

# **Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Johannine Theology,**

## **Session 4, The Structure of the Gospel of John**

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson and his teaching on Johannine Theology. This is session 4, The Structure of the Gospel of John.

Please pray with me. Father, we thank you for your holy word. We pray you would encourage us, stimulate us to love and good works, and increase our understanding and our knowledge of the Son of God who loved us and gave himself for us. In whose name we pray, amen.

We move now to the structure of the Gospel of John, which enables us to understand its passages within its big context. There's universal agreement that John's Gospel begins with a prologue, and there's pretty good agreement; I was happy to say, since it was my own conclusion, that it ends with an epilogue. The prologue is John 1:1-18 in which many themes of John's Gospel are introduced.

The epilogue is 21:1-25, the third appearance of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection, the miraculous catch of fish on the Sea of Galilee, and Jesus' dealings with Peter, bringing him to a threefold repentance which corresponds to his threefold denial of Christ. Prologue 1-18, chapter 1:1-18, epilogue 21:1-25, Book of Signs 1:19-12:50, Book of Glory 13:1-20:31. I should justify these breaks, so let's go to the prologue.

Obviously, 1:1 is where it starts. There's a break between 1:18 and 1:19. 1:18 says no one has ever seen God, the only God who's at the Father's side.

He has made him known. 1:19, and this is the testimony of John when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, who are you? There's a break there. There's a beginning, and there's a beginning of the witness theme, which takes up the rest of chapter 1. It could be included as part of the resurrection, part of the introduction.

The introduction could be the prologue, and the rest of chapter 1 witness the theme, or it could be just the prologue, and then 1:19 begins the Book of Signs. That is the common way to do it, and that's fine with me as well. Book of Signs thus starts either at 1:19 or 21.

I'll say 1:19, 21 says on the third day, so John's been counting days. That's a good indicator that the Book of Signs should not begin at 21. There are a number of reasons why the Book of Signs ends after 12.

13:1 is a big one. Chapter 12 ends like this, and I know that his commandment is eternal life. What I say, therefore, is what the Father has told me.

13:1, now before the feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew his hour had come to depart out of this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end. That begins a new beginning. Audience analysis leads us to distinguish between the Book of Signs and the Book of Glory.

Book of Signs, in that section, the audience of Jesus' signs and sermons is the world, especially the Jewish world in which he was, where he was, and the audience of the Book of Glory is not the world. It is the disciples in the upper room. As we said before, if you track the I Am Sayings, sorry, the signs, the seven signs cluster between chapters 2 and 11. I know it's not chapter 12; chapter divisions are not inspired, but before chapters 12 and 11 is the seventh sign.

No more signs until chapter 20, Jesus' resurrection, which is either the reality to which the signs point or the great sign to which the signs point. Lazarus' resurrection, thus, is a pointer to Jesus' resurrection, and so the seven signs cluster in the Book of Signs, and their absence until John 20 is an indication that the Book of Glory, starting in 13:1, again, has a break after 11 or 12 in this case. Audience analysis is really big in that regard.

Then, the statements in 12:37 and 20:30 and 31 are parallel, and they indicate the two sections of the Gospel of John. They're rooted in chapter 1, as I hinted at before. Let's go back to 1. Chapter 1, the prologue, I should say, the prologue guides us to the big division of the Gospel of John.

After saying the true light was coming into the world, verse 9, verse 10 says, he was in the world, the true light was in the world, and the world was made through him. Back up to chapter verse 3, the world did not know him. He came to his own, and his own people did not receive him. After incarnation in terms of light in verses 9, 10, and 11, give the rejection of the light, the rejection of Christ.

He was in the world that he made, and the creator became a creature to love the world and bring eternal life to the world. Although he made the world, the world did not know him. It rejected him. He came to his own, but his own did not receive him.

ESV says his own people, and that is good, but I have a recommendation for the first use of his own in chapter 11. The exact same expression is used in John 19, where from the cross, Jesus tells John, the beloved disciple, behold your mother, and to Mary, behold your son. I'm in the book of Acts.

And then it says, from that day, he, John, took her, Mary, into his own, into his home. That's the same expression used in John 1 and 11, the first use. There it is.

John 19, woman, behold your son. 19:26, to the disciple, behold your mother. From that hour, the disciple took her to his own home.

The same expression is in chapter 1 in verse 11. I thus would translate it like this. He came to his own home, and his own people did not receive him.

It's his own home because he created the world. Perhaps that's a reference to his own home, Israel, the promised land of the covenant people. To his own people, plainly a reference to Israel, as the commentaries acknowledge.

So, the first response given to Jesus in the prologue is negative rejection, John 1:10, and 11. The second response, thankfully, 12 and 13, is positive. But to all who did receive him, who believed in his name, that's important.

Receiving Christ is not different than believing in Christ. In perhaps a half dozen ways, John speaks of faith. In the fourth gospel, and I don't know if he ever uses the word faith, *pistis*, he uses *pisteuo*, believe, very frequently.

Believing in Christ, believing in his name, and receiving him. Believing in him is different from believing in him. Believing him means giving credence to his words.

Believing in him is the same as believing in his name. It means trusting him as a savior. But to all who did receive him, who believe in his name, he gave the right to become children of God, who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but who was born of God.

So, already in the prologue, 1:10 and 11, negative response to Jesus. 1:12 and 13, positive response to Jesus. And that contrast outlines the gospel of John.

Because the Book of Signs is summarized in 12:37 with these words, though he had done so many signs before them, they still did not believe in him. And this fulfills Isaiah's prediction in Isaiah 53. John intends for us to set those words, excuse me, alongside 20:30 and 31.

Let's do it and see the similarities and contrasts. Both have a reference to Jesus doing signs. Both are referenced to Jesus's doing signs in the presence of other people.

Both have a reference then to belief. As a matter of fact, to unbelief and then belief. Over against 12:37, which occurs first, 20:30 and 31, by contrast, says, now Jesus did many other signs, Jesus signs, 12:37, though he had done so many signs in the presence of his disciples, 12:37, before them, Jesus, many signs before them, Jesus, many signs, presence of his disciples.

Before them in 12:37 is the world, especially the world of the Jews. 12:30, which is not all the signs in this book. John was selective, but these are written so that you might believe them. 12:37, though he had done so many signs before them, they still did not believe in him.

Unbelief: the purpose of the book is belief. You might believe that Jesus is Christ, the son of God and that you might have life in his name. So 12:37 is the, 20:30 and 31 is the counterpoint to 12:37. Signs in the presence of people leading to unbelief, Jesus signs, Jesus signs in the presence of his disciples leading to belief and eternal life.

Thus, John indicates an outline of the gospel already in the prologue in verses 1, 10 through 13. The negative response of 10 and 11 presages the book of signs, and its response is summarized in 12:37, as a matter of fact, 37 to 43. And the positive response in one, 12, and 13 predicts foretells 20:30 and 31.

So, for many reasons, we see there's a book of signs and a book of glory. The Prologue, the body of the gospel, is divided into the Book of Signs, the Book of Glory, and then the Epilogue. The book of Glory doesn't include any signs until Jesus' resurrection.

Then, in the epilogue, there is another sign, but it includes the farewell discourses, 12, 13 through 16. The great high priestly prayer of Jesus in 17, arrest in 18, and crucifixion in 19, 20 is his resurrection. Different audience and different theme, not signs now, but Jesus' words and teaching about what's going to happen when he goes back to the Father, about the spirit of truth and the spirit of life, about persecution in the world.

This is teaching for his own, for his own, in a very special way. I'll say it again in 13:1: disciples go into the upper room, and Jesus closes the door on the world. In chapter 17, I don't pray for the world.

I pray for those whom you have given me. Oh, but it is missional still. And he prays for them that their God would use their word, the word of those who have, who the father has given to him and who have believed in him, that others will come to know him too, of course.

Let me do a little bit more with the prologue. It is so rich, and I haven't really done it justice. And I'm not going to do it now, but I can do a lot more.

In the beginning was the word, the word was with God, and the word was God. Here we have a reference not to Hellenistic philosophy, mystery religions, or Gnosticism but to the first verse of the Bible. In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.

This is John's background. Yes, he speaks into a Hellenistic world, of course. And in fact, the word Logos was the subject of much speculation in that world.

But his concept of a Logos comes not from Philo or the mysteries or something, but from Genesis one. And God said, let there be light. And there was and so forth.

That is, the word was God's means of creating his spoken word. Here, the word is personified. Even more, the word is a person, and the word is the father's agent in creation.

Verse three. So similar to Genesis, one verbatim in the beginning. These are the exact words of the Septuagint, the Greek text quotation of the Old Testament, even as it's the same in First John.

This word concept occurs in John 1, 1 John 1, and Revelation 19. The word was with God. This preposition speaks of one, the word being in the presence of one who is denominated as a God.

The word is in the presence of another. And furthermore, the word was God. Wait a minute.

The cults tell us you should translate a God. Does not the word that was their God like the article? Yes. Doesn't that mean you should translate a God? No.

Why do you say that? Well, because of consistency through the habit. Verse six. There was a man sent from a God whose name was John.

No translation says that it's the same God without the article. Obviously, it refers to the true and living God. How about verse 12? He gave the right to be to all who believe in his name.

He gave them the right to become children of a God. No, no, absolutely not. Children of God.

Why would anybody translate a God in verse one? Because of their prior theological commitment to the denial of the deity of Christ, for which they will be damned. You say, wait a minute. It doesn't change who Jesus is.

No, it doesn't change who he is. He's the eternal son of God: the word, the light, the second person of the Trinity.

But my false belief about who he is doesn't change who he is. But it sure prohibits me from trusting him for my salvation. Am I going to trust a creep, mere creep, mere man, or an angel to forgive my sins and give me eternal life? I don't think so.

Hence, the word God now gives us the rudiments of a doctrine of the binity of two persons in the Godhead. As I said before, primarily, John puts the Holy Spirit post-Pentecost. And it's a function not of biblical theology but rather systematic theology to say, here is the rudiments of the doctrine of the binity, which in the fullness even of John's teaching, and especially Paul's, becomes the doctrine of the Trinity.

All things were made through him. Without him was not was not anything made that was made. This is the affirmation of total creation by virtue of the affirmation of the positive and denial of the negative.

Paul uses different strategies in Colossians 1, and the writers of the Hebrews and Hebrews one, but each time, it's the comprehensive language here, denial, affirmation of the positive, all things were made through him. Denial of the negative, without him, was not anything made that was made. The Son, who is called the Word here, the Word, the great revealer of God, is the Father's agent in the creation of, to use the language of Genesis 1 and 1, the heavens and the earth, the universe.

In him was life, verse four, the location of eternal life. Zoe always means eternal life in the fourth gospel, which was in the Word. Again, another indication that he is God.

By the way, the very first words, in the beginning, were the Word, implying the deity of the Word. They echo, in the beginning, that God created the heavens and the earth. God's place there is taken by the Word.

Already, readers, Jewish readers, Gentiles who attend synagogue, the so-called God-fearers, would have their ears perked up. What? This Word takes the place of God in the first verse of the Holy Scripture of the Torah. Whoa. In him was life, and that eternal life, resonant in the Son, by virtue of his creating everything, was the light of men.

It was the revelation of God, the light shining on men, objective genitive. That is, John 1:4 teaches general revelation. How did humankind receive that? Not very well.

The light shines in the darkness that continues to reveal God, the creation, but the darkness has not overcome it. It's a much better translation than I understood it. The fact that the darkness has not understood the light is true, but the darkness is not trying to understand the light in the fourth gospel.

The darkness is trying to stamp out the light, to extinguish the light, as we saw in those verses in John 3:19 and following, was a man sent from God whose name was John. This is John the Baptist. John, the apostle, is never named in the fourth gospel.

He came as a witness to bear witness about the light. John the Baptist has a different focus in the presentation of the apostle John, John the Baptist is different in John's gospel than it is in the synoptic gospels, where John comes with a message of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, an emphasis on his baptizing people in the Jordan. The emphasis here is on John as a witness.

The witness theme, which, as I said before, is developed in John 1, 19 through the end, and then especially in chapter 5 and later on in chapter 8, is introduced in the seventh verse of the gospel of John. He came as a witness to bear witness about the light that all might believe through him, John, in the light, Jesus. The gospel of John couldn't be more clear.

He was not the light but came to bear witness to the light. No prophet for 400 years. God sends his son, and God sends the forerunner, excuse me, according to Isaiah 40 and according to the last chapter of Malachi.

God sent John the Baptist, the forerunner who came in the power of Elijah. Why did people believe the message of John the Baptist? The gospel of John chapter 10, verse 41 says, John did no sign. Are you kidding me? No prophet for 400 years, and this guy comes in this getup, looking like Isaiah, eating this desert diet, and he's preaching, and people believe him? Yes, because out of his mouth came the hot word of God.

That's why people believed him. God deliberately, John 10, 41, did not allow John the Baptist to do a sign. Why? Already, it ended up people confused him with the Messiah.

How many times does John say, John, the Apostle says, he was not the light? John the Baptist says I am not the Messiah. I am not the prophet.

Give me a break. I must decrease. He must increase, chapter three.

It is not John the Baptist's fault that there was a John the Baptist cult. Good grief. He was not the light but came to bear witness to the light.

He's a pointer. He's a witness, as Isaiah said. The true light, which gives light to everyone, was coming into the world.

This verse has been translated variously, and sometimes to give a very different meaning. The King James version, for example, says the true light enlightens every man coming into the world, and this has been used to teach the Wesleyan notion of universal prevenient grace being given to every baby. Certainly, that tradition could appeal to other passages to teach that idea.

I think it doesn't work, but I respect their attempt. My former student, Brian, whose last name is lacking, at my encouragement, wrote a book on a Wesleyan view of prevenient grace and actually dedicated it to two people, and I was one of them, and to Robert Peterson, my professor, who encouraged me, although he didn't agree with me. Well done, Brian.

Well done. Your name will come to me in a bit here, Lord willing. In any case, that's not a good translation of this verse for two reasons.

Rather, it should be the true light that was coming into the world, a periphrastic instruction where there was with the coming. Why do you say it? Because if you don't say that, then it reads like this. The true light that enlightened every man who was coming into the world was in the world.

No. Oh, as he was coming into the world, the true light enlightens every man coming into the world. Then, in verse 10, it's awkward.

He was in the world. That is, verse 9 does not teach the incarnation. It teaches God gives grace to babies.

But if you say this in this way, the true light was coming into the world, which sets up verse 10. He was in the world. That's why NASB, ESV, and NIV all do it this way.

The true light that gives light to everyone. What does that mean? Is it some kind of a? I've seen this by Christian philosophers, and they mean well. And I don't deny the truth of what they're saying, that God is the logos.

He's the source of all wisdom and knowledge. And God has blessed us with a good mind. That's true, but it's not what the verse is saying.

This verse is saying that the true light in his incarnation illumines human beings with whom he comes in contact. That is, it's a historical statement, not a philosophical principle. The true light gives light to everyone who's coming into the world.

He was in the world, as we said before now. And the world was made through him, yet the world did not know him. He came to his own home, and his own people did not receive him.

So, there's that negative response already in chapter 1, verses 10 and 11. But to all who did receive him, who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God. Unless John has his pronouns mixed up, and that's possible in the Bible, it is not inerrant in that way.



Instead, it says the son adopts people. Everywhere else the father adopts people. Let's try it again.

To all who did receive him, that is the son of God, who believe in his name, that is the son of God. He gave the right to become children of God. Does that switch to the father? I don't think so.

And that would mean the son takes the father's role. He shares the father's role in causing people to become the children of God, in adopting them. It would be uniquely in John's gospel and John's gospel in the whole Bible.

Maybe it is so. It's no big point. Who was born, three times it says, not of human doing or conniving or planning, but who were born of God.

Thus, faith is a gift of God. The new birth is not a human accomplishment. It is the work of God.

This theme, of course, is expanded in chapter three of John's gospel. The word became flesh and dwelt among us. I should say it again.

If 10 and 11 give the negative response, 12 and 13 give the positive response to Jesus. And that lays out the outline of the gospel. Book of Signs ends with unbelief, corresponding to 1:10 and 11.

The Book of Glory ends with the purpose of the gospel, which is Jesus' signs, faith, and eternal life, 20:30, and 31. That corresponds to 1:12, and 13. The word became flesh.

It doesn't mean, as Apollinarius said, only took a body. It is a metaphorical way of saying a man of flesh and blood. He became a human being and dwelt among us temporarily, tabernacled, double meaning.

And we've seen his glory. Glory is of the only son of the Father, full of grace and truth. Already, glory is introduced, a significant theme of the fourth gospel, which is full of grace and truth.

The Old Testament concept, hesed v'emet, God's loving kindness and his faithfulness. Parenthetically, John bore witness to him. John the Baptist cried out. This was the one of whom I said, the one who comes after me and ranks before me because he was before me.

You have to smooth it out in a translation, but literally it says, this was he of whom I said, he who comes after me is before me because he was before me. Sounds like gobbledygook. What's John doing? Engaging the reader.

He who comes after me in time, John the Baptist, was born six months before Jesus. But it does mean he ranks before me. He's outstripped me.

The one who comes after me in time, six months later than my birth, ranks before me. He has outstripped me. He's attained a higher rank than I because he was before me.

John the Baptist is here, probably speaking better than he knows. He's affirming the pre-existence of the eternal word, the light, the son. For from his fullness, we have all received grace upon grace.

There are many references to the eternal, to the deity of the son of God in the fourth gospel. Here is one. From the fullness of the son of God incarnate, we have received grace upon grace.

That makes no sense of an angel. From the fullness of the archangel Michael, we've received grace. I don't think so.

From the fullness of the apostle Paul, I don't think so. No, God occupies that linguistic slot. From the fullness of God, we have all received grace upon grace.

That is grace abundantly, grace in place of grace. God's loving kindness when we deserved his wrath. And the God, the God, God here refers to the son, the word, the light.

For the law was given through Moses. Indeed, it was. Grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.

And there was grace and truth through Moses, too. But it merely appears that the Old Testament appears merely illegal by comparison with the outpouring of grace and truth in the Lord Jesus Christ. No one has ever seen God to summarize the matter.

He's invisible. He's a spirit. The only God who was at the father's side.

Is that an ontological statement? That the son on earth is with the father in heaven? Or is it merely a metaphorical statement? Who is deeply loved by the father? It is at least the latter. It might be the former. And as a matter of fact, it might even be both.

I should have said this before. Over the years, as I have opened students up to John Stile, I have created a monster because it's a problem. How do you know what's hyperbole? How do you know what's double meaning? How do you know what's

irony? The answer is to work very closely with the immediate context and then the fuller context of that chapter and the fuller context of that half of the book of John and the whole book of John.

We can like an interpretation of the Bible. This is with a tipping of the hat to Grant Osborne's good book, *The Hermeneutical Spiral*, to a series of concentric circles. The circles get bigger as the context of the Bible expands.

The outermost circle is the whole Bible. One rung inside of that is the Old Testament, then the New Testament, in this case, the Gospels. And they do have things in common.

John doesn't repeat a whole lot, but he repeats some very important things, like the death and resurrection of Jesus and the feeding of the 5,000, for example. So, when he does repeat something, it's important. Then John's writings, certainly the Gospel and letters, maybe also Revelation there.

I do believe he's the author of the book of Revelation. I leave it to New Testament scholars. I'm just a humble systematic theologian having fun with the Gospel of John here.

Then, the Gospel of John is a smaller circle. As Grant Osborne shows in *The Hermeneutical Spiral*, as the circles decrease, their impact is greater. The Gospel of John, and then, in this case, the prologue, is still a smaller circle.

And then, I guess I'm doing 1:18. 1:18 is the smallest circle. And the circle just above it is one, I don't know, 16 to 18.

It's the bigger versus around it a little bit, perhaps in either direction, although 119 starts a new thrust. So that is how one would try to figure out what it means on the Father's side. As the circles expand, there's still influence, but less influence.

Sometimes it's surprising. John 1:51, Jacob's ladder is all the way out in the Old Testament. But there was an indication from the text of John that Old Testament reference indeed.

That is not a very good job of the prologue. It's loaded. It's packed with wonderful pictures and themes that occur in the rest of John's Gospel.

Book of Signs, as we've said, begins with these testimonies about Jesus already in chapter one, one after another. John the Baptist again testifies, especially making the beautiful statement in 1:29, behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world. We'll revisit this when we talk about John's views of the atonement of the saving death of Christ.

But for now, I think he is saying, not pointing to any one particular sacrifice, but as Leon Morris has said in his book, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, I believe John the Baptist is pointing to all the sacrifices, the whole sacrificial system. Jesus fulfills them all. He replaces them all.

He is the ultimate sacrifice. As Hebrew says in a different language and very plainly, that is the fulfillment and replacement of all those other sacrifices. And then in the rest of chapter one, we have more witnesses to Jesus.

C. H. Dodd is a famous book on the Gospel of John. And he, I think, rightly points out, very insightfully, that John 1:7 and 8 outline John 1:19 through 42. So I can get this right.

First of all, John 1:7. John came as a witness to bear witness to the light. That is John 1:19 through 28. Repeatedly, John says, I am not the Messiah.

I am not the prophet. I am not Elijah. Although in Matthew, Jesus says he came in the spirit and power of Elijah, he's not that Elijah figure from Malachi 4, who will appear in the last days, according to Jewish understanding.

So that is John 1:7. John came as a witness to bear witness to the light, which is the Joachim heading, if you will, for John 1:19 through 28. That all might believe in him. Excuse me.

The heading for John 1:19 through 28 is this. He was not the light but came to bear witness about the light. That's the heading.

Then, the one for John 1:29 through 34 is this: He came as a witness to bear witness about the light because that's what he does. Behold, the Lamb of God.

Then, the heading for John 1:35 through 42 is this: John 1:7. That all might believe through him. Because there we find the next day again, John was standing.

There were two of his disciples. And he looked at Jesus as he walked by. And he said, Behold, the Lamb of God.

And watch what happens. The two disciples heard him say this, and they followed Jesus. They left John.

They believed in Jesus. They follow Jesus and leave John, and John is pleased. The one is from above is greater.

I'm just the friend of the he's the bridegroom. He's the he's the savior of the church. I'm not; I'm just his friend.

I think that was an insightful series of ideas by CH Dodd in his good book on the themes of the fourth gospel. He was not the light became the bear witness about the light John 1:19 to 28. He came as a witness to bear witness of the light John 1:29 to 34.

That all might believe in the light in him. John 1:35 through 42. The Book of Signs, as we've said a number of times, starts with 1:19, the testimony section to the end of chapter one to the testimony of John the Baptist, John, the Apostle and, Philip, Andrew, Peter, and Nathaniel.

These are witnesses to Jesus. Chapter two and verse one begin the first of the seven signs. They continue through the end of chapter 11, where Lazarus is raised to seven signs are: water to wine, chapter 2; officer son healed, chapter 4, lame man healed chapter 5, 5,000 fed; Jesus delivers the disciples from the storm at sea walks on the water 6, healing a blind man, he ups the ante, it's more difficult 9, most difficult. Lazarus is raised in chapter 11. That's the Book of Signs is filled with signs and miracles. They are signs because they reveal who Jesus is.

Scholars correctly relate them not in any kind of one-to-one correspondence but to the signs in the book of Exodus, the plagues, which not only judged the Egyptian gods but revealed Yahweh as the true and living God. Once again, the signs pointed to the deity of the sun, who revealed his glory in the signs. We see the glory of the sun.

And with this, I'll close today's lecture, this lecture, we see the glory of the sun shown in the first sign, and the seventh sign. First sign, John 1 to 11. This the first of his signs Jesus did at Cana in Galilee, and manifested his glory, and his disciples believed in him, I would take it to mean began to believe in him, chapter 11.

So, what John does is associate glory with Jesus' signs, at the first sign, and the seventh sign, indicating that we're to see his glory in all of the signs, and especially in the great sign, his resurrection from the dead. This is a beautiful statement in chapter 11. I love it.

In chapter 4, verse 49. Sorry, 39 and 40 of chapter 11. Jesus is deeply moved.

38 Take away the stone. 39 Martha is very practical. Lord, by this time, there'll be an odor.

He's been dead for days. This is so beautiful. Here's the gospel, so to speak, human. The human stench of death and sin is juxtaposed by the revelation of God's glory in the next verse.

Jesus said to her, did I not tell you that if you believed, you would see the glory of God? Whoa. Jesus did the first sign in Cana of Galilee; he manifested his glory, and his disciples began to believe in him here in chapter 11. Move the stone, Lord, it'll stink.

So good, honest, realistic statement, is it not? But he didn't stink. Jesus has overcome the stench of sin and death already, even before the cross, metaphorically in raising his friend Lazarus from the dead without the effects of the decay of his body. It's astonishing.

In this way, the seventh sign reveals the glory of God, and it summons faith. Did I not tell you if you believed, you would see the glory of God? So, the first and seventh signs are deliberately associated with God's glory in order to show that all the signs manifest the glory of God and of the Son. And although John doesn't say it, of the Spirit.

We will take it up again tomorrow and move on and talk about the purposes of the gospel of John and other matters as well.

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson and his teaching on Johannine Theology. This is session 4, The Structure of the Gospel of John.