder writes the three Johannine Epistles as a circular (1 John), an epistle (2 John), and a letter (3 John) building on the themes of the earlier narrative material (ca. 85-95 CE)

• Following the death of the Beloved Disciple, the Elder adds to a first edition (or stage) of John’s narrative the Logos hymn as an engaging introduction (similar to 1 John 1:1-3), eyewitness and Beloved-Disciple references (esp. 19:34-35), and chapters 6, 15-17 and 21, circulating it among the churches as a complement to the other Gospels (ca. 100 CE)

Within this relatively simple approach to the Johannine composition process, most of the major Johannine aporias are addressed in fairly efficient ways. Chapters 4 and 5 seem to have originally been followed by chapter 7, and chapter 6 appears to have added between them, likely by the compiler. The compiler has apparently also crafted the Logos hymn around the passages narrating the Baptist’s ministry in John 1:6-8 and 15, adding also John 21 as a second ending, highlighting references to the tradition’s source and its eyewitness heritage as authority attestations. As John 14:31 seems to have originally flowed into chapter 18, it makes good sense to see the discourses of John 15-17 as additions to an earlier edition, which explains also their repetitive features. While more complex theories abound, this basic two-stage approach (although there may have been multiple stages in the material’s development and composition) thus deals with John’s most problematic literary, historical, and theological riddles with a minimal amount of speculation. It also accounts for the similarities between some of the later material and the Johannine Epistles, as we see a shift in the meaning of “belief” between these two sets of materials. For the first-edition material, to believe in Jesus as the Christ is to receive him as the Jewish Messiah/Christ. Within the later material, believing is more closely associated with abiding in Christ and his community of faith. Therefore, we see a shift from an apologetic interest to a pastoral concern between the earlier and later editions of the Johannine story of Jesus.61

Significant for the present study, however, is an observable shift in emphasis between John’s presentation of Jesus and Jewish subjects. Given that an interesting set of distributions emerge between the material in the two editions, an analysis provides insights into the community’s history and resultant meanings of the material:

1) First, the most intense presentations of the Judean leaders occur within the first stage of the material’s development. This implies a remembered set of tensions between the Galilean prophet and the religious authorities of Jerusalem.62 As an augmentation of Mark, John’s presentation of the early ministry of Jesus shows his work alongside that of John the Baptist as a challenge to temple-centered practices in Jerusalem and the performing of early prophetic signs in Galilee (2:11; 4:54)—before those rendered in Mark 1. John also includes three signs of

61 For an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of over a dozen leading theories of John’s composition leading to a new overall theory, see Anderson 1996, 33-68; 2011a, 95-170; 2015.
62 Tensions between followers of the Galilean prophet and the Jewish establishment in Jerusalem are palpable in sources beyond the Johannine tradition, and hence John’s story of Jesus receives corroborative support within its Palestinian phase of development (Reicke 1984).
Jesus performed in Jerusalem and Bethany, beyond the Galilean miracles presented in Mark—Sabbath healings and the raising of Lazarus—a total of five signs not included in Mark. The rhetorical thrust of this selection thus poses five prophetic signs of Jesus alongside the five books of Moses as a Jewish-friendly apologetic narrative. Therefore, the early stage in John’s narrative development presents Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, inviting audiences in a Hellenistic setting to believe in him as such, and to be welcomed into the blessings of the Jewish faith by believing in Jesus of Nazareth.

2) Within this material, the authorization of Jesus (and lack thereof) is key within his engagements with the Judean leaders. While the Galilean visitors to Jerusalem are impressed with his prophetic challenge to the marketization of institutional temple practices (2:13-25; 4:45), the Judean leaders not only seek to dampen the appeal of his work, but they begin planning to put Jesus to death because of a threefold offense: the temple disturbance, healing on the Sabbath, and making God his Father (5:18). Mosaic authority is here levied, as Moses gave the law regarding the forbidding of work on the Sabbath (Exod 20:8-11), and the Shema reminds Israel that the Lord God is one (Deut 6:4). To these challenges, Jesus is presented as appealing to an alternative Mosaic authority—the Prophet-like-Moses typology rooted in Deuteronomy 18:15-22 (5:16-30; 7:14-30; 8:12-20) bolstered by Danielic Son-of-Man apocalypticism (5:27; 8:28). This, of course, raises further consternation over Jesus’s emphasis upon the unity of the Son with the Father, which then leads to charges of blasphemy and its capital penalty (8:59; 10:33). In Johannine perspective, the religious authorities do not sense God’s love that was central to the Sabbath healing, and while they may know the scriptures, they do not see that they point to Jesus as the one of whom Moses wrote (5:31-46—a reference to Deut 18:15, 18). While Jesus spiritualizes the water-libation theme of Sukkot, they anticipate a Davidic Judean leader and are blind to the possibility that a messianic leader might come from Galilee (7:37-52).

3) Resulting tensions between would-be followers of Jesus and the Judean authorities are then referenced in a variety of ways, and palpable is the sense that these tensions continued for several decades after the ministry of Jesus. First, fear of the Judean leaders keeps people from expressing openly their allegiance to Jesus (7:13; 19:38), and even after his death the followers of Jesus meet behind closed doors as a factor of that intimidation (20:19). Second, this fear is named more specifically as being felt by oppressed-though-believing Jewish authorities, who fear the Pharisees’ endeavors to put open confessors of Jesus out of the synagogue (12:42). The parents of the man born blind are also subjected to this intimidation, as the Judean leaders “had already decided” that any who confessed Jesus to be the Messiah would be put out of the synagogue—an existential reality earlier and later (9:22). In the second-edition material, this threat is reflected upon more generally in the later stages of the Johannine situation, as those who do not know the Father or the Son will put people out of the synagogue, leading possibly to their death (16:1-4—perhaps at the hands of the Romans if they do not confess Caesar as Lord under Domitian’s reign). While theories of mass expulsions are

63 Thus, John’s apologetic thrust is designed to lead audiences into belief in Jesus as the Jewish Messiah/Christ on the basis of the witnesses, the signs, and the fulfilled word (Anderson 2000).
unlikely, the Judean leaders’ investment in dampening the Galilean Jesus movement during the Palestinian phase of the Johannine situation continues on within its Hellenistic phase, involving the understandable attempt to discipline perceived ditheism within diaspora synagogues. Even if Bernier’s thesis is correct, that the Birkat against the Minim began as a political concern, under Gamaliel II, it later came to function as a means of disciplining aspects of Jewish faith and practice, which would have targeted perceived ditheism in post-70 CE Judaism.

4) While Martyn disparaged links between the Johannine Gospel and Epistles, they actually bolster his theory in a general sense, even though tensions with local synagogues were not the most acute set of crises faced by Johannine believers in the 80s and 90s. The Johannine Epistles thus reflect some of the internal difficulties faced by the Johannine community and neighboring ones. First, there is disagreement over what is sinful and what is not. Gentile believers might not share the same convictions as to what is appropriate and what should be eschewed, having become part of the Jewish family of faith. The final chapter of 1 John clarifies that death-producing sins are not options for believers, and the last word coheres with the first word: stay away from idols! (1 John 1:5-10; 5:21). That would have been especially relevant during the reign of Domitian (81–96 CE), when subjects of the Roman Empire were expected to reverence Caesar or suffer the consequences. Being “out of the synagogue” also meant that while believers did not have to pay the fiscus Ioudaicus (the two-drachma tax exacted upon all Jewish subjects in the Empire—to be paid to Jupiter Capitolina, Josephus Wars 7.218), they were expected to reverence Caesar one way or another. Second, some have apparently abandoned the Johannine community, deciding to recant their confessions of Jesus as the Christ, reflecting acquiescence to the continuing effect of synagogue disciplining endeavors reflected in John 9:22 and 12:42. This is less of a schism and more of a defection, as Jewish members of John’s community find themselves courted back into the religious certainty and sociological homogeneity of the synagogue. The appeal of Jewish family and friends would also have been strong. Here the Elder counters by denying their central interest—preserving Jewish monotheism—claiming that those denying the Son will forfeit the Father, but those who receive the Son also maintain the Father’s embrace (1 John 2:18-25). While the proselytizing defection crisis is somewhat past, however, a third crisis is on the way: the false teachings of traveling of docetizing prophets and teachers, who deny that Jesus came in the flesh (1 John 4:1-3; 2 John 7). While the term antichristoi is also used to describe these teachers, this crisis is altogether different from the Jewish departures. One threat is past, the next one is impending; one threat involved secession, the later involved visitation; one threat denied Jesus’ being the Jewish Messiah/Christ, the later one denied his humanity. Yet the main interest of the docetizing threat was probably more practical than theological—the legitimizing of assimilation to culture over and against maintaining Jewish standards of faith and practice. In

65 Anderson 1997, 32-40; 2007e.
terms of local pagan festivals, reverencing Caesar’s image, and “loving the world,” a non-suffering Jesus alleviates the need for his followers to embrace costly discipleship. A fourth crisis in the later Johannine situation involved tensions with emerging institutional hierarchical leaders in neighboring Christian communities. Here, the primacy-loving Diotrephes has not only forbidden Johannine believers from visiting his community, but he threatens his own church members with expulsion if they take them in (3 John 9-10). The Elder has written to “the church” about Diotrephes, whose proto-Ignatian approach to church unity is being experienced adversely by at least one neighboring community. This leads the Elder, then, to finalize the testimony of the Beloved Disciple (after his death—around 100 CE) and to circulate it among the churches as a manifesto of Jesus’s will for the church—a spirit-based and egalitarian approach to believers’ unity in Christ, the Jewish Messiah.

5) In the later material added to the Johannine Gospel, several operations and interests are evident. First, the Jewish agency motif rooted in the Mosaic prophet typology of Deut 18 has been transformed into a cross-cultural Logos hymn designed to include Gentile believers alongside Jewish followers of Jesus (John 1:1-5, 9-14, 16-18; note parallels to 1 John 1:1-3). Therefore, extending the blessings of Abrahamic faith to the nations, despite the uneven reception of Jesus among “his own,” as many as believe receive adoption into the divine family as children of God (John 1:10-13). Second, the addition of John 6 features the only occurrences of Ioudaios/Ioudaioi found in the supplementary material, and two of these are simply within dialogues with Jesus in John 6:41 and 52, where “the Jews” do not understand what Jesus has been saying. They are miscomprehending, but not intensely adversarial here. The Passover feast of the Jews is also mentioned as locating the time of the feeding in 6:4, which is presented neutrally. What this later material suggests is that the intensity of debates with local Jewish communities has waned; the thrust of the later material is more pastoral than apologetic. It calls people to abide in Jesus and his community in the face of hardships under Empire. A third feature within this later material is that it displays virtually all of the incarnational material in the Fourth Gospel, reflecting an antidocetic thrust: the Word becomes flesh (1:14), believers must ingest the flesh and blood of Jesus—a reference to the way of the cross (6:51-58), tribulation in the world is predicted (chs. 15-17), water and blood pour forth from the pierced side of Jesus (19:34-35), and the martyrological death of Peter is predicted (21:18-23). This thrust replicates the interest in staving off the Docetists referenced in 1 and 2 John. A fourth interest furthers John’s egalitarian and spirit-based ecclesiology by presenting Peter as affirming the authority of Jesus (6:68-69; a dialectical engagement of Matt 16:17-19?), featuring Jesus’s teaching on the accessibility of the Holy Spirit to all believers (chs. 15-16), and asserting the priority of loving the flock in the ambivalent reinstatement of Peter (21:15-17). These features in the Beloved Disciple’s later

66 With Kümemann 1968 and others.
67 Anderson 2016.
68 So argues Borgen 1965, and this accounts for elements of John’s antidocetic emphases upon the fleshly incarnation of Jesus, with Schnelle 1992.
ministry would have been important for the Johannine Elder to assert, especially in his dealing with Diotrephes and hierarchical developments within proto-Ignatian Christianity, following the death of the Beloved Disciple.

7.3 A third feature of John’s intra-Jewish thrust involves closer foci upon the Palestinian and diaspora settings of the evolving Johannine situation. As a result of this overview, the developing engagements in Jesus-Judean and Johannine-Jewish engagements are evident within the evolving history of the Johannine situation. On this score, Martyn’s earlier view that there was a singular dialectical relationship within the Johannine situation—with the local synagogue in a diaspora setting—is far too limited. That was one of the dialectical engagements within the Johannine situation, but it was not the only one, and in the later phase it was not even the primary one. Brown’s multivalent dialectical approach is more realistic, although it also fails to account for the Roman presence under Domitian, and it makes too much of Samaritan inferences. Assuming a move to Asia Minor or some other diaspora setting during the Roman invasion of Palestine from 66-73 CE, the following Jesus-Judean and Johannine-Jewish tensions are plausible.

7.3.1 Palestine-Based Tensions Between the Jesus Movement and the Judean Leaders

- Jesus follows the lead of John the Baptist in challenging the institutions and religious practices of Galilee and Judea, leading off with the temple incident, performing healings on the Sabbath, and creating cognitive dissonance with his words and deeds; this evokes opposition by Judean leaders, who challenge his authorization.
- In response to Mosaic-Law and institutionalized-religion challenges, Jesus defends his authorization citing the Mosaic Prophet typology (with his word being fulfilled) and Son of Man apocalyptic agency.
- Jesus and his followers encounter resistance in Judea, leading to the Chief Priests and Pharisees plotting to put Jesus to death at the hand of the Romans, which indeed eventuates.
- If an early Birkat ha-Minim was operative in Jerusalem during the ministry of Jesus and following, it could reflect resistance against Jesus for political reasons, disparaging Galilean political-messiah insurrectionism out of fears of a likely Roman backlash.
- Competition with followers of John the Baptist is palpable within the Johannine narrative, as John is presented as being the key witness to Jesus—yoking his popular authority to the Jesus movement.
- Continuing tensions between followers of Jesus and Judean leaders are also evidenced in the Johannine narrative, as the disparaging of Galileans and Samaritans by the Jerusalemites continues.

7.3.2 Diaspora-Based Tensions Between Johannine Believers and Jewish Communities

69 For a fuller analysis of the Johannine community that Raymond Brown left behind, see Anderson 2014.
70 Borgen 1997; Reinhartz 1989, 10.
• With the movement to Asia Minor or another diaspora setting around 70 CE, the Johannine leadership joins the local synagogue, likely worshiping with Jewish community members on the Sabbath and with Gentile believers in Jesus on First Day—plausibly reflecting the fruit of the Pauline mission.
• As Johannine believers witness to their conviction that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah, this appeal is partially compelling; some come to believe in Jesus, but others see the Father-Son relationship claims as a blasphemous development.
• The blessing against the heretics bolsters the disciplining of perceived ditheists, as the use of the *Birkat ha-Minim* becomes a codification of local concerns, leading, perhaps unwittingly, to the departure of some Johannine believers.
• Following a partial separation from the synagogue, some Johannine community members are apparently proselytized back into the synagogue if they are willing to diminish their beliefs in Jesus as the Messiah—embracing something like an Ebionite Christology; John’s leadership calls for solidarity with Jesus and his community.
• As traveling Gentile-Christian prophets and teachers come within reach of the Johannine situation, the Johannine leaders assert Jewish-based convictions against their assimilative teachings—including admonitions regarding staying away from idols, resistance to worldly customs, and refusing to offer emperor laud.
• As monepiscopal structures of hierarchical leadership emerge within proto-Ignatian Christianity, the Johannine approach to community organization maintains its Jewish egalitarian and presbyter-based approach to discernment and leadership.

Within these developments in the Johannine tradition and situation, it is clear that John’s presentation of Jesus never really departs from its Jewish origin and ethos. As the Martyn paradigm too easily dismisses the first levels of history in the Johannine tradition, a more nuanced view of John’s historical memory sees most of its narrative as reflecting an intra-Jewish perspective on what happened to Jesus “back then” and therefore “why it matters” in later settings. While Martyn’s overall view that synagogue disciplining—leading to at least some departures or perceived expulsions—has not been overturned by scholars claiming close relations between Christians and Jews in the second century,71 flaws in this approach are threefold. First, Martyn wrongly follows a form of the earlier Bultmannian view that the Johannine narrative was constructed upon an alien source; it did not have its own historical memory to develop.72 This inference has been overturned by the fact that Bultmann’s own evidence for a diachronic origin of John’s material is

71 For instance, while Reuven Kimelmann questions inferences of mass expulsions from late first century synagogues, he does acknowledge that the *Birkat ha-Minim* would have been targeted at Jesus adherents within Jewish communities in Palestine, based on the report of Rabbi Issi of Caesarea (Kimelmann 1981, 232): “From this it is clear that minim can include at least Jewish Christians. Hence it is safe to conclude that the Palestinian prayer against the minim was aimed at Jewish sectarians among whom Jewish Christians figured prominently.”

72 Thus, Martyn supervised Robert Fortna’s doctoral work on the identification of a Signs Gospel (Fortna 1970) as the primary source underlying the Johannine narrative, allowing him to focus on the second level of John’s story of Jesus, having eliminated the Johannine character of its origin, following Bultmann’s lead.
completely lacking. Thus, the historical character of John’s memory of Jesus’s ministry deserves renewed critical consideration on the einmalig level of the events reported.

Second, Martyn wrongly discounts the Johannine Epistles as having anything to do with the Johannine situation in which the Johannine Gospel was finalized. This may have been a factor of the difficulty in dealing with the docetizing antichrists figures within his John-Jewish paradigm, but if the secessionists in 1 John 2:18-25 returned to religious security of the synagogue having first been distanced from it, the Johannine Epistles would actually bolster Martyn’s overall theory. A third error with Martyn’s earlier work is that it tends to confine the crises in the Johannine situation to a single set of issues, when real life rarely affords such a luxury. Martyn actually modified his view later, taking note of John’s Gentile mission in addition to Jewish engagements, further noting signs of Johannine engagements with other Christian communities. Over seven decades, ample evidence reflects at least six crises with other groups within the evolving Johannine situation, including two crises within its pre-70 CE Palestine setting (Phase I: Judea-Galilee tensions; Baptist-Jesus tensions), two crises within its early diaspora setting (Phase II, 70-85 CE: synagogue-Johannine tensions; imperial-Jewish tensions), and two crises within its later diaspora setting (Phase III, 85-100 CE: docetizing-Johannine tensions; Christian institutionalizing-Johannine tensions). A running set of dialogues with Markan and Matthean traditions is also palpable from the earliest to the latest stages of gospel traditions, reflecting a seventh set of dialectical engagements.

The significance of this analysis for the present study is that it can no longer be claimed that the Johannine presentation of Jesus and the Ioudaioi is confined to theological construction in the late first-century Johannine situation as a projection of Johannine theology with no historical memory behind it. Rather, the opposite is more likely the case. John’s presentation of Jesus and his ministry conveys an autonomous memory of Jesus’s works and teachings, reflecting real tensions between a Galilean prophetic leader and religious authorities in Jerusalem. While that memory is narrated later, coming into its written formation later in the history of the Johannine situation, its content did not originate there. As an alternative to Mark, John’s story of Jesus includes material that augments Mark’s narrative, reflecting acute tensions between Jesus and the religious leaders of Jerusalem. In terms of primitivity, critical realism, and corroborative impression, John’s socio-religious presentation of religious challenge, disputed authorization, popularist sentiment, and concerted opposition with relation to the engagements of Jesus in Jerusalem, John’s story of Jesus is far more rooted in early historical memory than modern critical scholarship has allowed. In that sense, continued opposition by religious leaders in the second generation of the Pauline mission

---

73 In the analyses of Smith 1965; Van Belle 1994; Anderson 1996, the stylistic, contextual, and theological bases for inferring alien material underlying the Johannine narrative is not only inconclusive; it is nonexistent (Anderson 1996, 70-136; 2014b).

74 Anderson 2006a. With Goodenough 1945, John contains a good deal of primitive memory as well as later developments. See also the work of the John, Jesus, and History Project from 2002-2016 (Anderson/Just/Thatcher, eds. 2007; 2009; 2016) and Charlesworth’s acknowledgment of a paradigm shift within New Testament studies since the turn of the millennium (Charlesworth 2010).


76 Anderson 2002; 2013.

77 Thus, John and Mark are best seen as the Bi-Optic Gospels—two distinctive perspectives from day one: Anderson 2001; 2013.
reflects secondary concerns not primary ones. Even in the light of an uneven reception among Jewish family and friends within that diaspora setting, John’s story of Jesus is that of the Jewish Messiah/Christ, offering Abrahamic blessing to the rest of the world. Therein lay its promise and its later challenges.


Like John’s rendering of so many other themes, John’s presentation of *hoi Ioudaioi* is highly dialectical.\(^{78}\) This is a point too often missed by those studying John’s tensions between Christianity and Judaism. On one hand, as we have seen, Jewish leaders are portrayed as being threatened by Jesus and opposing him and his movement. On the other hand, Jesus is presented as fulfilling many of the central typologies of Israel itself, even representing the Father’s sending of the Son as the Prophet anticipated by Moses in Deut 18. The negative references to the *Ioudaioi* in John are almost exclusively confined to particular Judean religious authorities who engage Jesus pointedly in adversarial ways. Granted, he calls them “children of your father, the Devil” in confronting their claims to be children of Abraham and never to have been in bondage (an ironic claim, given histories with Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Rome). They, in turn, claim Jesus has a demon and that he is a blasphemer, deserving of being put to death (cf. Lev 24:16). These invective slams are neither anti-Jewish nor anti-Christian; such inferences are thoroughly anachronistic. Rather, John’s Jesus declares that *salvation is of the Jews* and presents Jesus as fulfilling Israel’s historic typologies in eschatological ways.\(^{79}\) This cannot be considered anti-Semitic, and John’s author and compiler, its subject (Jesus), and a good portion of its audience were all Jewish. Therefore, John’s story of Jesus—in tension with Judean authorities, some of whom indeed believe in Jesus—must be seen as an intra-Jewish set of engagements. Just as John’s narrative cannot be used as a basis for violence, nor can it be read responsibly as advocating any form of anti-Semitism. It is radically Jewish in its self-understanding, even if that inference is contested.\(^{80}\)

John’s presentation of Jesus as the Revealer, however, does challenge religious and political bastions of power and authority, yet these challenges extend beyond first-century Judean leadership and ancient imperial Rome. They also apply to modern and postmodern institutions and authorities, whether they be Christian, secular, political,

---

\(^{78}\) As with other tensive presentations of John’s key subjects (Anderson 2011a, 25-43), the epistemological origins of John’s theological tensions include: the creative work of a dialectical thinker, forwarding his understanding of the divine-human dialogue (revelation and its uneven responses), within a dialectical and evolving Johannine situation, by means of crafting a narrative designed to engage targeted audiences in imaginary dialogues with Jesus—the subject of the narrative (Anderson 1996, 252-65). These four dialectical operations are also evident in the Johannine Prologue, which was added to the final stages of the narrative in order to create an experiential response to John’s story of Jesus (Anderson 2007a).

\(^{79}\) As John Painter (1978) points out, “Israel” in the Fourth Gospel is never identified specifically with believing Jews or other groups of people. Embrace within the flock of the shepherd is simply a factor of receptivity and responsiveness to the voice of the shepherd.

\(^{80}\) Given evidence of encounters between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism in the late first century CE (Wild 1985), it is no surprise that John’s story of Jesus reflects the ethos of Palestinian Judaism (Borgen 1965). Additionally, the Jewish feasts in John are remembered with energetic vitality (Yee 1988), showing another side of John’s radical Jewishness.
economic, or ideological. On these and other subjects, the best antidote to wooden interpretations of John is the balancing of particular claims with others found within the same gospel narrative. The best corrective to John, in other words, is John. Does John portray Jesus as overturning Jewish religious structures and forms only to set up “good Christian ones” in their place? Absolutely not! True worship takes place irrespective of place and regardless of cultic form (4:21-24); it must be in spirit and in truth. In that sense, the Johannine Jesus challenges not only Jewish dogmatism and religiosity, but it also challenges Christian instantiations of the same. The truth in John is not a new set of notions to be assimilated intellectually; it is a spiritual reality, revealed by the divine agent and communicated by the Spirit of truth. Likewise, to be a seeker of truth is to be open to the enlightening work of the eternal Christ in whatever form or from whatever sector it may be found. John’s Gospel, as well as the greatest source of Christian exclusivism (John 14:6), is also the greatest source of Christian universalism (John 1:9; 6:45). In that sense, John’s presentation of Jesus, because it challenges as contingent all that is worldly and partial, challenges all religious dogmatism, if understood adequately. Because the Spirit of truth is available to all, each person has the privilege of engaging the spiritual presence of God and testifying to what one has seen and heard (John 3:32; Acts 4:19-20; 1 John 1:3). When this happens, people not only are enabled to listen to one another; they are better enabled to listen together, with one another, to the subtle promptings of the divine. Hearkening back to Isa 54:13, Jesus declares in John 6:45, “they shall all be taught by God.” Thus, the greatest Johannine scandal is not its exclusivism but its universal inclusivism, which defies religious, political, and societal bounds.

So, what do we do with anti-Semitism, religious violence, and the Gospel of John? First, while it is true that John has contributed to anti-Semitic tendencies in Europe, America, and elsewhere, this is not the same as deeming John to be an anti-Semitic document in terms of its origin and character. John is thoroughly cosmopolitan in its ethos and rhetoric, and to fail to acknowledge that fact is to make an egregious interpretive error. Also, John will not go away. Sacred scriptures are here to stay, and the problems they evoke must be addressed with exegetical acuity rather than anachronistic eisegesis. Therefore, what we see about hoi Ioudaioi in John is neither a prejudice against a race or a particular religion, but a set of reflections rooted in a community’s tumultuous history reflecting its own struggles and alienation from its parent religious movement, while also seeking to extend the blessings of Judaism to the greater world beyond. Wrongly or rightly, this is seen as a fulfillment of Israel’s vocation rather than its aberration.

While none of the general references to the Jewish nation or the Jewish religion are negative, John’s Jesus is opposed by particular religious leaders and groups in Judea, and within that memory lies the heart of the adversarial struggle. John’s tradition does not respond, however, with the supersession of one religion over another. Here Bultmann’s insight relates powerfully. It is not Jewish religion proper that the saving/revealing initiative of Jesus as God’s agent in John confounds; it scandalizes all that is of creaturely origin, including the religious platforms and scaffolding of Christianity, political and social empires, and even irreligion as a human construct. The reader is thus invited to be

---

81 Anderson 1991; see also Alan Culpepper’s important essay inclusivism and exclusivism in the Fourth Gospel, 2002.
a seeker of truth, and such is the means of liberation, the character of authority, and the center of our common commitments (8:32). And, the truth is especially liberating when it comes to correcting flawed interpretations of classic religious texts.

As Professor Henry Cadbury used to say to his students at Harvard Divinity School, “It may take us five hundred years to get the interpretation right on this particular text, but we’re going to start today.” And, may it be so in our careful readings of this polyvalent text.
Appendix I:

A Historical Outline of the Johannine Situation

In longitudinal perspective, the history of the Johannine situation involved at least seven dialogical engagements between 30 and 100 CE. Two largely sequential, yet somewhat overlapping, crises emerged in each of its three periods, with a seventh dialogue, engaging other gospel traditions, spanning all three periods. Some of these crises reflected extramural dialogues (north-south tensions in Palestine, tensions with Rome, etc.), while others involved intramural ones (followers of the Baptist, tensions with the synagogue, Docetist teachers, institutionalizing tensions). Evidence for these dialogues is found in the Johannine Gospel and Epistles and the letters of Ignatius, and four of them are evident in a history-and-theology reading of John 6.

Period I: The Palestinian Period, the Developing of an Autonomous Johannine Jesus Tradition (ca. 30-70 CE)

Crisis A—Dealing with North/South Tensions (Galileans/Judeans)
Crisis B—Reaching Followers of John the Baptist
(The oral Johannine tradition develops.)

The early Johannine Situation develops in Palestine, reflecting northern perspective (likely in Galilee with Samarian sympathies) and southern familiarity (with Jerusalem and Judea). Within this setting, an autonomous Jesus tradition develops, to some degree in dialogue with Petrine (or other pre-Markan) oral traditions, but also in dialogue with other groups, including political/religious leaders in Judea and followers of John the Baptist. Palestinian archaeological and topographical references reflect historical realism, betraying knowledge of the area before its destruction by the Romans in 70 CE.

Period II: The First Asia Minor Phase, the Forging of a Johannine Community (ca. 70-85 CE)

Crisis A—Engaging Local Jewish Family and Friends
Crisis B—Dealing with the Local Roman Presence
(The first edition of the Johannine Gospel is prepared.)

The Johannine evangelist and perhaps other associates relocate to one of the mission churches—plausibly Ephesus or another mission setting in Asia Minor—some time before or around the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Their contacts with the local synagogue eventually become strained (the Birkat ha-Minim is a codification of Jewish opposition to the Jesus movement), leading to an individuated

---

82 This outline is an adaptation of Table 2.5 and Appendix II in The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus, LNTS 321 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2006) 196-99.
83 Ignatius describes visiting Judaizers (Barrett 1982) and Docetists (Goulder 1999), who proselytize and bring false teachings among the churches of Asia Minor—living under the hegemony of the Roman Empire; in addressing these threats, he advocates appointing a single bishop in every church as a means of dealing with internal and external threats to church unity.
Johannine community composed of Christian Jews and Gentile Christians. While appealing for Jewish family and friends to receive Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, members of the synagogue also exhort those with Jewish backgrounds to return to the way of Moses and the household of Abraham. This leads some to abandon the new community and rejoin the synagogue, while Jesus-adherents who never left, and perhaps others who did, sought to straddle the two communities. During the reign of Domitian (81-96 CE) the increased expectation of public emperor worship and participation in pagan festivals and civic life creates a crisis for Hellenistic followers of Jesus, especially Gentile Christians with non-Jewish backgrounds.

**Period III: The Second Asia Minor Phase, Dialogues between Christian Communities (ca. 85-100 CE)**

- **Crisis A**—Engaging Docetizing Gentile Christians and their Teachings
- **Crisis B**—Engaging Christian Institutionalizing Tendencies (Diotrephes and his kin)
- **Crisis C**—Engaging Dialectically other Christians’ Presentations of Jesus and his Ministry (actually reflecting a running dialogue over all three periods)

(The evangelist continues to teach and perhaps write; the Epistles are written by the Johannine Elder, who then finalizes and circulates the testimony of the Beloved Disciple after his death.)

The Johannine sector of the early church grows, both by the starting of new communities and by establishing contact with other Christian communities in Asia Minor and beyond, leading to correspondence and intervisitation between the churches. Some Gentile teachers/preachers comfort their audiences with a teaching allowing some worldly assimilation, including softening the stand on forbidding emperor worship and participation in Hellenistic festivals, legitimated by a non-suffering Jesus. Rising institutionalization among neighbor churches reflects a proto-Ignatian means of addressing similar issues, but it also becomes a strident matter as expressed by Diotrephes and his kin. Dialogues with Synoptic traditions continue, now with a focus on Matthean-Johannine dialogues regarding church leadership and how Christ continues to lead the church.

**Post-Johannine Christianity (100 CE and later)**

The Post-Johannine situation reflects the spurned docetizing preachers’ taking the Johannine Gospel with them, leading into what eventually became some parts of second-century Christian Gnosticism (including eventual Johannine influences upon Heracleon, the Gospel of Truth, and the Gospel of Philip). The Johannine Gospel becomes a favorite among orthodox Christians in the broader Mediterranean world, and Montanus and his followers are moved by its influence to seek to restore the spirit-based vitality of the church. John’s dialectical Christology becomes a source of debate among Christians, and eventually the Johannine Gospel is employed to combat Gnostic influences (Marcion and Valentinus) and to challenge those who would reject the Johannine writings (referred to pejoratively as the *Alogoi*) for secondary reasons.
(references to the Parakłētos, differences with the Synoptics, dissention over the Apocalypse and its interpretation, advocating for a particular calendar, etc.). By the turn of the second century CE the Fourth Gospel has become the “Spiritual Gospel” written by “John the Theologian,” a great source of debate within Christology studies and Jesus research to the present day.
Appendix II:

The Outline of Deuteronomy 18:15-22 as Found in John

Rather than rooting in the Gnostic Redeemer-Myth, the History-of-Religions origin of the Johannine sending motif is the Prophet-like-Moses agency schema outlined in Deuteronomy 18:15-22. The language and themes of the septuagintal rendering of this passage may be found throughout the Johannine Gospel, and the Father-Son relationship is replete with these associations. Eight primary parallels and twenty-four secondary parallels confirm the centrality of this schema within the Johannine narrative. 84

a) 15a, 18a—The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me (Moses) from amidst the brethren.

i) Jesus—is anticipated as (John 1:17; 3:14; 6:32; 7:19, 22), is written about by (1:45; 5:46), and is identified as being a prophet like Moses (6:14-15).

ii) The role of “the Prophet”—is ceded by John the Baptist (1:21-25) and declared to be Jesus by the Samaritan woman (4:19), the Jews (7:40), and the blind man (9:17).

b) 15b—You must listen to him.

i) The Son bears witness to that which he has seen and heard from the Father (3:32; 5:19, 30; 6:46; 8:26, 38, 40; 14:24; 15:15).

ii) Hearing the Son implies believing in him (3:36; 5:24; 6:45; 8:51) and knowing his voice (10:3-4, 16; 18:37).

iii) Rejecting the Son implies neither having heard nor seen the Father (5:37-38; 8:47), and the one not hearing or keeping Jesus’ words evokes judgment (12:46-8).

c) 18b—Yahweh will put his words in his (the prophet’s) mouth.

i) The words of the Father are spoken by Jesus (3:11, 34; 6:63, 68; 7:16-18, 28; 8:28, 38, 55; 12:44-50; 14:24, 31), and those who receive them receive the one on whose behalf he speaks (1:12; 3:36; 5:24; 12:44; 13:20; 14:21-24; 15:10).


84 The content of this outline is rendered more fully in Anderson 1999, and it is presented in a slightly different form in the new introduction to The Christology of the Fourth Gospel in its third printing (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2010) lxxix-lxxviii.
iii) In John, of course, Jesus not only speaks the word of God, he is the Word of God (1:1, 14).

d) 18c—He shall speak everything Yahweh commands him (= in his name).
i) The Son’s word is to be equated with that of the Father precisely because the Son says nothing on his own, but only what he hears and sees from the Father (5:19; 10:18, 28-29, 32, 38; 12:49-50; 17:21). Likewise, he carries out identically the commandment of the Lord (10:18; 12:49-50; 14:31; 15:10).

ii) Jesus comes in the name of the Father (5:43) and the Lord (12:13), and he seeks to glorify the name of the Father (12:28). Jesus has manifested the name of the Father to those given to him, and they are kept in the name of the Father in unity (17:11-12).

iii) The Son issues a new commandment (13:34; 14:15, 21; 15:10-17), and that which is done in the name of the Son is also efficacious (14:13-14, 26; 15:16; 16:13-14, 23-24, 26; 20:31), while a scandal to the world (15:21).

e) 19—Whoever does not heed Yahweh’s words, which the prophet speaks in his name, will be held accountable.

i) Those not receiving the Son or his words believingly have already been judged (3:16-18; 12:47), and the Father entrusts all judgment to the Son (5:22, 27) as the truthful words of the Son produce their own judgment if rejected (12:48).

ii) Eschatologically, the judgment of the world involves the casting out of the ruler of the world and the lifting up of the Son of Man (12:31-36; 16:11), and the Paraklētos will be sent as a further agent of revelation and judgment (16:8-11).

f) 20—However, a prophet who presumes to say in the name of Yahweh anything Yahweh has not instructed, or one who speaks in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die.

i) Jesus is accused of speaking and acting presumptuously in John (“breaking” the Sabbath 5:16, 18; 7:22-23; 9:16; “deceiving” the crowd 7:12, 47; and witnessing about himself 8:13, 53). Furthermore, considered as blasphemy are his calling God his “father” (making himself “equal to God,” 5:18) and accusations of making himself out to be God (10:33) and the Son of God (19:7).

ii) Thus, the Judean leaders seek to kill Jesus (5:16, 18; 7:1, 19, 25; 8:37, 40, 59; 10:31; 11:8), or at least to arrest him (7:30, 32, 44; 8:20; 10:39; 11:57). They accuse him of having a demon (7:20; 8:48, 52; 10:20)—or even of being “a Samaritan” (8:48)—and begin to orchestrate his being put to death (11:53; 18:12; 19:7—likewise Lazarus, 12:10).

iii) They also agree to put “out of the synagogue” anyone who openly acknowledges Jesus to be the Christ (9:22; 12:42; 16:2).

g) 22a—If a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord and the word does not take place or does not occur, that is a message the Lord has not spoken.

i) The words testified about Jesus by the primary Johannine witness (John the Baptist) are true (1:15, 26-27, 29-32, 36; 3:28; 10:41).

iii) The word of Caiaphas regarding Jesus’ sacrificial death is ironically fulfilled (even unknowingly, 11:49-52) being the High Priest that year; and even Pilate declares, perhaps unwittingly, Jesus to be “the King of the Jews” (19:14-22).


v) To remove all doubt, Jesus declares ahead of time what is to take place so that it will be acknowledged that he is sent from God (13:18-19; 14:28-29; 16:2-4; 18:8-9, 31-34). The typological embodiment of Deut. 18:22 could not be put any clearer; Jesus is the true Prophet like Moses because all of his words—as well as the testimony about him—come true. Thus, he is clearly sent from God (3:16-17, 34; 4:34; 5:23-24, 30, 36-38; 6:29, 37-40, 44, 57; 7:16-18, 28-29, 33; 8:16-18, 26, 28-29, 42; 9:4; 10:36; 11:42; 12:44-45, 49-50; 13:20; 14:24; 15:21; 16:5; 17:3, 8, 18, 21-25; 20:21) and is to be heeded as though heeding the one who sent him.

h) 22b—That prophet has spoken presumptuously; do not fear him (Note the irony, given the fulfilled prolepses!).

i) Jesus is accused of testifying about himself (see above under f), and his not being from David’s city (7:41-52) becomes an ironic criterion for rejection.

ii) Ironically, in seeking to have the “presumptuous prophet” put to death at the hand of Pilate—in keeping with Deut. 18:20 (19:7)—the Jewish leaders commit blasphemy and hail Caesar as King (19:15).

iii) Furthering the irony, those tending to be feared in John are the Jewish religious leaders (7:13; 9:22; 12:42) rather than God or the Prophet like Moses sent from God, and even Jesus’ disciples are “afraid of the Jews” (20:19).
Appendix III:

Jesus the Jewish Messiah in John:
Fulfillments of Scripture—Typological and Predictive

In constructing his story of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, the Fourth Evangelist displays extensive engagements with Jewish scripture, both directly and indirectly. Indirectly, Jesus is held to be the Messiah typologically, in numerous ways. Jesus fulfills such typologies as the redemptive word and wisdom of God, the patriarchal legacies of Abraham and Jacob, the royal associations of David and Solomon, the prophetic typologies of Moses and Elijah, and the apocalyptic ministries of Elijah and Daniel.85

- The Word and Wisdom of God are the source of creation and redemption (Gen 1:1–2:4; Prov 8:22-30 → John 1:1-18).
- Being children of Abraham is asserted by Jews in Jerusalem, who claim they were slaves to no one; Yahweh’s promise to bless the world is fulfilled in the Greeks’ coming to Jesus (Gen 12–22 → John 8:12-59; 12:20-21).
- Parallels to the ascending and descending angels of Jacob’s ladder are referenced by Jesus, and in contrast to the water from Jacob’s well, the water Jesus avails is living and life producing (Gen 28:12 → John 1:51; 4:5-12).
- Just as Moses brought the law, raised a serpent on a pole, provided manna in the wilderness, produced a wondrous sea crossing, and predicted a prophet to come, Jesus brought grace and truth, was raised on a cross, fed the multitude, delivered his disciples safely to the shore of the lake, and spoke words that came true (Exod 20:1-18; Num 21:8; Exod 16:4 / Ps 78:24-25; Exod 14; Deut 18:15-22 → John 1:17; 3:14; 6:1-13, 16-21; 5:46; 18:9).
- While Jesus’s coming from the city of David is debated, he indeed rides into Jerusalem on a donkey, fulfilling the Davidic prophecies of Zechariah. (Zech 9:9 → John 12:14).
- Just as Elijah raised the son of the widow of Zarephath and parted the water with his mantle, and just as Elisha raised the son of the Shunammite woman from the dead and fed the crowd of one hundred with barley loaves, so Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, fed the five thousand with barley loaves and fish, and delivered his disciples across the sea (1 Kgs 17:17-24; 2 Kgs 2:8; 4:8-44 → John 11:1-44; 6:1-21).
- Just as Ezekiel referred to his lowly obedience to God with “Son of Man” language, and just as Daniel used the same term with reference to the heavenly agent of God coming to judge the earth, Jesus as the Son of Man in John obeys whatever the Father commands and is paradoxically lifted up on the cross as a result of his divine commission (Ezk 2:1-8; Dan 7:13 → John 3:13; 5:27; 8:28; 12:23).

85 Adapted from Paul N. Anderson, The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel; An Introduction to John (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011) 84.
In addition to typological fulfillments of Jewish scripture in John’s narrative, explicit references to scripture having been fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus abound. Much like the Matthean tradition, the Johannine tradition shows text-based developments connecting events and details in the ministry of Jesus with the fulfillment of key biblical texts as a means of asserting the conviction that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah. Some of these connections appear to have developed within the later Johannine tradition, and in that sense, their formation need not have been tied Palestinian Judaism in particular.

- The reader is told that the disciples later found anticipated in scripture a particular meaning for what Jesus had done or said: the temple incident (John 2:17 → Ps 69:9); the triumphal entry (John 12:13-16 → Zech 9:9); the disciples and Jesus both point to scripture as that which testifies to his mission and authenticity (John 1:45; 5:39 → Deut 18:15-22).

- Hebrew scripture is cited by a person or group (John the Baptist declaring his mission (John 1:23 → Isa 40:3); the crowd at the entry to Jerusalem (John 12:13 → Ps 118:25-26), at times in flawed ways (the Jewish leaders after the feeding, John 6:31 → Exod 16:4; Neh 9:15; Ps 78:24-25); the Jerusalem authorities in seeking a Davidic Messiah (John 7:41-42 → Mic 5:2).
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