



TRUTH APPLICATIONS

Papers | Reviews | Essays

THE PURPOSE OF JOHN: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

David Anguish

In a view he claims is “gradually gaining influence,” D. A. Carson argues that the purpose of the Gospel of John “is not only evangelistic, . . . but aims in particular to evangelize Jews and Jewish proselytes.”¹ This paper will use his argument as a starting place for an examination of John’s purpose. Both his contributions to the debate and challenges to his position will be noted. Using his approach to help clarify the issues, a tentative conclusion, designed to serve as a working model for future study of the book’s purpose and nature, will be presented.

Preliminary Considerations

The complexity of the question of John’s purpose is somewhat surprising in light of the author’s statement in chapter 20:30-31: “Therefore many other signs Jesus also performed in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these have been written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in His name” (NASB). Three questions are prominent.

First, is the writing intended to convince unbelievers or confirm believers? On the surface, the word “believe” (v. 31) would appear to answer this question, but the fact that the textual evidence for the tense of this verb is ambiguous complicates matters. Impressive manuscript evidence exists for both the present subjunctive πιστεύητε (*pisteuēte*) and for the aorist subjunctive πιστεύσητε (*pisteusēte*).² Generally, it is argued that use of the present tense would indicate a purpose of confirmation for believers (“that you may continue to believe”) while use of the aorist would point to an evangelistic purpose.³ Both positions have found proponents and the way has been opened for scholars to turn to other data from the book to solve the question of the book’s purpose.

Second, what is the role of the signs? This gospel is well known for its preference for the word “signs” (σημείων, *sēmeiōn*) over the words used more often in the Synoptics (δύναμις [*dunamis*],

¹ D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991), 91. See idem., “The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:30-31 Reconsidered,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 639-651.

² Early evidence for πιστεύητε includes p⁶⁶vid \aleph^* and B; similar evidence for πιστεύσητε includes $^2\aleph$ A C and W.

³ Carson, “Purpose,” 640-641, devotes much attention to this issue, focusing on “an influential essay by H. Riesenfeld, who argues that John commonly uses the present tense after ἵνα [*hina*],” leading him to conclude that “the work was written to encourage believers to persevere in the faith, not to bring outsiders to the faith.” Carson’s treatment of Riesenfeld is helpful, but more useful is that of Th. C. De Kruijf. “‘Hold the Faith’ or ‘Come to Believe’?” *Bijdragen* 36 (1975): 439-449.

“mighty work,” and τέρας [*teras*], “wonder”). So prominent is this theme in John that source critical scholars have argued for a “signs source” as part of the tradition which lies behind the book.⁴ But to what does John refer in 20:30-31 when he says that the “signs” were designed to bring about belief? Brown differs from many in arguing that the signs John has in mind include more than the miraculous deeds found in chapters 1-12. In his view, though John probably does not mean to exclude those signs, “he must mean also to include the appearances to the disciples in xx 1-28 that led them to confess Jesus as Lord.”⁵ In addition to the question of the specific referent for the signs, there is also the issue of their exact role in bringing about belief. Since “the Gospel recognizes the ambiguity of the signs,”⁶ presenting both a positive and negative picture of them as regards their role in leading people to faith,⁷ the statement in 20:30-31 alone is inadequate for determining how the signs relate to the purpose.

Third, to what audience is the writing addressed? Robinson provides focus for this question: “Was its motive in the first instance to win the faithless, to establish the faithful, or to counter the gainsayers? And if John’s primary purpose was to defend the Gospel, was the opposition Jewish, or Gnostic, or Baptist, or even Christian?”⁸ Even if the questions concerning the tense and use of the signs could be answered, modern students are still left to wonder about the original readers. Unlike an epistle—or even Luke (1:3)—the statement in chapter 20:30-31 yields no information which helps with this question. Again, the way is open for scholars to draw various conclusions from data spread throughout the book.

In arguing that the book was written to evangelize Jews, Carson proposes one set of answers to these questions. His argument calls attention to features of the book that should not be overlooked. But it is also an argument which can be challenged, a course which itself leads to insights about the book’s purpose.

Three Important Contributions

Three positive contributions from Carson’s treatment of John’s purpose deserve particular attention for ongoing study of the book. First, he correctly points out that, although there are some questions which cannot be answered from chapter 20:30-31, that passage must be the starting place for any study of what the book attempts to do.

In recent years discussions of the purpose of John’s Gospel have largely ignored John 20:30-31. The purpose of the Fourth Gospel has been delineated largely on premises other than and broader than this explicit contribution to the theme within the canonical text. . . . [It has been] a task best accomplished by detailed study of the book as a whole, especially redaction-critical study. . . . In such studies, John 20:31 plays only a small role; for the textual and exegetical uncertainties in the verse . . . afford the

⁴ Examples include Bultmann, Dodd and Brown. The latter two refer to the first chapters of the book as “The Book of Signs.” For a summary of the discussion concerning John’s sources, see Stephen S. Smalley, *John: Evangelist and Interpreter* (Exeter, UK: The Paternoster Press, 1978), 97-113. See also M. M. Thompson, “John, Gospel of,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 1st ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 373.

⁵ R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 29A (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1971), 1058.

⁶ Robert Kysar, *John, the Maverick Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976), 71.

⁷ Craig Koester, “Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John,” *Biblica* 70 (1989): 328.

⁸ J. A. T. Robinson, “The Destination and Purpose of John’s Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 6 (1960): 117.

interpreter enough room to maneuver and shape the verse's interpretation in a fashion consistent with his or her broader thesis, established on other grounds.⁹

In the broader approach to the problem taken in his commentary, Carson also mentions theories which define John's purpose in light of his relationship with the Synoptics. Such approaches "refuse to let John be John." They also set up a circular argument which allows the critic to in effect have a greater hand in shaping the book's purpose than the author does.¹⁰ These challenges to such arbitrary treatments of the book are important, not only for understanding the book's purpose, but also for interpreting the larger message presented in light of that purpose. At a time when historical study is met with increasing skepticism,¹¹ anything which helps New Testament students remain focused on the documents themselves contributes much to determining the message of the text.¹²

Second, Carson gives credence to the Jewish nature of the book. Older views of the book saw it as "the Gospel in Hellenized form."¹³ Carson is not the first to stress the Jewishness of the book,¹⁴ and in my view he goes to an extreme on this point (a matter to be discussed more later). But his presentation of the evidence in favor of his view that the book is written solely to a Jewish audience does serve to keep this quality of the book firmly in view.

Third, Carson's analysis of Riesenfeld's work shows the importance of proceeding cautiously before accepting the conclusions of studies which involve detailed points of grammar.¹⁵ Such studies do have merit and, as will be noted later, Carson himself can be charged with claiming too much from a point of grammar. But, as both Carson and De Kruijf¹⁶ demonstrate, it is important to properly limit the boundaries of such studies, to make sure that the comparisons considered are legitimate, and that more is not concluded than the evidence will allow.

Four Areas of Challenge

Carson's thesis can be divided into two claims, that the book is intended to be primarily evangelistic and that it is written to evangelize Jews and Jewish proselytes. This thesis attempts to prove more than the evidence will allow and is subject to at least four challenges.

First, Carson begs the question in his claim that the emphasis on the Messiahship of Jesus in chapter 20:30-31 cannot be aimed to bolster the faith of believers because "Christians *would not ask*

⁹ Carson, "Purpose," 639. He singles out Raymond Brown in this criticism, citing his Anchor Bible commentaries on the gospel and epistles of John along with his *Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979).

¹⁰ Carson, *Commentary*, 87.

¹¹ The increasing historical skepticism goes hand in hand with the spread of postmodernism. See, for example, Tom Dixon, "Postmodern Method: History," in Dennis McCallum, ed., *The Death of Truth* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1996), 127.

¹² Carson, *Commentary*, 50, addresses this issue from another angle elsewhere in his introduction when he quotes, with general approval, a passage from A. H. N. Green-Armytage, *John Who Saw: a Layman's Essay on the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (Faber and Faber, 1952), 12-13, to show how the approach of some New Testament scholars has gone to an extreme which is out of step with similar studies in other disciplines.

¹³ Thompson, 372.

¹⁴ In a note on p. 646, Carson, "Purpose," cites W. C. van Unnik, J. A. T. Robinson and K. Bornhauser as important scholars who preceded him in arguing that John is written primarily to Jews.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 640-641.

¹⁶ De Kruijf, 441-446.

that kind of question, because they already knew the answer."¹⁷ Paul's epistles are instructive in this regard. How often does he chastise his readers with the question, "Do you not know" (cf. Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 6:9, 19)? Or, consider his response to the Corinthians on the matter of the resurrection where he begins his exposition by repeatedly reminding them of what he had preached to them, what he had delivered to them "as of first importance" (1 Cor. 15:3). And just before exposing the conclusion of their assumption that dead men are not raised (vv 12-19), he reminds them that not only had he preached the resurrection, but it was what they had believed (v. 11). Clearly, it is not unheard of for Christians to need reminders of the basics. This would be especially important as resistance to their new belief became more pronounced.¹⁸

Second, although he claims that "if the work is evangelistic, and intended for those who enjoy some competence in what we today call the Old Testament, diaspora Jews and proselytes to Judaism constitute the only possibility" for the book's audience,¹⁹ this claim fails to account for the complexity of the ancient world and efforts of the Christian preachers to teach those who converted to Christ.

There are a number of statements Carson makes which assume too much and therefore fail to yield the conclusion he claims. He argues against the view that the translation of Semitic words (e.g., 1:38, 41; 4:25; 19:13, 17) presupposes a non-Jewish readership because "a Greek-speaking Jew with no knowledge of Hebrew or Aramaic *might* well appreciate the translations" (my emphasis).²⁰ He correctly observes that "the immense wealth of OT quotations and allusions presupposed a readership steeped in biblical lore," and that the use of such terms as "the son of man," "the prophet," "the devil" or "Satan" along with the presentation of Jesus as the fulfillment of figures such as Jacob and Moses "virtually rule out a biblically illiterate readership." But this point counts as much for the idea that the writing was for Christians as it does for the view that only Jews were addressed. Carson acknowledges this, but then attempts to rescue the point by pointing out that "1 John, addressed quite clearly to Christians, makes little use of the OT, in rather stark contrast to the Fourth Gospel."²¹ But why must it be assumed that the two would have to approach the matter in exactly the same way, especially if the purposes for the two writings were different (e.g., an exposition versus an exhortation)? And when considering evidence of "Hellenistic and gnostic overtones" in the book, his response is that "Diaspora Judaism was nothing if not diverse and frequently syncretistic."²² But one must ask how, if diaspora Judaism could blend in so well with Greek culture, it can be so clear that the Hellenistic tendencies seen in John are limited to *Jews* of the dispersion.

This is not to say that the Jewish element in the gospel should be discounted or lightly dismissed. In fact, it is Robinson who makes the stronger case for the gospel being written to Greek-

¹⁷ Carson, *Commentary*, 90. In Carson, "Purpose," 647-648, he commits a similar error in his claim that the title "Son of God" should not be presumed to be a title which would speak to Gentiles because in one of the three places in John where the title is used with "Messiah," it "is connected with the resurrection, a decidedly Jewish notion (5:25)." While true that the resurrection concept had Jewish origins, it ignores the *sitz in leben* of the early church generally to think that only Jewish people would have had any interest in it. As 1 Corinthians 15—and indeed, the sermon texts in Acts—clearly show, resurrection was at the heart of the Christian faith, whether the believers were Jews or Gentiles.

¹⁸ It is ironic, in view of Carson's thesis, that one of the clearest New Testament examples of Christians needing to be reassured of their faith at the level of fundamentals involve believers with a Jewish background (see Hebrews).

¹⁹ Carson, *Commentary*, 91.

²⁰ Carson, "Purpose," 646.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, 650.

speaking Jews. Included in his case is the fact that “the fourth Gospel, with the Johannine Epistles, is the only major work in the New Testament in which the term τὰ ἔθνη [*ta ethnē*] never occurs.” He is also unable to find any trace of the idea that Jesus is “presented as a revelation to the Gentiles.” He points out that the term “Messiah” is used more often by John than by the Synoptics put together. And he notes that Paul includes John with Peter and James in Galatians 2:9 as the “pillars . . . who gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, so that we might go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised,” and that the books by those three men are the only ones in the New Testament to use the term διασπορά (*diaspora*).²³

But the question is not whether there is a focus on the Jews in the writing, but whether this focus accounts for all the book contains. Is there another explanation which offers a more plausible reason the book takes the shape it does?

Prior to addressing it, however, two other challenges to Carson’s case must be considered. The first arises from his treatment of John 14-17. Carson admits that the passage presents a “difficult question” for his proposal, since “few would judge [this section] to be primarily evangelistic.”²⁴ Again, his response demonstrates a tendency to make the evidence fit the theory. In his *Commentary*, he argues that the claim that John 14-17 is “primarily evangelistic . . . is premature, for at least two reasons.” First, it was necessary for the church’s evangelism to have teaching which explained “as it were, ‘how we got from there to here,’ especially if the targeted audience was Jewish.” Second, “the best evangelistic literature not only explains why one should become a Christian, and how to become a Christian, but what it means to be a Christian.”²⁵ In his *JBL* article, he argues much the same thing, though adding that such a passage as chapters 14-17 “would also prove of evangelistic and apologetic value to non-Christian Jews who might well question by what right Christians were trying to win them to their position.”²⁶ Once again, his argument cuts both ways, for Christians too would benefit from literature which tells what being a Christian is like. Furthermore, assuming that the book was written to bolster Christians whose faith was under duress, they too would benefit from a reminder of what gave them the right to evangelize their neighbors. Indeed, this is more reasonable than to think that unbelievers not yet convinced of the basic truths of the faith would have any real interest in understanding why believers sought to win them to this unique faith.

One additional challenge to Carson remains for consideration here. That is the point he bases on what he calls “the firm syntactical evidence that the first purpose clause in 20:31 must be rendered ‘that you may believe that the Christ, the Son of God, is Jesus.’”²⁷ Relying on the research of Lane McGaughey, in particular the rule that “the word or word cluster determined by an article is the subject,” Carson argues that since the article in 20:31 is with “Christ”, the phrase should be rendered as above.²⁸ Again, the question is whether this “syntactical firmness” yields the conclusion Carson desires. Perhaps John does want to stress the importance of the term “Christ.” But would that point not be as significant for Christians—even those from a Gentile background—who understood the teaching of the apostles as for non-believing Jews? Put another way, does it really make any

²³ The above are from Robinson, 118, 120, 122, 126-127.

²⁴ Carson, “Purpose,” 649. In noting this, he follows van Unnik, who noted that “John did not write for Christians in the first place, except perhaps in ch. 13-17 which show a somewhat different character.” See W. C. van Unnik, “The Purpose of St. John’s Gospel,” in Kurt Aland, et. al., eds., *Studia Evangelica* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 410.

²⁵ Carson, *Commentary*, 92.

²⁶ Carson, “Purpose,” 650.

²⁷ Carson, *Commentary*, 90.

²⁸ Carson, “Purpose,” 642-643.

significant difference to say “the Christ is Jesus” or “Jesus is the Christ”? Neither rendering proves that the audience for this gospel was exclusively Jewish, or that the point of the writing was to convince them to convert to the Christ.²⁹

A Proposal To Account for the Complete Picture

Brown has noted the “clear statements of universalism” in John which must be accounted for in addition to the Jewish traits seen in the book if the purpose of this gospel is to be understood:

Jesus comes into the world as a light *for every man* (i 9). Jesus takes away the sins of the *world* (i 29); he has come to save the *world* (iii 17). When he is lifted up on the cross and in the resurrection, he draws all men to himself (xii 32). Besides these statements which implicitly include the Gentiles, there are specific references. In unconscious irony the Jews in vii 35 incredulously foretell that Jesus will go to the Diaspora and teach the Greeks. The public ministry comes to a climactic finale in xii 20-21 when the Greeks or Gentiles ask to see Jesus—a sign that all men have begun to come to Jesus and that therefore it is now the time (or “the hour”) for his return to the Father in crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension. . . . In x 16 Jesus stresses that he has other sheep who do not belong to this fold but must be brought and made part of the one sheep herd under the one shepherd. . . . In iv 35 Jesus sees the field of the Samaria mission ripe for the harvest; and while the Samaritans are not precisely Gentiles, they are outside the mainstream of Judaism. These same Samaritans hail Jesus in iv 42 as “the Saviour of the *world*.” . . .³⁰

In addition to these considerations, Earle Ellis³¹ and Stephen Smalley³² find evidence for at least some of John’s audience being Greek in such things as the use of the word *λόγος* (*logos*) and in the way in which John so obviously puts a Christian spin on Greek concepts. The point is that, while the older view that the book was “the Gospel in Hellenized form”³³ must be tempered by recent emphasis which shows the Jewish character of the book, neither can it be argued that the book is absent of Greek thought. Robinson is correct in noting that “John is not a Judaizer; nor, like Paul, is he an anti-Judaizer: that whole issue never comes within his purview.”³⁴ But that does not mean that he is not aware of the Gentiles and their need to have firm faith in Jesus the Christ.

In this paper I have challenged the thesis that John is exclusively evangelistic and that its intended audience is solely (or even mainly) Jewish. Instead, I see the writing as one which is designed to bring about or strengthen faith in Jesus by showing both his divine character and how he completes God’s plan for redemption in salvation history. In order to elaborate on this view more fully, it is necessary to look at the role of the signs in John and at what the author shows about the nature of Jesus as the true fulfillment of Jewish expectations.

²⁹ It is interesting that the same construction is found in chapter 1:1, where a literal rendering of the Greek word order would be “and God was the Word.” Following the rule Carson cites, it is understood that “the Word” is the subject. In Greek, the predicate nominative is in a position to emphasize the word “God,” the point being that “the Word,” later identified as Jesus, is deity.

³⁰ Brown, vol. 29, lxxvii-lxxviii.

³¹ E. Earle Ellis, *The World of St. John: The Gospels and the Epistles* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984), 17-20.

³² Smalley, 42-58.

³³ Thompson, 372; see above, p. 3.

³⁴ Robinson, 123.

Both Koester and Kysar have written surveys which are quite useful for elaborating the place of the signs in John. As was previously noted, “the Gospel recognizes the ambiguity of the signs,”³⁵ and presents both a positive and negative picture of them as regards their role in leading people to faith.³⁶ Defined as “a manifestation, through the person of Jesus, of God’s work in the world,”³⁷ the signs are events which serve to bolster the faith of those who are open to seeing the truth about Jesus. But the picture one gets from John is that the signs are inadequate to bring people to faith if there is not already some openness to learning God’s will (cf. John 7:17). In his treatment of the signs as they relate to hearing, seeing and believing, Koester includes the examples of the man born blind (John 9) whose “initial response was not complete faith, but . . . a trusting obedience which intensified as the man was questioned repeatedly about the identity of the healer (9, 11.17.27.33).” In chapter 10, it is those who hear Jesus, not see signs, who are of his fold. Mary Magdalene’s experience at the tomb “confirms that seeing alone does not guarantee faith.”

Based on these and similar cases, Koester concludes that “genuine faith, according to the Fourth Gospel, is engendered through hearing” and that the role of signs is therefore not to create faith, but to strengthen it.³⁸ It is in light of considerations like these that W. H. Griffith Thomas has observed “that the signs were intended primarily for the disciples, or at least we may say that in the result they made their deepest impression on them and not on those who were outside.”³⁹ Put another way, as John develops his argument, the choice is not one of “either-or,” but of “both-and.”⁴⁰ John selects signs to show that Jesus is the Christ. Probably the original audience consisted of “second and subsequent generations of believers” with the goal of “making clear who Jesus is and the salvation he offers” so that the believers would be encouraged and strengthened “in their faith in Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God.”⁴¹

What place did the Jewish emphasis have in this effort to bolster faith? John has to present such evidence in the story for two reasons. First, there is no other way to tell the story of Jesus. God incarnate did not just come to earth, he came to a particular place on earth, Palestine in the early years of the first century A. D. No matter what circumstances faced the church of which John was a part or to which he wrote (if in fact they were not the same), there were certain limitations on the story because of the way it happened. He could select the parts which best met his concerns. He may have even been aware of other efforts to present the story, perhaps even one or more of the Synoptics. But no matter what the specific parts of the story he chose to stress, no matter what specific considerations might have led him to write it, he could not go outside the boundaries of the story itself. As Robinson observes, “it is fundamental to the Gospel that Jesus himself is ‘a Jew’ (iv. 9).”⁴² Because this is so, the Jewishness of his story has to be included.

³⁵ Kysar, 71.

³⁶ Koester, 328.

³⁷ Thompson, 379.

³⁸ Koester, 342, 345, 347-348. In a similar argument, Kysar focuses on John’s treatment of the signs, seeing, and hearing and concludes that, while the signs are useful at different levels of faith development, their real purpose is to begin “a process of believing which evolves until the signs themselves are less and less important and the faith perspective all important.” God grants each person the capacity to be positively influenced by the signs, “but each individual is left with the freedom to use or not use that capacity” (the above quotations are from Kysar, pp. 72, 83).

³⁹ W. H. Griffith Thomas, “The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 125 (1968): 256.

⁴⁰ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987), lxxxviii.

⁴¹ Thompson, 372.

⁴² Robinson, 119.

But there is an additional purpose to discern in John's presentation. His desire to show Jesus as the Messiah also serves to show the control of God and how his plans will be fulfilled. Both J. W. Bowker and Earle Ellis develop this idea in more detail. As Bowker sees it, the problem at issue in John's gospel is just "what the definition of Judaism [is] to become."⁴³ What does it mean to be a true son of Abraham (see John 8)? John shows that merely being born into the Jewish race is not sufficient. One must identify with the Lord's Anointed. While John shows how Jesus challenged the Judaism of his day, he is also firm in his conviction that "Christianity belongs inescapably to Judaism."⁴⁴

Brown perhaps pulls the thought together best when he observes that

we must not forget that the Christian preachers carried over to the Gentiles much religious terminology. Gentiles who became interested in the message about Jesus would soon have to learn some OT background (a good example is Paul's argument from the OT addressed to the Gentile converts in Galatia) and have to learn what Messiah meant.⁴⁵

John's interest, then, in stressing that Jesus is the Messiah was not to evangelize the Jews *per se*, though the signs he presents would have doubtless served that purpose for any who might have approached the subject with an open mind (just as they would have been beneficial for any Gentile who so approached the matter). Rather, he wanted to show what it meant to follow the Messiah, what was involved in going beyond the elementary levels of faith, which might be formed for good, but inferior reasons, to the deeper levels which came to fully appreciate God's ultimate control over all things. His plan has been fulfilled. His power is evident for all those who will truly see. His way is the one which leads to life.

Bowker asks, "Has Christianity so supplanted Judaism that all contact between the two should be abandoned? This question is as relevant today as it ever was, and perhaps St John's Gospel indicates not only the sharpness of the issues but the worth-whileness of the debate."⁴⁶ In a world of so much uncertainty, there is need for the deepest level of faith. It must be a faith which sees beyond the physical, which understands that there is far more to religion than the trappings of a successful life, or even a successful church. The heritage Christians share is greater than that. Understood in light of its purpose, John's gospel shows the way to this God-directed, true way to live.

⁴³ J. W. Bowker, "The Origin and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 11 (1965): 399.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 407. Ellis, 35-41, 64-73, follows much the same course, focusing on such things as Nathanael being called the "Israelite indeed" because he acknowledged Jesus as "the King of Israel" (John 1:47 ff.), the mission of Jesus in fulfilling salvation history, and the "last hour" as the fulfillment of God's plan throughout history. He also discusses the ways in which Jesus fulfills the expectations of religious Judaism (in John 5-10).

⁴⁵ Brown, vol. 29, lxxvii.

⁴⁶ Bowker, 408.

WORKS CITED

- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987.
- Bowker, J. W. "The Origin and Purpose of St John's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 11 (1965): 398-408.
- Brown, R. E. *The Gospel According to John*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Vol. 29-29A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966-1971.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991.
- _____. "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:30-31 Reconsidered." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 639-651.
- De Kruijf, Th. C. "'Hold the Faith' or 'Come to Believe'?" *Bijdragen* 36 (1975): 439-449.
- Dixon, Tom. "Postmodern Method: History." In *The Death of Truth*, ed. Dennis McCallum. Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1996.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *The World of St. John: The Gospels and the Epistles*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995.
- Koester, Craig. "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John." *Biblica* 70 (1989): 328.
- Kysar, Robert. *John, the Maverick Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976.
- Robinson, J. A. T. "The Destination and Purpose of John's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 6 (1960): 117-131.
- Smalley, Stephen S. *John: Evangelist and Interpreter*. Exeter, UK: The Paternoster Press, 1978.
- Thomas, W. H. Griffith. "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 125 (1968): 254-262.
- Thompson, M. M. "John, Gospel of," in Joel B. Green, Scott McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall, eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. 1st ed. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- van Unnik, W. C. "The Purpose of John's Gospel." In *Studia Evangelica*, ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Howard Riesenfeld, and W. C. van Unnik. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.

*Graduate paper written for a Course on the Johannine Literature
Taught by Dr. Michael Moss
Lipscomb University, Summer 1997*