

Remembering and Revelation: The Historic and Glorified Jesus in the Gospel of John

L. W. Hurtado, University of Edinburgh¹

In a recent book, *Lord Jesus Christ* (2003), I noted that one of the features common to all four of the intra-canonical Gospels is that they situate Jesus explicitly and rather fully in time, place, and cultural setting.² This is all the more remarkable in light of the interesting and well-known differences among them in some other matters, and also in comparison with the rather unlocalized way that Jesus is depicted in extra-canonical “Jesus books” such as *The Gospel of Thomas*, and *The Gospel of Philip*.³ That is, all four intra-canonical Jesus books concur broadly in emphasizing that the risen and glorified Jesus is to be identified as the historic figure who first appeared in Galilee, and whose career was framed by the prophet-ministry of John (the Baptizer) and by Jesus’ execution in Jerusalem at the hands of the Roman governor, Pilate. By contrast, from the *Gospel of Thomas*, for example, one would scarcely suspect that Jesus was a Jew, where he may have operated, or any specific time-frame for him, to say nothing of anything more specific about him in historical terms.

All four intra-canonical accounts, however, are rich in geographical references (e.g., Lake Galilee, Capernaum, Nazareth, Bethsaida, Caesarea Philippi, the Decapolis, Samaria, Jericho, Bethlehem, Bethany, Emmaus, the Jordan River, Tyre and Sidon, and Jerusalem), and references to the religious and cultural setting, including religious parties (e.g., Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians), issues about observance of Jewish religious law (e.g., Sabbath, food laws, divorce and remarriage, skin diseases, oaths, tithing, and taxation), festivals such as Passover, issues of belief such as resurrection. We also get information on governing structures and personalities (e.g., Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, Caiaphas, and the Roman

¹ This is a pre-publication version of this essay, which was published in *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity, Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal*, eds. D. B. Capes, A. D. DeConick, H. K. Bond, T. A. Miller (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 195-213. ISBN 978-1-60258-026-8.

² L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), esp. 265-67.

³ To avoid confusion, when referring to the *texts* of gospels (as distinct from putative authors), I attach a capital “G”. So, e.g., GMatthew = Gospel of Matthew, and GJohn = Gospel of John. For what it is worth, as someone interested in ancient manuscripts, in which the order of the four Gospels varies, I am not comfortable with “Fourth Gospel” for GJohn. E.g., in Codex W (and quite likely also in P45, the order of the four Gospels is GMatthew, GJohn, GLuke, GMark.

governor Pilate). There are references to local occupations, such as fishing, farming, tax gathering, and shepherding. Indeed, it seems to me that this emphasis that the Lord and Christ of Christian devotion is to be linked to, and defined with reference to, the historic figure of Jesus may also have been a major impetus for these texts, and an important factor in shaping their genre as *narrative* books about him.⁴

Also notable is the use of Semitic words and expressions in these Greek texts.⁵ The most familiar instances are echoed in one or more of the four Gospels, such as “Hosanna” (Mark 11:9-10/Matt. 21:9/John 12:13), “Gehenna” (Mark 9:43-47; Matt. 10:28; 23:15, 33; Luke 12:5), “Rabbi” and “Rabbouni” (e.g., Matt. 23:7-8; John 1:38; 20:16), and the famous cry of Jesus on the cross reported in varying forms by Mark (15:34) and Matthew (27:46). It is very interesting that the use of such Semitic loanwords seems particularly frequent in GMark and GJohn.⁶

With more direct reference to the literary nature of GJohn, note in particular that, although this Gospel is readily distinguishable from any of the Synoptics in various specific matters such as in the ordering of events, selection of material, vocabulary, characters, and key themes, nevertheless, this distinctive account can be likened to the Synoptics in emphatically placing Jesus in a historically specific setting, and with lots of “local color”.⁷ To underscore the point, although GJohn is very well known for its uniquely explicit presentation of an exalted view of Jesus, the text in its own way also emphatically identifies the incarnate Logos and the risen/gloried “Lord” fully with reference to the historic Jesus.⁸

The author’s concern, however, was obviously not that typical of modern “historical Jesus” scholars.⁹ He was not aiming to *separate* or even to distinguish the historic figure from the glorified recipient of Christian devotion, or to offer what can be made of Jesus historically apart from what he became in Christian faith. Instead,

⁴ I do not have space to explicate further this claim or to defend it. In *Lord Jesus Christ*, chap. 5 (“Jesus Books”), I have probed the historical significance of the narrative-gospel *genre* as a literary expression of devotion to Jesus.

⁵ Michael O. Wise, “Languages of Palestine,” *DJG*, 434-44, points to some thirty instances of the use of Semitic loanwords in the intra-canonical Gospels, most of these involving Aramaic.

⁶ In addition to instances already cited above, note, e.g., “Messiah” (John 1:41), “Cephas” (1:42), “Bethzatha” (5:2), “Gabbatha” (19:13), “Golgotha” (19:17).

⁷ As is known, especially among Johannine scholars, the classic study of this is C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

⁸ Note, e.g., how the risen “Jesus” who appears to the disciples in 20:19-29 is acclaimed also as “my Lord and my God” by Thomas in 20:28.

⁹ See, e.g., the balanced and discerning discussion by Marianne Meye Thompson, “The Historical Jesus and the Johannine Christ,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, eds. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 21-42.

the author's emphasis was on the direct *identity* and *continuity* of the earthly and the risen Jesus. The author's reason for giving his account of the ministry of Jesus was entirely *theological*, not to serve some academic modern interest in historical exactitude, but to shape and nurture the faith of the intended readers. This is, I believe, reasonably well known and uncontroversial among informed readers of GJohn.

In this discussion, consequently, I focus on three features of GJohn, elaborating further here some observations more fleetingly registered in *Lord Jesus Christ*. I contend that these are all features unique to GJohn, and yet they also reflect the commonality of this text with the other intra-canonical Gospels in linking the earthly and risen/gloried Jesus. First, in GJohn there is actually a sharper and more explicit distinction between the perceptions of Jesus' true significance in the earthly ("pre-Easter") and post-resurrection periods than is projected in the Synoptics. Second, GJohn also gives a distinctive and rather clear emphasis on the agency of the Holy Spirit/Paraclete in specifically communicating the fuller post-resurrection grasp of Jesus' significance. Finally, GJohn uses a distinctive terminology to refer to the revelatory work of the Spirit and the major cognitive developments represented in the greater realization of Jesus' true glory that is reserved for the post-resurrection situation.

Pre-Resurrection and Post-Resurrection Knowledge

The first point that I want to address is how GJohn actually makes an explicit and emphatic distinction between the understanding of Jesus' significance in the pre-resurrection and the post-resurrection situations.¹⁰ This is particularly interesting in light of the clear concern in GJohn to link the situation of Jesus' ministry and the life-setting of the intended readers. This latter emphasis is well recognized, and for many of us may be especially associated with the classic work by J. Louis Martyn, who

¹⁰ After forming this judgment, I was encouraged to find that the point had been registered previously by John Painter in his major paper, "The Interface of History and Theology in John: John and the Historical Jesus" (SBL Consultation on The Gospel of John and the Historical Jesus, November 2004), 31, "Of the four Gospels, only John explicitly makes clear the epistemological distance/difference between the time of Jesus' ministry and the post-resurrection period in which the Gospel was self-consciously written (see 2:22; 7:39; 12:16; 16:7, 13-16)."

argued cogently that GJohn presents a “two-level drama,” the account of Jesus intended also to speak directly to the later issues and situation of the readers.¹¹

To cite one example of this, it is widely accepted that the unique GJohn references to Jesus’ followers being excluded from the Jewish *synagogē* (9:22; 16:1; and cf. 12:42-43) most likely reflect experiences that actually happened to Jewish Christians sometime subsequently to the time of Jesus’ ministry.¹² In GJohn, however, references to these experiences are intended to help orient and strengthen believers who have suffered this treatment, and/or who fear something similar for themselves, whether from fellow Jews or, in the case of gentile believers, from other social circles. Moreover, as Martyn further argued, GJohn also has Jesus debating with Jewish leaders over his true significance, articulating his own status in the supernal categories that must actually derive from and more directly represent the christological rhetoric of those Christians whose faith is reflected in the text (e.g., 5:19-47; 6:25-59).¹³ Indeed, throughout GJohn the explicit claims of the “post-Easter” period are the main matters under debate in the many controversies that mark the text. That is, the Jewish rejection of Jesus is put very much in terms of the sort of critical rhetoric that was more likely directed against the christological claims and devotional practices of Johannine Christians (e.g., 5:18; 19:7).

Moreover, GJohn programmatically (and uniquely among the intra-canonical Gospels) frames the account of Jesus’ earthly activities with the pre-mundane setting of the prologue, repeated references to Jesus’ descent from heaven, and his imminent return and glorification by the Father. In short, in a manner easily distinguishable from the Synoptics, Jesus ministry is very explicitly presented in terms of his transcendent stature and significance. GJohn 1:14 will serve to illustrate this, as perhaps *the* interpretive statement of what the ensuing account conveys: “We have seen his glory, the glory as the unique son from the Father, full of grace and truth.”¹⁴

Yet this same account also repeatedly presents the immediate cognitive effects of Jesus’ ministry, including his explicit assertions of his divine origins and significance, as misunderstanding and the failure to perceive aright or fully who he really is. To be sure, GJohn typically portrays the responses of Jesus’ opponents as

¹¹ J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979 [original ed., 1968]).

¹² Martyn, *History and Theology*, esp. 37-62.

¹³ E.g., Martyn, *History and Theology*, 129.

¹⁴ For $\omega(\text{j monogenou} \sim \text{j para} _ \text{patro} \& \text{j}$, cf., e.g., the NRSV: “as of a father’s only son” (although “the Father’s only Son” is given in the marginal notes as an alternative).

culpable misunderstanding and failure (e.g., 6:39-47; 8:42-47; 12:37-43). It is not simply an intellectual deficiency in these hearers, and in GJohn certainly not a lack of clarity on Jesus' part! Instead, Jesus' critics and opponents *willfully* choose darkness instead of the light.

But this is not simply a critique of Jesus' opponents. For even Jesus' disciples are presented as falling considerably short of arriving at the full truth of his person. True, among them only Judas is pictured as directly under the influence of Satan (6:70-71; 13:2, 27). But, although the cognitive failures of others are treated much more benignly, these disciples, too, seem unable to realize adequately what the author and intended readers take as crystal clear. For instance, Jesus' disciples mistake the meaning of his reference to nourishment (4:31-34); some complain that his teaching is difficult to accept, failing to perceive that his words are "spirit and life" (6:60-66); and others cannot grasp his reference to giving spiritual freedom to those who believe in him (8:31-33). His disciples are also pictured as obtuse in reaction to Jesus' statements about Lazarus (11:7-16). In the farewell-discourse material (chaps. 13-17), the frequent questions and other comments of Jesus' disciples further illustrate their well-meaning confusion and dim perception. Note, e.g., Peter's reaction to Jesus' foot-washing (13:6-11), Peter's puzzlement over Jesus' reference to his imminent departure (13:36-38), Philip's request to be shown the Father (14:8-9), the further puzzlement about Jesus' departure (16:16-18), and Jesus' response to their over-confident claim to understand and believe (16:29-33).

Also, of course, in a couple of significant scenes there is a specific contrast between the level of the disciples' understanding of things before and after Jesus' resurrection. I shall return to these passages later in this discussion, to focus on the author's use of "remembering" language in them. At this point, I simply note briefly the chronological distinction between levels of understanding. In 2:18-22, the disciples seem to be implicitly included among those who mistake Jesus' reference to raising up the temple, and only after Jesus' resurrection do they perceive the true meaning.¹⁵ Likewise, in 12:12-16 there is a similar contrast, the disciples not really understanding the contextual events "at first" (*to_ prw~ton*), but after Jesus was "glorified" coming to perceive them as fulfillment of prophecy.

¹⁵ It is likely, though somewhat less obvious, that in 2:17, also, the disciples' "remembering" of Psalm 69:10 in connection with his clearing of the temple court is a cognition that is placed in the post-resurrection period. The two incidents that I treat here will do, however, to make the point.

Several times in the “farewell discourse” material Jesus explicitly contrasts the limited understanding of his disciples in the setting of his earthly presence with the greater understanding to come after his departure. In 14:25-26 (another passage to which I return shortly), for instance, there is a distinction between the things that Jesus says then and the full truth that will come via the *Parakletos* (Spirit of Truth) whose activity is directly tied to Jesus’ departure from the earthly sphere through his death and resurrection (16:7). Likewise, in 16:12 Jesus refers to “many things” that he wished to communicate but that could not then be borne by his disciples, and Jesus promises a future revelation of “all the truth,” again set after his departure. I take the distinction in 16:25 between Jesus’ use of “parables” (ἐν παροιμίαις) and a future hour when all will be all will be openly declared as yet another Johannine reference to the different levels of understanding available in pre-resurrection and post-resurrection settings.¹⁶ For, although in this same scene the disciples claim to see clearly (16:29-30), Jesus’ response casts doubt on this claim, warning that in fact they will yet forsake him (vv. 31-32).

On the other hand, we should not exaggerate things. The contrast in GJohn between the time of Jesus’ earthly ministry and the post-resurrection period is not one of complete ignorance and understanding, or of deliberate secrecy and subsequent forthrightness. So, for instance, Ron Cameron’s characterization of GJohn as distinguishing between “the incomprehensible ministry of the earthly Jesus and the post-resurrection period of understanding the work and words of Jesus” must be judged an exaggeration that over-simplifies the more nuanced tension in GJohn.¹⁷ The unbelief of Jesus’ opponents results from their rank refusal to accept what is so plainly shown them in Jesus’ works and words. The problem was not an incomprehensible Jesus but that some loved darkness rather than light (3:19). And the result of Jesus’ ministry was not total incomprehension and unbelief. For in GJohn, Jesus’ disciples do respond favorably and commendably. They certainly have much more to learn, particularly involving a much larger grasp of Jesus’ person and significance, but there is a clear distinction in GJohn between their faith (limited though it is in cognitive depth) and the unbelief of those who accuse Jesus of blasphemy or simply do not know what to make of him. As Schnackenburg noted,

¹⁶ So also, e.g., Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John, Volume Three* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 161-62.

¹⁷ Ron Cameron, *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James* (HTS 34; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 118-19, also 130.

several times in GJohn Jesus is pictured speaking openly (*parrhsi&a|*) and to the general public (7:25-31; 10:22-26; 18:19-21).¹⁸ So, to repeat the point for emphasis, in distinction from the limited understanding of him among his disciples, those who completely misconstrue and oppose him are portrayed as doing so willfully and in disobedience to God.

Although Jesus' disciples fall considerably short of the full realization of his status that comes only after his resurrection, they do have a relatively positive view of him that is sharply contrasted with Jesus' opponents. So, e.g., although Jesus' response to Nathaniel's acclamation indicates that it does not adequately capture Jesus' full significance (1:49-51), nevertheless it is true, so far as it goes. In GJohn, Jesus is the rightful king of Israel, and Son of God in a far more profound sense than Nathaniel realizes. Also, in the structurally crucial prayer in GJohn 17, Jesus refers to his disciples in very positive terms, as, e.g., those to whom he has given revelation and who therefore believe that he has come from God (17:6-8), and those who are therefore distinguished from "the world" (17:114-16), the ones for whose sake Jesus now sanctifies himself (17:19), and through whom others will come to believe (17:20).

But granting the comparatively positive treatment of Jesus' disciples, nevertheless, there is a real distinction in GJohn between what people were able to perceive about Jesus prior to his death and resurrection, even those most positively inclined, and what the author and intended readers know to be true, standing this side of Jesus' resurrection, and with minds illumined to see his fuller glory. It is a distinction in degree or depth, but it is still a major difference. That is, although GJohn can rightly be characterized as programmatically presenting the earthly ministry of Jesus in light of what believers subsequently came to perceive as his full significance, the author also actually underscores the comparatively limited grasp of Jesus' person that characterized the time of his ministry. Indeed, the rather blatant presentation of Jesus' exalted significance in GJohn actually makes all the more explicit the contrast with the level of understanding of him attained by his followers during his ministry.¹⁹

¹⁸ Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3.162.

¹⁹ One could perhaps argue that GLuke in its own way also makes explicit such a contrast, especially in the scenes where the *risen* Jesus opens the disciples' eyes to the Scriptures' manifold testimony to him and his glory (Luke 24:25-27, 31-32, 44-49), and even criticizes their prior understanding as "slow of

The Agent of Post-Resurrection Comprehension

I turn now to discuss the way that GJohn more explicitly indicates how the fuller and more adequate grasp of Jesus' significance characteristic of the post-resurrection period was made possible. There are two factors to note. First, Jesus had to complete his work, including particularly his death, and be resurrected and glorified, which also involved him departing from earthly activity and presence with his followers. That is, although GJohn presents Jesus as the incarnate and human expression of the pre-mundane divine Logos through whom the world was made (1:1-3), the author also clearly attributes great significance to Jesus' ministry, death and resurrection/exaltation as further revelations of Jesus' person, and also as providing the crucial content and bases for the proper confession of him as divine Son and Lord. In GJohn, in other words, a fully adequate confession of Jesus requires that it be shaped crucially by these events. That, I suggest, is the reason why GJohn is a *narrative* book about Jesus. GJohn is known classically for its propositional statements of faith (e.g., 1:1-18; 20:31), but these christological propositions take their *specific content* and have their *basis* in the *actions and events* that form the substance of this essentially *narrative* text.

But there is also a second factor which GJohn uniquely emphasizes as the crucial *agency* through which the fuller grasp of Jesus' significance was made possible after Jesus' resurrection, the Spirit/Paraclete.²⁰ Although respectable scholars have made other suggestions, e.g., that the Paraclete is the implied author and/or an unnamed teacher/prophet figure, I consider the textual evidence rather clear that the reference is to the divine Spirit (a.k.a., Holy Spirit, and Spirit of Truth).²¹ Granted, there are also references in the Synoptics to the Spirit providing the impetus and content of Christian witness. In Mark 13:9-11, part of the discourse directly

heart to believe all that the prophets have declared" (24:25). But it seems to me that the contrast in GJohn is more frequently deployed.

²⁰ Among earlier studies still very instructive, I mention Heinrich Schlier, "Zum Begriff des Geistes nach dem Johannesevangelium," in his collection of essays, *Besinnung auf das Neue Testament: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge, II* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964), 264-71. More recently, there is the extensive discussion by Hans-Christian Kammler, "Jesus Christus und der Geistparaklet: Eine Studie zur johanneischen Verhältnisbestimmung von Pneumatologie und Christologie," in Otfried Hofius and Hans-Christian Kammler, *Johannesstudien: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des vierten Evangeliums* (WUNT 88; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), 87-190, which includes interaction with a large body of scholarly publications. These and other studies, however, have foci different from mine in this essay.

²¹ See, e.g., the excursus in Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3.138-54, for a review of various issues and further bibliographical references.

predictive of and for the post-resurrection period, Jesus is pictured as warning that his followers subsequently will face arraignment “because of me,” and he instructs them to “say whatever is given you at that time, for it is not you who speak, but the Holy Spirit” (v. 11). In a Lukan parallel to this saying (12:11-12), the Holy Spirit “will teach you at that very hour what you ought to say,” and the Matthew parallel in 10:19-20 promises “the Spirit of your Father speaking through you.”²²

GJohn, however, more frequently and more explicitly links the impartation of the Spirit among Jesus’ followers to Jesus’ resurrection, and also more fully elaborates the work of the Spirit in conveying to Jesus’ followers a greater understanding of his significance than was theirs prior to his resurrection. There is the unique statement in 7:39, where the author both explains Jesus’ contextual saying about “rivers of living water” as predicting the work of the Spirit, and also links the reception of the Spirit among Jesus’ followers to him being “glorified”. In another passage unique to GJohn, the risen Jesus breathes upon his disciples and bestows the Holy Spirit (20:21-22).

But, obviously, it is in the unique and large body of material comprising the Johannine “farewell discourse” that we have the most explicit treatment of the cognitive work of the Spirit in the post-resurrection setting. This is material frequently worked over by scholars, of course, and I do not intend to do much more here than to highlight a couple of matters.²³ My main point is the central role of the Spirit/Paraclete in conveying christological truth subsequent to Jesus’ departure from the earthly scene.

²² Of course, the sayings in Luke 12:11-12 and Matt. 10:19-20 may have been part of the “Q” collection. See now, e.g., James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 312-17. Cf. Luke 21:12-15, in the Lukan version of the eschatological discourse, Jesus promises that he “will give you words and a wisdom that none of your opponents will be able to withstand or contradict.” The Matthean 24 parallel to Mark 13 has no equivalent saying.

²³ From the classic essays by Hans Windisch onward (translated as a booklet, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel* [Facet Books; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968; German originals, 1927, 1933]), the references to the Paraclete have received considerable attention. E.g., Raymond E. Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 13 (1966-1967): 113-32; George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (SNTSMS, 12; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970); and now Tricia Gates Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-scientific Perspective* (JSNTSup253; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), esp. 170-234. The dominant questions, however, have often been the derivation of the term “*Paraklētos*” and the tradition/redactional history of the sayings. These matters do not concern us here. Kammler’s recent study focuses more on the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit in GJohn, and he includes a close exegetical study of the particular sayings (“Jesus Christus und der Geist-Paraklet”).

Let us quickly review the key sayings, beginning with 14:15-17. Note here the reference to “the Spirit of truth” (v. 17), which I take to reflect the projected role of the Spirit in teaching and conveying deeper insight, more explicitly and fully brought out in subsequent sayings. Note also that the promised bestowal of the Spirit here is presented as in response to Jesus’ request to the Father, which reflects a clear link between Jesus and the Spirit.

In 14:25-26, there is more explicit reference to the cognitive work of the Spirit, who “will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you” (v. 26).²⁴ There is a distinction here between the things that Jesus speaks/has spoken in the time of his earthly presence ($\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, v. 25) and the fuller revelation ($\rho\alpha\&n\tau\alpha$, v. 26) that the Holy Spirit will deliver. The specific content or focus of the Spirit’s teaching is not spelled out in these verses, but in the larger context of the farewell section in GJohn it should be obvious that this teaching concerns the person of Jesus. From 14:1-7 onward, Jesus high and unique significance is the clear central theme. He is “the way, and the truth, and the life,” and access to God is mediated entirely through him (esp. vv. 6-7). Still closer to this Paraclete saying, in 14:18-21 Jesus promises a future revelation of himself to his followers, which seems here rather clearly placed after his death/departure from the earthly sphere. So, surely, the reference to the Spirit’s work of reminding Jesus’ followers of all that he has said to them (v. 14:26) must mean particularly sayings that concern him. Note also that the Spirit is to be sent by God “in my name,” which further links the Spirit to Jesus.²⁵ In the final section of this paper, I shall return to the use of terms of “reminding” and “remembering”. At this point, I want draw attention to the clear emphasis on the agency of the Spirit in effecting a greater understanding of Jesus’ person and significance than was conveyed and apprehended during his earthly ministry.

²⁴ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (2nd ed.; London: SPCK; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 467, notes the variant reading in D, $\alpha\ \nu\ \epsilon\iota\ \rho\omega$, instead of $\epsilon\iota\ \rho\omega$, and judges that it “gives an entirely different meaning to the work of the Paraclete, who (according to this reading) receives fresh teaching from Jesus and transmits it to the church . . . contrary to the meaning of the passage as a whole.” To be sure, the D variant does place the emphasis on the Spirit as agency of a continuing communication from Jesus. But this is not in my view so totally at variance with how GJohn presents the Spirit’s work. As to the text-critical question, however, I concur with the reading preferred, e.g., in the Nestle-Aland text here.

²⁵ I suggest that $\epsilon\ \nu\ \tau\omega\ \lambda\ \omicron\ \nu\ \omicron\ \mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \& \ \mu\omicron\upsilon$ here alludes to the cultic practice of invoking Jesus by name, which we know characterized early Christian baptismal practice, exorcism, and, perhaps most characteristically featured in the worship setting. See, e.g., Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 140-44, and other bibliographical references cited there. I further contend that corporate worship was a characteristic setting for prophecy and other revelatory phenomena (e.g., 1 Cor. 14:26), i.e., a setting in which the Spirit-Paraclete would be expected to bestow revelations of Jesus’ glory.

In a third passage, 15:26-27, there is an interesting balance between the emphases that Jesus will send the Spirit-Paraclete and that the provenance of this Spirit is “with the Father” (para_ tou~ patro&j, twice in v. 26). Another interesting feature of this passage is that this “Spirit of *truth*” (or “*true* Spirit”) will “testify” specifically about Jesus (v. 26b). This confirms our earlier surmise that the greater truth that the Spirit is to reveal will have to do specifically with Jesus. This positive testimony to Jesus will contradict and correct the unjustified negativity toward Jesus portrayed in 15:18-25, and it also will implicitly inform and empower the testimony of Jesus’ followers (v. 27). That is, in 15:26-27, the future revelatory work of the Spirit is to shape their greater christological claims and witness. I suggest that GJohn is itself intended by the author as a paradigmatic presentation of these claims and this witness, as a forthright declaration of Jesus’ glorious significance, through which his earthly ministry is retrospectively portrayed. That is, GJohn is supposed to be taken as the product of the Spirit-Paraclete’s testimony. It is common for scholars to judge that GJohn is to be understood as reflecting the work of the Paraclete; I wish to urge further that the author of GJohn always *intended* us to know this.

The post-resurrection cognitive and forensic work of the Spirit-Paraclete is still more fully expressed, and more precisely targeted, in 16:5-15. There are two main emphases here. First, in vv. 5-11, the Spirit’s testimony to Jesus is set over against the unbelief in Jesus that is characteristic of “the world,” and which is here *the* sin (v. 9). Because the Spirit is promised exclusively to Jesus’ followers (e.g., 14:15-17), and his revelatory work is directed to them (e.g., 14:25-26), we must infer that the demonstration of the error of the world is likewise directly to believers, and then through them to the world, as believers are enabled to echo the Spirit’s witness to unbelievers (15:27), in arraignment/persecution and other settings.²⁶

Second, in vv. 12-15, the final reference to the Spirit-Paraclete in the farewell discourse material, we have the most explicit statement of the cognitive content of what he is to convey.²⁷ We noted briefly earlier the contrast in vv. 12-13 between the

²⁶ “The Paraclete accuses and exposes the world and proves it guilty only by means of the community [of Jesus’ followers], and the community also requires faith in the Paraclete and the support of the Paraclete in order to fulfil that task.” Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3:132.

²⁷ The masculine pronoun used of the Paraclete here I intend simply to reflect the personal quality that is implicitly attached to the Spirit-Paraclete in the farewell discourse material. As numerous commentators note, this personal quality even seems reflected in the grammar of this passage, in the masculine pronoun (e) kei&noj) used in apposition with the neuter το_ pneu~ma (v. 13).

comparatively limited teaching conveyed (and capable of being apprehended) in Jesus' earthly ministry and fuller truth (about Jesus' person) into which the Spirit will lead believers after Jesus' departure. We now should also note that the cognitive focus of the Spirit's work is not on the Spirit, but consists in declaring "the things to come" (*ta_ e) rxo&mena*, v. 13), and in glorifying Jesus (v. 14). There is some uncertainty among commentators about what "the things to come" are, and whether they are something distinguishable from the more explicitly christological content of the Spirit's teaching in v. 14. It is not crucial here to settle the matter, and it would be presumptuous to imagine that I could do so.²⁸ For the present purpose, it is sufficient to focus on the dominant emphasis of these verses, which is that *the Spirit's work relates directly to Jesus' historic ministry and words*, extending them in some way(s) and conveying more fully some of the "many things" that could not be conveyed in that pre-resurrection setting. And I repeat that these "many things" to be revealed seem particularly to do with Jesus' glorious significance.

What else can we make of vv. 14-15 than to take these verses as ascribing to the Spirit a post-resurrection role of leading Jesus' followers into a deeper, fuller apprehension of who Jesus really is? Despite the (understandable) theological anxiety among some commentators about the idea of a further revelation "beyond" Jesus, we must do justice to the forthright declaration here.²⁹ As Haenchen put it (in translation), John 16:13 rather clearly implies "that what the spirit [*sic.*] will teach will go beyond the message of the earthly Jesus," for, as we have noted already, in GJohn "in spite of continuity, there exists a distinction between the earthly Jesus and the post-Easter spirit, and the real message [I take this to mean the full truth of Jesus' person] is first proclaimed by the spirit."³⁰ Of course, in GJohn the reality of the

²⁸ I take *ta_ erxomena* to refer primarily to eschatological/future events, which the Spirit reveals in prophetic oracles. So, to my mind, Rev. 1:19, where "things which are and things which are to be" reflects the sort of religious "micro-climate" in which revelations of religious truths and of future events are accepted matters of prophetic oracles. Cf. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3:151.

²⁹ E.g., Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3:132-37. He grants that "the Paraclete is not only [Jesus'] interpreter, but also his 'successor', who will continue his revelation" (133), and that this involves "a more profound penetration into the content of revelation" (135). Yet he then insists that the Paraclete will not "proclaim anything with new content" (135). Similarly, R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (xiii-xxi)* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), 714-17, takes John 15:15 as excluding further revelations, and prefers to see 16:12-15 as promising "deeper understanding," judging it "unlikely that in Johannine thought there was any concept of further revelation after the ministry of Jesus, for Jesus is *the* revelation of the Father, the Word of God" (714).

³⁰ Ernst Haenchen, *John 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 7-21* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 144.

crucial event of Jesus' resurrection is first revealed by Jesus himself, through his appearances and interaction with Mary Magdalene in 20:17-18, and then the other disciples, 20:19-29. Further, in GJohn the Spirit is explicitly imparted as a consequence of Jesus' resurrection, and by the risen Jesus himself (20:22-23).

Nevertheless, I contend that, corresponding to the genuine distinction that we have noted in GJohn between the levels of truth about Jesus' person conveyed and perceived during his earthly ministry and in the post-resurrection situation, GJohn also clearly ascribes a significantly further and fuller revelation of Jesus' person to the agency of the Spirit.³¹ Moreover, as 15:26-27 indicates, the witness of Jesus' followers as well will be prompted and informed by the post-resurrection testimony of the Spirit about Jesus.

Unquestionably, the *kerygma* reflected in GJohn and arising from this fuller revelatory work of the Paraclete concerns *Jesus*, and, as I have already proposed, the whole *genre* of GJohn manifests the strong emphasis that the Jesus whom believers confess and proclaim is none other than the historic figure who operated and died in Roman Judea and in a specific time-frame. So, certainly, in GJohn there is no prospect of a revelation "beyond" Jesus. Any fuller, further revelation can only be about him. But the point I emphasize here is that GJohn also candidly indicates, perhaps most explicitly in 16:12-15, that the content of believers' confession and proclamation is to be crucially informed by the revelatory work of the Spirit-Paraclete that will come in the aftermath of Jesus' departure.³²

That is, in GJohn the Spirit has a particularly explicit *cognitive* role. The Spirit will "glorify" Jesus (16:14), which I take to mean that the Spirit will powerfully convey to believers the previously unimagined glory that Jesus has from and with the Father. Of course, much more frequently, GJohn refers to the Father glorifying Jesus (8:54; 13:31-32; 14:13; 17:1, 5). So, as the immediate context indicates, the Spirit glorifies Jesus *to believers* precisely by declaring to them what the Spirit "receives" from Jesus (ε)k tou~ ε)μου~ λαβα&nei, v. 15). And what the Spirit declares will be glorious indeed, for it involves a disclosure of all that Jesus shares of

³¹ So also Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 210, and others she cites (n. 56), and Kammler, "Jesus Christus und der Geistparaklet," e.g., 140.

³² It is in this sense that I judge Haenchen right in stating: "In any case, the church, in fact, took the Easter message and not the preaching of Jesus of Nazareth as the basis of its own proclamation and teaching. And perhaps one may say that it is precisely the Fourth Gospel that confirms the church in that move." (*John 2*, 144).

that which pertains to the Father (πατὴρ ὁ ἄριστος ὁ πατρὸς θεοῦ ἐκείνου, v. 15).

We may ask what form(s) the revelatory work of the Spirit-Paraclete is to take. Here, too, there are differences of opinion among scholars (and a good deal of ducking the issue too!). So, e.g., Schnackenburg preferred to see these references to the Spirit-Paraclete's activity as reflecting "a community which is guided and instructed by the Spirit, but which in fact also receives this teaching from those who are qualified to teach and called to proclaim the message."³³ To be sure, as anyone who has acquaintance with modern form of charismatic religious group will know, a strong experiential appreciation of the Spirit's powers can go well in hand with strong leadership by particular individuals seen as especially gifted. But Schnackenburg's statement seems to me to project a bit too uncritically a traditional Roman Catholic outlook upon the "Johannine" Christians.³⁴

I contend that the way to take the sayings about the Spirit-Paraclete "guiding", "teaching", "speaking", "testifying", and "proclaiming" is that they reflect charismatic utterances and insights, i.e., prophetic oracles and such phenomena.³⁵ Certainly, from other evidence of first-century Christianity, it appears that such experiences were characteristically welcome, sought, and even expected.³⁶ For example, there is Paul's extended discussion of such things in 1 Corinthians 12—14, which includes his almost off-hand reference to "revelation" and "a tongue" with its "interpretation" as regular and expected parts of the worship gathering (14:6). Much closer to GJohn, the author of 1 John warns readers to judge carefully among prophets, which presupposes a religious setting in which such phenomena are frequent (4:1-3). So, I think that we should take GJohn's references to the work of the Spirit-Paraclete as reflecting

³³ Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3:152.

³⁴ I use the scare-quotes here to indicate an open attitude toward exactly who the intended readers of GJohn were, and what Christians might be reflected in the text. I am confident that GJohn reflects some early Christians, but I am not so sure that they comprised a totally distinct circle over against all other Christian groups of the time. Then as now, Christian groups can be *distinguishable* and *distinctive* without being separatist and sectarian. But the issue cannot be engaged adequately here.

³⁵ As I have argued in previous publications, one does not have to accept the *religious validity* of such experiences to recognize their historical *reality and efficacy* in contributing to religious innovation. See esp. L. W. Hurtado, "Religious Experience and Religious Innovation in the New Testament," *Journal of Religion* 80 (2000): 183-205, which appears now also in my book, *How on Earth did Jesus Become a God?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), chap. 8. For a sympathetic treatment of such phenomena in the NT, see esp. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians As Reflected in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975).

³⁶ David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

religious experiences of the writer and intended readers, who have direct acquaintance with insights that were disclosed in prophetic oracles and other experiences of apprehension of truth that struck recipients as divine revelations.³⁷ The latter include what David Aune has called “charismatic exegesis” of biblical (Old Testament) texts, finding in them previously unrecognized disclosures and confirmations of Jesus’ status and role in God’s plan.³⁸

In addition, we should probably allow for a similar “charismatic exegesis” of sayings of Jesus, experiences in which the Spirit-Paraclete revealed an understanding of their greater and fuller import.³⁹ This would be consistent with, and, indeed, would help explain, the findings of other scholars that in the Johannine form of Jesus’ sayings we can often perceive a core-saying that echoes or resembles sayings reported in the Synoptics.⁴⁰ That is, GJohn is certainly a textual/literary product that in some sense reflects a process of authoring and editing; but it also reflects a lively experiential “micro-culture” of inspiration and revelation, in which new insights came with forceful effects, and often occurred in circumstances that included prayerful and expectant pondering of scripture and traditional sayings of Jesus.

These new insights and revelations focused particularly on Jesus, and involved the sweeping and startling claims advanced in GJohn. These were taken to be bestowed by the Spirit-Paraclete, the agent of a fuller revelation of Jesus than he was able to communicate in his earthly ministry. GJohn reflects a candid recognition of such new truths, or at least a depth of truth that went noticeably beyond what Jesus had taught in his pre-resurrection activity. Yet, to underscore the point again, the GJohn insists that Spirit-Paraclete’s revelations concerned *Jesus*, and were actually the fuller disclosure of what he was all along. To be sure, GJohn presents Jesus as “glorified” in his death and resurrection, and exalted to heavenly status. Yet,

³⁷ It is curious, and reveals perhaps more about the scholars in question than about GJohn, that a good many include no treatment of such religious phenomena in accounting for the text. Even among those whose religious orientation is favourable to GJohn this is the case. See, e.g., Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel* (Downers Grove/Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001), esp. 17-67, where he offers an account of how GJohn came to have its distinctive qualities.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 339-36; and *id.*, “Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, eds. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 126-50.

³⁹ Johannes Beutler, “The Use of ‘Scripture’ in the Gospel of John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John, in Honor of D. Moody Smith*, eds. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 147-62, noted that the words of Jesus had “a comparable authority” to scripture for the author of GJohn (154), pointing to 2:22, where both are linked explicitly as the focus in post-resurrection insights.

⁴⁰ E.g., Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 315-65.

according to GJohn, this really involves God giving to Jesus the glory that he had with God before the creation (e.g., 17:5).

In short, the Spirit-Paraclete's revelations included the realization that, though not disclosed and certainly not grasped during his earthly activity, the historic Jesus was the unique human embodiment of the divine Word, the transcendent Son, whose intimate relationship with the Father transcends all time (e.g., 8:58). So, from this perspective, the author felt it was perfectly understandable and correct to tell the Jesus-story with the benefit of this realization, and even to ascribe to the historic Jesus sayings that reflect these greater insights into Jesus' person and the Spirit-utterances through which they first came to expression. Indeed, I propose that the author knew very well that the historic Jesus had not actually said many of the sayings that he utters in GJohn, particularly those that reflect the exalted christological claims about Jesus' pre-existence and divine significance, and yet the author felt free to put them on Jesus' lips. For in doing so, the author believed that he was simply reflecting the true and ultimate significance of Jesus. For the author, although revealed by the Paraclete subsequent to Jesus, these articulations of Jesus' divine status express truths that had always been valid.⁴¹

Moreover, in GJohn the Spirit-Paraclete not only unpacks in a new and deeper dimension Jesus' person, the Spirit actually gives continuing voice to *Jesus* in the post-resurrection setting. In the farewell discourse material, along with promises that the Spirit will come in Jesus' name and testify about him are promises that Jesus himself will come again to his followers and reveal himself to them after his departure (14:18-21, 27). Other first-century texts show that early Christians saw oracles spoken under the inspiration of the Spirit as also from the risen/exalted Jesus.⁴² This

⁴¹ In preparing this revised version of my essay, I was encouraged to discover a somewhat similar contention by Otfried Hofius, "Unknown Sayings of Jesus'," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991 [German: 1983]), 359-60 n. 132 (336-60): "The sayings and discourses of Jesus contained in [GJohn] are in no way intended to be primarily understood as pronouncements of the earthly Jesus. . . . When the evangelist offers *his* witness to Christ in the form of sayings and discourses of *Jesus*, he thereby brings to expression the idea that the apostolic witness to Christ does not constitute a human value-judgment *about* Christ. The witness can only utter what the Lord who is present in the Spirit has disclosed to him . . ." See a similar view in Franz Mussner, *The Historical Jesus in the Gospel of St. John* (trans. W. J. O'Hara; London: Burns & Oates, 1967 [German: 1965]), e.g., 52, 63.

⁴² Note, e.g., Acts 9:10-16, where the risen Jesus ("the Lord") speaks in a vision to Ananias. I take Paul's reference to a word from Jesus in 2 Cor. 12:9 in light of the references in the context to frequent "visions and revelations of the Lord" (12:1, 7).

is, of course, precisely how the author of Revelation presents his material.⁴³ While “in the Spirit” (1:10), the author has visions and auditions of the risen Jesus (e.g., 1:12-20), and the messages to the seven churches are to be taken as direct utterances from the glorified Jesus, delivered through the Spirit.⁴⁴ So then, the new insights about Jesus’ person that were communicated by the Spirit, e.g., in prophetic oracles and other charismatic-type phenomena, were also further teaching from Jesus. This is another reason why, therefore, the author of GJohn felt free to ascribe these revelations to Jesus. In the author’s mind, this may be technical anachronism, but on a more profound level it is actually a fully legitimate “rendition” of the historic Jesus inspired directly by the risen Jesus himself, expressing a fuller truth about him conveyed through the agency of the Spirit.

Reminding and Remembering

This leads me to the final aim in this paper, which is to explore the use of terms for reminding and remembering in GJohn to refer to the cognitive work and effects involved in this fuller apprehension of Jesus’ person.⁴⁵ There are three closely-related Greek words used in GJohn that require our attention: *mimnh&skomai*, *mnhmoneu&w*, and *u (pomimnh&skw*.⁴⁶ Each of these is used quite a number of other times as well in the New Testament writings, each overwhelmingly with the “ordinary” connotations of remembering something or someone.⁴⁷ I want to trace here, however, the special use of these terms in GJohn, and consider what they represented for the author.

⁴³ I cannot linger here over the question of how much Revelation reflects actual visions and how much it is simply a literary work. Even if strongly the latter, it reflects and was intended to commend itself to early Christian readiness to entertain such claims of prophetic revelation.

⁴⁴ Each of the seven messages has an opening statement ascribing it to Jesus (2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14) and each concludes with a statement ascribing it to the Spirit (2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22).

⁴⁵ See also Peter Stuhlmacher, “Spiritual Remembering: John 14:26,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, eds. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 55-68. Stuhlmacher’s essay, however, differs from my own in being more concerned with the usefulness of the way GJohn handles Jesus tradition for historical Jesus investigation.

⁴⁶ A fourth word, *a) namimnh&skw*, does not appear in GJohn, but is used in Mark (11:21; 14:72), and several other NT writings (1 Cor. 4:17; 2 Cor. 7:15; 2 Tim. 1:6; Heb. 10:32). In both Markan uses, it refers to Peter remembering a saying of Jesus (about Peter’s betrayal of him, or Jesus’ cursing of the fig tree) in light of subsequent events.

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Otto Michel, “*mimnh&skomai*, *ktl.*,” *TDNT* 4:675-83; K. H. Bartels, “Remember,” *NIDNTT* 3:230-247. According to the *Computer Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1985), *mimnh&skomai* appears in the NT twenty-three times in all, *mnhmoneu&w* twenty-one times, *u (pomimnh&skw* seven times, and *a) namimnh&kw* six times.

We begin with the passage where GJohn alone among the four Gospels ascribes to Jesus a promise that the Spirit-Paraclete will come to “teach you everything and *remind* [u (p omnh&sei)] you of all the things that I said to you” (14:26). For Bultmann and Brown, this is a case of synonymous parallelism, the two actions interpreting each other.⁴⁸ Schnackenburg’s view appears somewhat similar, describing the action of reminding as “very closely related” to the teaching function of the Spirit, whereas Haenchen saw a “tension between the two statements” here, reflecting a potentially problematic relationship between “the new experience of the spirit [*sic.*] and the old tradition,” the reference to the Spirit’s reminding of Jesus’ words intended to eliminate “the danger that the experience of the spirit will turn out to be a subjective dream.”⁴⁹ But whether the two activities of the Spirit in 14:26 are to be taken as synonymous or complementary makes little difference for my discussion. Either way, this verse promises a post-resurrection fuller disclosure of truth by the Spirit that is closely linked with “reminding” Jesus’ followers of his pre-resurrection teaching.

Earlier, we noted briefly the references to specific instances in which the disciples “remember” some saying or event in the post-resurrection setting. Granted, in 2:17, the remembering (e) mnh&sqhsan) of the line from Psalm 69:10 (LXX 68:10) is not explicitly set in a post-resurrection circumstance, and so one may question whether it should be included in a list of such references.⁵⁰ I take v. 17 as referring to a post-resurrection reading of the Psalm, the author here giving an instance of what he refers to in v. 22; but my analysis does not depend upon this question, so I move on to the remaining texts.⁵¹

Undeniably, in 2:22, GJohn refers to a post-resurrection setting in which Jesus’ disciples remembered (e) mnh&sqhsan) Jesus’ saying about him raising “this temple” (v. 19), their remembrance also involving belief in “the Scripture [passage]

⁴⁸ Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (xiii-xxi), 651, agreeing with Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1941), 485; ET, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster Press; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 626 n. 6.

⁴⁹ Cf. Schnackenburg, 3:83; Haenchen, 128.

⁵⁰ Cf. R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (i-xii) (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), 115, who leaves the question open; Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 198, who sees this remembering as “at the time” of Jesus’ action; and Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 124, who reads v. 17 in light of v. 22 and 12:16, taking their recall of the Psalm as a later (post-resurrection) cognition.

⁵¹ If we take th|~ grafh|~ in v. 22 as Psalm 69(68):10 (the only Scripture passage cited in the larger context), then the christological understanding of it posited in v. 17 would be a post-resurrection cognition.

and the word that Jesus spoke.” The remembering and the believing recognition of the import of the Scripture passage and Jesus’ saying seem here to be so closely connected that they really comprise one cognitive development. Clearly, the remembering posited in this passage involved more than recollection; it also included a new perception that Jesus’ actions are prefigured in, and interpreted by, Scripture, and also a new understanding of Jesus’ pre-resurrection sayings and actions in light of his resurrection.

In 12:16, we have a further instance where “remembering” is used to designate a specifically a post-resurrection cognition which contrasts sharply with their pre-resurrection lack of perception. In the immediately preceding verses (12-15), GJohn recounts Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem and how a great crowd met him jubilantly, the author using scripture passages to signal the larger significance of these things. Then, he tells us that, whereas in the first setting (to_ prw~ton) the disciples did not grasp these things (tau~ta ou)k e@gnwsan), after Jesus was “glorified” they “remembered” (e) mnh&sqhsan) his actions and that they were prophesied in scripture (tau@ta h]n e)p’ au)tw|~ gegrammen&a). Clearly, the more precise nature of the cognitive event(s) here involves much more than simply recalling things. What the author seems to designate by “remembered” is actually a new perception of what the narrated events really represented as parts of a divinely-intended drama. This significant cognitive development involved a creative appropriation of biblical passages, along with a radically sharpened view of who Jesus is and what this fateful entry into Jerusalem represented in God’s purposes and plan.

It is, I think, not accidental that the two passages where GJohn explicitly identifies instances of this post-resurrection remembering are where they are, in the narrative about the temple-incident, and the scene where Jesus enters Jerusalem for the fateful final time. The Johannine temple-incident functions to foreshadow Jesus’ death and resurrection, as 2:19 makes explicit, and 12:12-19 marks Jesus’ movement to the setting of his looming suffering and glorification. In short, the two scenes where GJohn refers to post-resurrection remembrance seem, in this sense, to form an *inclusio*, bracketing a particular body of narrative material that concerns Jesus’ ministry prior to the passion-resurrection narratives.

Surely, in light of these other Johannine uses of the terms for reminding and remembering, we should also take Jesus’ admonition in 15:20 to “remember the word

which I said to you” as intended by the author to designate the same post-resurrection cognitive phenomena.⁵² That is, here Jesus is pictured as exhorting, and thus as *advocating and authorizing*, the developments in belief that GJohn so explicitly ascribes to the work of the Spirit-Paraclete in the post-resurrection setting.

Likewise, in 16:4, Jesus expresses the hope that in a future setting his disciples might “remember” (mnhmoneu&hte) the things (tau~ta) that he has said. Curiously, however, immediately following this statement Jesus refers to things that he did *not* say while he was (physically) with his disciples (v. 4b), and then promises the advent of the Spirit-Paraclete, whose advocacy of Jesus to disciples, and against the unbelief of the world, we have already noted. Consequently, I take the remembering urged by Jesus in v. 4a to be another reference to the post-resurrection cognitive developments more unambiguously referred to in the other passages that we have just considered.⁵³

In sum, in GJohn we have several instances where verbs for “reminding” and “remembering” are used with a technical meaning, indeed a meaning that seems peculiar to GJohn. I propose that the author of GJohn chose these terms and invested them with this technical meaning precisely to express his *dialectical* view of the Spirit-Paraclete’s revelatory work. On the one hand, this work consists in a significantly fuller measure of truth than was disclosed during Jesus’ earthly ministry (esp. 16:12-13). On the other hand, the author insists, this fuller revelation will simply be all about Jesus, pointing back to him with the aim of showing forth his true/full glory, and his full participation with “the Father” (esp. 16:14-15). That is, the new revelations from the Spirit-Paraclete simply bring forth a fuller disclosure of what was true of Jesus all along, and what his earthly activities actually portended.

Precisely to hold together these two emphases, GJohn ingeniously uses the terms that we have noted here. To speak of the Spirit as “reminding” disciples of Jesus’ words and actions, and to portray the disciples as “remembering” in their fuller realization of the import of these things and also how scripture actually predicts and confirms him as the human embodiment of God’s name, and glory, indeed the one whose glory Isaiah saw and about whom he prophesied (12:37-41), these all represent

⁵² In the immediate context (15:18-21), there are warnings and exhortations to Jesus’ followers about being hated by the world on account of their faith in him, and being rejected by the world, just as Jesus was rejected. And, of course, only a few verses later we have one of the Spirit-Paraclete sayings that we have noted earlier in this essay (15:26-27).

⁵³ So also, e.g., Brown, *The Gospel according to John (xiii-xxi)*, 702.

a profound theological position. The author's concern was to emphasize that the revelations that shaped his faith and Christology are entirely truths about *the historic figure, Jesus*, and they serve simply to unfold more completely his true import and significance.

In other early Christian writings also, we have terms of reminding and remembering used with technical meaning, and a brief comparison with a couple of these texts actually help us to appreciate more clearly the distinctive emphasis in GJohn. In the "Hymn of the Pearl", which forms part of the *Acts of Thomas*, a figure who leaves his luxurious home and in disguise goes "down to Egypt" to retrieve "the one pearl" forgets his royal status and his mission.⁵⁴ In response to a message from his royal parents, however, he awakened from his sleep of forgetfulness and "remembered that I was a son of kings" (kai_ u (pemnh&sqhn paraxrh~ma o{ti basile&wn ei)mi_ ui{oj) and recalls his mission to fetch the pearl (111:56-57). In its present context, this obviously seems to reflect a view of redemption as discovery of one's divine provenance and destiny, this discovery portrayed here as a remembering.

This fits perfectly with the "gnostic" idea that the elect are divine by origin and nature, and only need to be re-awakened to their true identities and significance.⁵⁵ But this is clearly very different from GJohn's special use of reminding/remembering terms, which has to do entirely with believers having a fuller grasp of the full divine glory of *Jesus*. Indeed, I see no relationship between GJohn and the Hymn of the Pearl in this matter. Instead, the latter may reflect the Socratic/Platonic notion that teaching involves helping students to bring to remembrance what they in fact already knew but have forgotten.

To note yet another contrasting instance of early Christian use of remembering, Ron Cameron drew attention to *The Apocryphon of James*.⁵⁶ In this

⁵⁴ There is an English translation in Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* (rev. ed., trans. R. McL. Wilson; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1992), 380-85. For the Greek text of *Acts of Thomas*, see Maximilian Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha: Acta Philippi et Acta Thomae accedunt Acta Barnabae* (reprint, Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972 [1903]), 99-288. The "Hymn of the Pearl" forms chaps. 108-13.

⁵⁵ I write the word "gnostic" in scare-quotes in acknowledgement of the force of Michael Williams' argument about the dubious value of the term as a historical descriptor: *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

⁵⁶ Ron Cameron, *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), esp. 91-124. Cf. also the incisive discussion of this matter in Charles E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 250-58.

text, however, we have a use of the idea of “remembering” Jesus’ words which is much closer to the *topos* that we have examined in GJohn. Early in *Ap.Jas.* (2.9-15), the twelve disciples of Jesus are portrayed as “all sitting together and recalling what the Savior had said to each one of them, whether in secret or openly, and [putting it] in books.”⁵⁷ Cameron rightly notes that here we have a specifically post-resurrection scene where “remembering” goes on among the disciples. Moreover, Cameron also discusses explicitly the use of “remembering/reminding” language in GJohn, noting similarities and differences in comparison with *Ap.Jas.*⁵⁸ But I want to register disagreement here on a few points.

First, I am not sure that Cameron is correct in claiming that in GJohn the “hermeneutical turning point” is located in the farewell discourses.⁵⁹ As indicated in the preceding analysis of relevant passages, contra Cameron, I do not think that the disciples’ statement in 16:29 is to be taken as the author’s indication that the full secret of Jesus’ person was unveiled to the disciples in this setting. So, Cameron’s contrast between GJohn and *Ap.Jas.* seems to me flawed. As I have argued here, in GJohn the full realization of Jesus’ transcendent glory comes after his resurrection and through the agency of the Spirit-Paraclete. In this GJohn and *Ap.Jas.* actually agree.

The decisive difference between the two texts is that *Ap.Jas.* shows little interest in linking the post-resurrection disclosures of Jesus with his pre-resurrection activity and teaching, whereas GJohn *emphasizes* the link between the revelatory activity of the Spirit-Paraclete and the historic ministry/teachings of Jesus. Indeed, in *Ap.Jas.* 8.1-10, Jesus appears to treat as second-class those for whom his pre-resurrection teaching (“parables”) was sufficient, in contrast with which the disciples (and intended readers) are urged to go on to the more secretive truth revealed in this text.⁶⁰

Moreover, in *Ap.Jas.*, unlike GJohn, the reference to the post-resurrection revelation and reinterpretation of Jesus as “remembering” is not really a major motif.

⁵⁷ I cite here from the translation of *Ap.Jas.* by Francis E. Williams in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English, Revised Edition*, ed. James M. Robinson (Leiden/New York: Brill, 1988), 30 (29-37).

⁵⁸ Cameron, *Sayings Traditions*, 116-24.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 119. Cameron rightly notes that it is significant that GJohn offers a “life” of the historic Jesus, and that *Ap.Jas.* does not. But he seems to me to miss the import of this.

⁶⁰ I fear, thus, that Cameron (*ibid.*, 120) may over-emphasize a supposedly intended continuity in *Ap.Jas.* with the teaching of the earthly Jesus.

It does not appear again in *Ap.Jas.* after this early scene. But in GJohn, I contend, the cognitive work of the Spirit-Paraclete is more prominently portrayed as a reminding/remembering, and precisely to indicate that the new truths that the Spirit revealed after Jesus' death and resurrection had to do with the historic figure, and simply unpacked more fully the significance of who he is and what he did. In GJohn, although what believers know of Jesus is heavily shaped by the post-resurrection work of the Spirit-Paraclete, the cognitive import of the further truth that the Spirit has revealed should help them *to appreciate more fully that the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus* comprises the embodied manifestation of the glory and name of God. Indeed, as others have noted, GJohn is probably to be taken as a formal literary expression of what it means to view the historic Jesus in light of the post-resurrection revelatory work of the Spirit-Paraclete.⁶¹ That is, GJohn is intended to be understood as a direct product of the very operation of the Paraclete that is portrayed in this text.

Conclusion

I end this essay simply by reiterating briefly my main theses, and the larger implication for our view of GJohn. First, GJohn distinctively emphasizes the contrast between the cognitive possibilities in the pre-resurrection and post-resurrection situations, indicating more explicitly than the Synoptic Gospels that in his earthly ministry Jesus did not reveal all that came to be known of his divine significance later. Second, GJohn distinctively also gives an explicit explanation of the agency of the greater apprehension of Jesus' significance that came in the post-resurrection setting: the Spirit-Paraclete, who will speak of Jesus and unfold more fully his glory. Finally, GJohn uses a distinctive terminology to describe this work of the Paraclete, the language of reminding and remembering that is intended to signify the strong Johannine emphasis that the new truths about Jesus revealed by the Spirit in the post-resurrection time are actually disclosures of what was true of the Jesus of Galilee and Judea all along.

In this very real sense, to take what Clement of Alexandria is famously reported to have written, GJohn is intended to be “a *spiritual* Gospel,” presenting in a skillful literary form the historical figure of Jesus with a radical transparency toward what the author accepts and offers as his true divine status and significance, *as*

⁶¹ E.g., Windisch, *The Spirit-Paraclete*, 12, GJohn is “the Gospel inspired by the Paraclete for the mature who have done away with their immaturity . . .”

*revealed by the Spirit-Paraclete.*⁶² To make the point clear, the author was, I propose, perfectly aware that much of what he put into the mouth of Jesus was never spoken by Jesus in his earthly life, and, indeed, the author gives readers rather clear indication of this also. But this deliberate anachronism was prompted by the profound conviction that the post-resurrection views of Jesus ascribed to him were simply revelations of what had always been true of him. Moreover, in this tactic the author also emphasized that genuine revelations given by the Spirit were to have the effect of directing believers back to the historical figure of Jesus as the non-negotiable center of their faith. But, GJohn insists, through the work of the Spirit, the fuller glory of Jesus is rightly to be seen as part of the “historical” truth of his person.

⁶² The expression appears in a passage purporting to give tradition about the Gospels from Clement in Eusebius, *HE*, 6.14.7.