

Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Johannine Theology,

Session 2, Johannine Style, Part 1

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson in his teaching on Johannine Theology. This is session 2, The Johannine Style, Part 1.

We continue our study of Johannine Theology by giving attention to John's style.

I have 11 points for us to consider. His distinctive vocabulary, his explanatory notes or editorial notes, misunderstandings, irony, double meaning, double entendre, chiasm or inverted parallelism, variation of style, Old Testament ideas, symbolism, ethical, not ontological, dualism, and hyperbole. First, distinctive vocabulary.

Part of the richness of the fourth gospel is its distinctive style. I offer the following features in an attempt to introduce us to the Johannine style, which forms and gives us an entree into his ideas—distinctive vocabulary.

The gospel of John is distinctive in terms of the words which it includes, which the Synoptics lack or have much less of, and in terms of the words omitted, which the Synoptics include. My outline comes from C. K. Barrett's commentary on the gospel of John—a word about that commentary.

Let me see. Forty-five years ago, as a young professor, I discovered the gospel of John. I hadn't really had a course on it in Bible college or seminary.

And in the two schools at which I taught for 35 years, I suppose I was the expert on it, although I wasn't even a New Testament scholar ultimately. But I got into it, I devoured it, I worked with it. I still do not know the secondary literature very well, and I'll give credit to Andreas Kostenberger as part of the Zondervan biblical Theology Series.

Andreas Kostenberger, *The Theology of John and His Letters*, has taught me a lot as I work through that. And he keeps showing me a voluminous secondary literature of which I know very little. But again and again, I've just been thankful that Andreas' conclusions mirror my own from basically just working with the text over and over again for many years, including most recently teaching two courses, halfway through and then the other halfway through the gospel of John via Zoom in Ukraine with RITE, Reformed International Theological Education.

Barrett's commentary. C. K. Barrett, or as his friend, which I am not one, I never met him; Kingsley Barrett is at the University of Durham. He's a world-class New Testament scholar.

So, for example, his two volumes on Acts are recommended by everybody as the definitive, the greatest commentary in the book of Acts. However, he'll tell you what Luke meant, although he doesn't consider Luke a very good theologian, not very penetrating and so forth, like Paul, and he'll even correct Luke at times. Well, that fits with my knowledge of his commentary on John.

I was using it. I was just learning so much from it because he had the ability to tell me what John meant. When I was walking the halls of what was called Biblical Theological Seminary, a student who was likewise catching the Johannine disease, probably from me, said, Did you read the introduction to Barrett's commentary on John? I said, You know, I don't know.

I don't think so. He said I was shocked. I said, At what? He says he doesn't especially think the things John records actually happened.

And I was more shocked than he was. You would not know that reading the commentary. He tells you the meaning of Jesus' words and signs in an outstanding way.

A little bit of the history of Joannine research. Up until the discovery of the Red Sea Scrolls in more liberal or critical circles, John's gospel was not highly regarded. Everybody saw that it was more theological than the first three gospels, but that made it, that was interpreted negatively by mainstream critical scholarship.

The second century, maybe mid or late second century, and Bultmann said, had put forth views that have since been discredited. Well, the similarity between Paul's thought and John's is that they both partake in the teaching of mystery religions or early Gnosticism. All that has been rejected now, thankfully, but John's, the study of John among scholars, especially more mainline scholars, has been rehabilitated by the Dead Sea Scrolls, which demonstrated a Judaism at the time of the New Testament that was very much like John's Judaism.

So, he didn't get his ideas from all these different Greek sources, but from the Old Testament, we think, as he himself says at points, and now there's a new look at the gospel of John. I mentioned Raymond Brown of the Union Theological Seminary in New York. Certainly not a bastion of belief, but he was part of the new look of the gospel of John, and his approach was to regard John as a separate tradition from the synoptic tradition but to give it the benefit of the doubt, and that was much more, that was much better than regarding it as unreliable, its theology as invented by John, and so forth.

In any case, I've learned a lot from these different writers. Although I don't endorse their views, their personal views, which I don't even know so much, but I want to

learn the gospel of John, and I believe in, if it's necessary, plundering the Egyptians to do so. In any case, distinctive vocabulary, with a heavy reliance upon C.K. Barrett, the gospel according to John. The Greek style of the fourth gospel is highly individual.

It closely resembles that of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd John, otherwise it stands alone in the New Testament. John's vocabulary is small, but even so, many of his most frequent words occur comparatively rarely in the synoptic gospels. For example, to love and love, agapao, agape, 44 times in John, 30 times combined in the first three gospels.

I'm summarizing numbers. Truth, true, true, two different ways of saying true, 45 times in John and 10 times in the other gospels. To know, as in knowing God, knowing Jesus, 56 times in John.

It's either 56 or 57, based upon a textual variant. I'm not going to even mention that. Fifty-six times in John, about the same amount in all three gospels combined. I am; every usage of I am is not in the I am sayings, but it does draw attention to Jesus as the speaker.

Fifty-four times in John, 34 in the first three gospels. You get the idea. To work is way more times in John and the noun work.

Life, much more in John. Jews, 66 times in John, 16 in the rest of all three gospels together. Primarily speaks of the Jewish leaders who hated Jesus, although there were exceptions.

And we'll talk about Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea at the right times. World, 78 times in John, 13 in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Our claim is not that it's never used the way John uses it, but the predominance in John is overwhelming.

To judge, 19 times in John, 12 times in the others. To witness, and then two different words for a witness, 39 or 40 times in John, 12 in the three gospels. Father of God, 118 times compared to 60 or so from the first three.

I send, as in Jesus was sent by the Father who sent me, 32 in John, 15 in the first three gospels. Light, 23 in John, 15 in the first three gospels. Conversely, some common synoptic expressions are rare in John or absent altogether.

Baptism, ten times in the three gospels, 0 in John. The word baptism. Kingdom, 5 in John, 130 in the first three.

Demon, this is a fascinating one. 11 in Matthew, 11 in Mark, 23 in Luke. 6 in John, every time in the accusation that Jesus has a demon.

No exorcisms in the fourth gospel. Remember how I said the trials are present but minimized toward the end of Jesus' life? Okay, and he's on trial the whole time? Well, John does not record the exorcisms. He kind of clears the playing field and also has no temptation of Jesus by the devil for the same reason.

Because then, starting in 13, the devil inspires Judas, beginning of 13. The devil enters Judas; he inspires Judas, and he enters Judas toward the end of 13. He goes out and does his foul deed of betraying his master.

John just gives the big battle between Jesus and the prince of this world who has been cast out. Like that, the devil is defeated by Christ, ironically at the cross, righteous of human beings. Thirty times in the three former gospels and 0 in John.

Power as in a miracle, 30 to 0 in John. To show mercy, to have mercy, mercy. 0 in John over against 40 times approximately.

To preach the gospel and gospel, 0. Boy, don't commit the word gospel fallacy, the word concept fallacy. John never preaches the gospel, and Jesus never does, right? Wrong. He doesn't have that word, and it's 22 times in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 0. No, he doesn't preach the gospel; he brings the truth that the Father who sent him gave him to share with the world so that people might have eternal life by believing.

It's a different idiom. To preach, 0 in John, 30 times in the first three gospels. And on and on, repentance, to repent and repentance.

Metanoia, 0 in John, about 25 times in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Parable, 45 times to 0 in John. Tax collector, toll collector, tax collector, 20 to 0. I'm giving the synoptic number first and the number in the gospel of John last.

This raises some questions for us, does it not? How do we account for this? As I've explained over the years, it sometimes has been problematic for young Christians, and I regret that, but I need to share Christian scholarship with those who want to learn. We know for a fact that every commentary on Acts says, and I didn't misspeak Acts, that Luke summarized the sermons and speeches in the book of Acts. For one thing, the vocabulary is always Luke's vocabulary.

It doesn't matter whether Peter speaks, Stephen, or Paul; it's Luke's words. So, what do we say? We say God used Luke to summarize Peter's, Stephen's, and Paul's words to mention the big three. Stephen, because of his big message in chapter speech in chapter 7 of Acts.

Ben Witherington III is a great source for this. His massive commentary, Socio-Rhetorical commentary on Acts, is incredible. It is true that some Roman, Greek, and Roman historians played fast and loose with speeches.

As a matter of fact, they sometimes made them up. And, of course, critical scholarship said Luke did that. Some still do, sadly.

Hansen's scholarly commentary is just marred by that kind of stuff. On the other hand, others, including Witherington himself, find a whole other stream of historians, ancient Greek-Roman historians. Polybius comes to mind, and I don't have notes here.

There's more than Polybius, but these people were careful. They summarized in their own words the message of the speaker, the orator, that they were quoting. But quoting didn't mean verbatim.

It meant summarizing their words in their own speech. Witherington correctly concludes, as do other evangelicals who study the book of Acts. That's what we have in the Book of Acts.

And what I'm trying to say is that in the Gospels, Jesus did not change. By the way, whoever speaks in the fourth Gospel uses John-speak. It's John's style, and whether it's Jesus, whether it's one of the disciples, whether it's the narrator, who's John, Mary or Martha or Nicodemus, everybody speaks John-speak.

Did Jesus change his way of speaking? Yes, those were synagogue sermons, and he spoke in this way. It doesn't work because it's not only his speaking. So, John summarized the words and deeds of Jesus.

Now, we don't want to leave the Holy Spirit out of this. The Holy Spirit enabled Luke to write a Gospel and a second volume, the Acts of the Apostles. For both of those volumes, Luke wrote in his own idiom, Luke 1, 1-4 tells us he studied everything written like crazy.

And he writes, and God superintends and works through his words to give an adequate summary of the words and deeds of Jesus. Scholars distinguish between the very words, *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, and the very voice of Jesus. *Ipsissima vox* of Jesus.

We don't have the very words, and we have the very voice. This is the point that sometimes has shaken my students a bit. It simply is how the Bible works.

We don't start with a theory and impose it on the Bible. We understand how the Bible itself works. Witness the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, which is done by evangelical Christians and inerrantists who insisted that the evangelical theological society at first had one qualification.

You had to believe in inerrancy. The Chicago Statement gives 50 qualifications for what that means and doesn't mean. What are they doing? They're trying to be fair to what the Scripture says about itself while promoting, endorsing, encouraging and defending a high view of Scripture.

I believe in inerrancy, and I always have. The people that led me to the Lord viewed the Bible like that, and I never have had reason to deny it. Do I understand every verse in the Bible? Of course not.

Are there problems? Of course, there are. Do they keep me up at night? No. Other people were called to work on that kind of stuff.

My deal was kind of to understand the Bible's teachings, and for this course, John's teachings. What I'm trying to say is God used the apostle John, superintending his whole life, as B.B. Warfield said, especially when he put his pen to the page to give the very words that God wanted him to use. He used his own style to summarize accurately the words and deeds of Jesus. So, when he says Jesus said such and such, we don't always have the very words.

We have the very voice of Jesus. As a matter of fact, even better than having the very words, we have God's summary of the words, and then, because all the Gospels have this, John, more than the others, his inspired interpretation of the words. People heard the words of Jesus and did not understand them for various reasons.

Culpability and God working to harden them are a couple that comes to mind, and they're active in John. Anyway, that's my deal with John's distinctive vocabulary. There is no question his vocabulary is distinctive.

He has favorite terms that are negligible or not even present. They're usually present but in very small numbers in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. On the other hand, they have common terms that he does not see fit to mention at all or minimally.

That's the best I can do. Explanatory notes. The Apostle John often gives explanatory notes in his Gospel.

Raymond Brown, in his Anchor Bible commentary, points out that these notes accomplish a variety of purposes. They explain names and titles at times. So, we find it in 13:8.

I'm just going to do a sample of some of these things because we do have miles to go before we sleep, hopefully. 13:8. Jesus turned and saw them following.

Two of his disciples, it says. Doesn't identify them immediately. And was he said, what are you seeking? And they said to him, Rabbi, where are you staying? And he invites them to stay with him for the rest of that day.

Well, that was a blessing, I'm sure. But after Rabbi, John includes it, and the ESV puts it in parentheses, they say to him, Rabbi, which means teacher. That is, if John wrote from Ephesus, as we believe, to not primarily a Jewish audience, as Matthew did with his evangelistic Gospel, he explains Jewish, in this case, names and titles for those who are not Jewish.

Or how about verse 42 of the same chapter 1? Andrew brought his brother Simon to Jesus. Those are powerful words. Here's the witness theme in action.

He brings his brother to Jesus. Physically and more than physically, Jesus looked at him and said, you are Simon, the son of John. Simon Bar-yona, Bar-jona.

You shall be called Cephas. It's an Aramaic word. And so, John interprets, which means Peter.

These are explanatory or editorial comments that John gives to help the reader. As we work with John's style, we want to think about why he uses some of these features, sometimes plainly, to engage the reader. Here, to help the poor reader understand what he's talking about.

Sometimes, he explains symbols. 12:33 says, one way that Jesus speaks of his crucifixion is as the son of man lifted up. Ah.

There it is. John 12:33. He said, and I, verse 32, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself. He said this to show by what kind of death he was going to die.

John 12:33 interprets John 12:32 as referring to crucifixion, to death by crucifixion. Many readers may not have known that simply by having that expression lifted up. It's a long story, but we think it comes from Isaiah 53, the end of 52, beginning of 53, which speaks of the servant of the Lord being exalted, being high and lifted up.

And ironically, John's lifting up has a double meaning. He is literally lifted up on a cross. And very ironically, the worst men can do to him is give him the horrible death of crucifixion.

But the worst they can do to him is only hasten his return to the Father. His lifting up ironically doubles the meaning of ugly crucifixion and exaltation at the same time. Sometimes John uses editorial comments to qualify other things he has said to correct false impressions.

So, in 4:2 of John, it speaks of Jesus baptizing disciples. 4:2 is put in parentheses correctly by the ESV. It says that Jesus himself did not baptize, but only his disciples.

Jesus baptized in the sense of authorizing baptisms. But we think wisely he did not perform those baptisms with his own hands. Why is it wisely? Are you kidding me? I was baptized by the master.

Oh, my word. So, in 4:2 and in 6:6, John corrects false impressions. Sometimes, John relates events to other events with an explanatory comment.

11:2 tells us which Mary it was. Now, a certain man was ill, Lazarus of Bethany, the village of Mary, and her sister Martha. It was Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair.

I'll just say in passing, it looks like that happened more than once in the Gospels. But here, John identifies this Mary as the one who did that. And, oh, boy, I believe that event is not recorded in this Gospel.

I hope I'm not giving wrong information in these lectures. It's a place, I think, where John is depending upon the synoptic tradition. In any case, it's creating, it's relating events to other events.

At times, John uses explanatory notes or editorial notes to identify characters. So, John 7:50 identifies Nicodemus as the one that we learned about in chapter 3. Nicodemus, who had gone to him before and who was one of them, said to them that he was a member of the Sanhedrin, and he had come to Jesus before, all right, in chapter 3. The study of Nicodemus throughout the Gospel is fascinating, and we will take a peek at that when we study the Church because John teaches the doctrine of the Church not only by considering the people of God corporately as the sheep, as those who abide in the vine, for example, but also as singling out individuals who are models for us. And Nicodemus is an example of a secret disciple who becomes a public disciple.

The man identifies with the crucified body of Jesus. That is just amazing—enough of that.

John gives editorial notes. He is a historian, and he's also a theologian. And here, in both of those capacities, he's helping explain his words.

Misunderstandings. Oh, these are fascinating. John includes... The Apostle John very effectively employs misunderstandings in his Gospel.

Often, Jesus' hearers misunderstand him. He speaks of spiritual realities, and his hearers are thinking solely on an earthly plane. This is so fascinating.

Let's look at these together. 4:12. This is one way John engages the reader and even the reader's emotions.

I'm sorry, 2:20. Jesus has cleansed the temple, a rather brazen act. What sign, 2:18, do you show us for doing these things? The Jews said, the Jewish leaders.

Jesus answered, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Jews said It has taken 46 years. For Herod to refurbish the temple.

And you're going to raise it up in three days? Are you insane? Here comes the... Actually, it's both an editorial comment. It's a misunderstanding on their part, and here, John clarifies. But he was speaking about the temple of his body when, therefore, he was raised from the dead.

His disciples remembered he had said this, and they believed the scripture and the word that Jesus had spoken. 2:20 gives a misunderstanding. And its purpose to the reader is to say, Wow, Jesus predicted his resurrection.

This is an example of John's difference from the synoptics. In the synoptics, at least three or four times in Matthew, Jesus predicts he's going to be handed over, betrayed by the Son of Man, he'll be betrayed, handed over to the scribes and Pharisees, he's going to be crucified on the third day, and rise again. John does it more symbolically.

He has Jesus betrayed and arrested. But here, he's got this symbolism. Through this misunderstanding, it serves to testify to the veracity of scripture.

My goodness, the disciples put Jesus' words on a level with the scriptures. Verse 22. That is incredible.

And it was founded on a misunderstanding. Three, four is such a dumb one. Nicodemus is a teacher of Israel.

I'll just leave it like that for now. Later on, I'll show the great contrast between him and the Samaritan woman. But this guy is not only a member of the Sanhedrin and a Pharisee but a teacher, an important teacher.

Nicodemus, Jesus says, unless you're born again, you cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus says, how can a man be born when he's old? Can he enter a second time in his mother's womb to be born? Are you kidding me? That is right up there on the

dumb scale, toward the top. Oh, what is John showing? He's showing this colossal misunderstanding.

And again, Nicodemus ends up on the right side of things. And coming to Jesus at night, I don't criticize him for that. Coming is incredible.

He seems to sincerely want to know more about Jesus. But Jesus plays hardball with him and says, you are in kindergarten. You don't know anything about the kingdom of God.

Oh, my goodness. You're a teacher of Israel. What is your problem, verse 10? Are you the teacher of Israel? Yet you do not understand these things.

Don't you know Ezekiel 36? For Pete's sake, like that. He's not rude or crude, but he is strong. And that's exactly what Nicodemus needs.

He needs to be shaken. And he says this stupid thing. Oh, what a misunderstanding.

It exposes his ignorance. And he seems to be vulnerable. In chapter 7, he defends Jesus.

In chapter 19, he requests the crucified body of Jesus to bury it, to put it in a tomb. Wow. 415, we're working on these misunderstandings.

Did I make a mistake on that one? Hmm. 4:15. Oh, yes, Jesus says, the water I will give someone in him will become water welling up to eternal life.

John 4.14, the woman said to him, Sir, give me this water so that I will not be thirsty or have to come here to draw water. It's an example of double meaning. She hears living water.

She hears running water. And she thinks, man, is there a stream near my home that I don't know about? That would be fantastic. Instead of coming all this way.

And Jesus, of course, is speaking of the living water. As a matter of fact, it's a little hard to know. It's either the Holy Spirit who gives eternal life or eternal life given by the Holy Spirit.

I'll say eternal life. I'm not sure. But it's one of his symbols.

Water, bread, and light are his three big symbols, according to Andreas Kostenberger, a theology of the Gospel of John in his letters. And that is correct. More symbols.

But those are three big ones. He's talking about eternal life given by the Holy Spirit. She's thinking about running water.

She misunderstands. And the Christian reader may chuckle. Maybe says, lady, you don't understand.

He draws us in. He involves us in the story through these means. One more.

11:50. This gets the prize for the greatest one. Oops, I'm sorry.

I keep jumping in the wrong place. 6:26. That got the prize for the greatest irony.

And it is a misunderstanding. But I'll do that one, 11:50, in a bit. But 6:26, the crowds.

Jesus feeds the crowd, the 5,000. They count up boats. And they go to the other side of the sea.

They're on the other side. And they count boats. And they say, wait a minute.

The disciples came in a boat. Jesus didn't come in a boat. What's going on? How did he get across here? Something is mixed up here.

And rabbi, when did you come here? Is there some boat we don't know about? They're not even thinking about walking on the water. That's not even in their vocabulary. But he understands.

He goes to the heart. In the other gospels, Jesus reads the person and says and knows their evil thoughts and addresses those thoughts sometimes. Here, he says, truly, truly, I say to you, you're seeking me not because you saw signs, in the sense of 20:30, and 31.

These signs are written that you might believe and gain eternal life, right? No, no, no. They're not seeking him for that and that reason. They want another free meal.

They're there for the giveaway. Another free buffet is what they want. It's a misunderstanding.

It serves to highlight Jesus' generosity, his identity, and his even confronting them with their sinfulness, which is a good thing. Another feature is irony. Raymond Brown, again, Anchor Bible Commentary, writes, I'm quoting, that the opponents of Jesus are given to making statements about him that are derogatory, sarcastic, incredulous, or at least inadequate, in the sense they intend.

However, by way of irony, these statements are often true or more meaningful in a sense they do not realize or intend. The evangelist simply presents such statements and leaves them unanswered, for he is certain that his believing readers will see the deeper truth. Talk about engaging the readers.

4:12. 4:12, a Samaritan woman. Boy, she is in for just an amazing ride.

Oh, goodness. He asked her for a drink and said if she knew what he was all about, she would ask him for a drink of living water. And she, of course, misunderstands.

Sir, the well is deep, and you don't even have a bucket. How are you going to get water? And then verse 12. Are you greater than our father, Jacob? John has told us Jacob's well is here.

Are you greater than our father, Jacob? It's a misunderstanding, but it is so ironic. And the Christian reader cannot control herself. Are you kidding me? He's greater than Jacob as the creator is greater than the creature.

He's greater than Jacob as the Savior is greater than the saved. Yes, he's greater than Jacob. Or how about 7:42? Very frequently, as we indicated in the summary of the survey of what we're going to cover, there are two responses to Jesus.

John 7:40. When they heard these words at the Feast of Tabernacles, he said that he would give rivers of living and supply the water that God supplied in the water-pouring ceremony at the feast. People said this really was the prophet.

Others said this is the Christ. Those are both positive responses. But some said, is the Christ to come from Galilee? Has not the scripture said that Christ comes from the offspring of David and comes from Bethlehem, the village where David was? So, there was a division among the people over him.

Some said, look, these are the words of the prophet from Deuteronomy 18, like Moses. Wow. And others say this is the promised one.

This is the Messiah. Others said, no, no, no, no. Don't you know your Old Testament? This guy comes from Galilee.

We know from the Old Testament the Messiah is going to come from Bethlehem. The Christian reader says, yikes! He does come from Bethlehem. Later, the family moved up to Galilee.

You got it wrong. You don't understand. Your reason for rejecting him, or questioning him at least, is actually a reason for believing in him.

Because he satisfies the biblical requirement that you cite. The greatest irony is 11:50. My goodness.

When Jesus raised Lazarus, that created a great stir and compounded the problems of the Jewish leadership, which was against Jesus no matter what he said or what he did. They're not buying it. John 11.45 Many of the Jews, therefore, who had come with Mary and had seen what he did, believed in him.

Their Jews do not mean Jewish leaders. It means Jewish people. But some of them went to the Pharisees and told them what Jesus had done.

Tattletales. So, the chief priests and the Pharisees gathered the council, the Sanhedrin, and said, what are we to do? For this man performs many signs. Later on, the Talmud accuses Jesus of being a magician and doing these things.

They acknowledged the miraculous element, but they didn't attribute it to God and call Jesus a Messiah or even a true prophet. He's a false prophet. He's doing satanic signs, not messianic signs.

If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation. Place, probably the temple. One of them, Caiaphas, who was high priest that year, it means that fateful year, said to them, you know nothing at all.

Josephus says the Sadducees were characterized by rude speech. Caiaphas shows it. Nor do you understand that it's better for you that one man should die for the people, not that the whole nation should perish.

He did not say this of his own accord. Well, of course, he did on one level, but ultimately, he didn't say it on his own accord. But being a high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus would die for the nation and not for the nation only, but also to gather into one the children of God who were scattered abroad.

So, from that day on, they made plans to put him to death. Caiaphas makes a statement of political expediency. That is his intention.

But God, talk about irony, unexpectedness. The irony of ironies is the high priest, in his official capacity, speaks a word of political expediency, basically saying, we need to rub out Jesus. We need to kill him.

We need to eliminate him. But his words are an ironic, unintended prediction of Jesus' substitutionary atonement. It is better for you that one man should die for the people, not that the whole nation should perish.

Well, one man did die for the people. Amazingly, Acts 6 tells us that even many of the priests means Levites surely believed in him. Because Jesus had the courage to oppose them, because God gave witnesses even through these enemies of Jesus, God graciously brought many people to know his son as the apostles proclaimed the gospel.

We'll continue on with the Johannine style in our next lecture, dealing with things like chiasm, variation, and Old Testament themes.

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson in his teaching on Johannine Theology. This is session 2, The Johannine Style, Part 1.